Beyond Oil and Gas

Fossil fuels have no part in America’s energy future — coal, oil, and natural gas are literally poisoning us. The emergence of natural gas as a significant part of our energy mix is particularly frightening because it dangerously postpones investment in clean energy at a time when we should be doubling down on wind, solar and energy efficiency.

—Robin Mann
President, Sierra Club

shale rock using an undisclosed cocktail of chemicals, known to contaminate drinking water, pollute the air, and trigger earthquakes.

Excelaron told the Supervisors that because the Monterey Shale under the Huasna Valley is already fractured, there was no need for fracking; they’d be pouring nothing more suspect than hot water down their oil wells.

Project opponents immediately pointed out that several large oil fields in the state are also situated on already fractured Monterey Shale, and they are fracking. Whether oil and gas shale is fractured or unfractured, fracking increases yield and profits, and “if it will make them more money, they’ll do it.”

That’s why fracking for oil and gas has become the unregulated wild west and great gold rush of the fossil fuels industry. The May 9 L.A. Times noted that the lack of fracking regulations “has been a sore point for legislators who have said that rules are long overdue for California, the fourth-largest oil-producing state.” Rules to regulate out-of-control fracking in California won’t be finalized until 2014, prompting Assemblyman Jared Huffman (D-San Rafael) to observe “It’s hard for me to imagine that we won’t have a meaningful, reliable regulatory safeguard in place for fracking for at least a year, and yet we are plumping into expedited permit project mode on projects that involve fracking.” The Times also quoted Assemblywoman Nancy Skinner (D-Berkeley), saying in response to the standard industry line that fracking is carefully done, perfectly safe, no harm has been proven in the state, etc. “If we haven’t been inspecting and we don’t have an adequate set of criteria, then we don’t know yet if there’s harm. We want to ensure that we’ve caused no harm to date, and if any harm has been caused, that we can remedy it as soon as possible and that we don’t cause any harm in the future.”

Americans consume 25 percent of the world’s produced oil, yet we have less than 3 percent of the world’s

Sierra Club Launches “My Generation” Campaign for Local Clean Energy

Campaign calls on Governor to step up support for rooftop solar power, clean energy jobs

On May 2, the Sierra Club launched a new statewide clean energy campaign in California. Utility companies are preventing California from realizing its huge potential for local clean energy development. They are fighting proposals to expand access to local clean energy and proposing costly and unnecessary rate increases for solar customers. The My Generation campaign will showcase the vast public demand for local clean energy, particularly rooftop solar power, and is calling for 30% of the state’s electricity needs to be met by local clean energy sources by 2020.

“Across our state, big utilities are denying Californians the opportunity to save money, create local jobs, and reduce the enormous health problems that come from dirty
Read “Thrive,” Chapter 5

And feel free to borrow our copy of the 1995 “Vision for Sustainability in San Luis Obispo”
As of May, Governor Brown’s proposed 2012-13 state budget expects a shortfall for the year of $15.7 billion. Environmental programs or issues that are affected include the following:

The State Department of Parks and Recreation. The governor’s proposal does not change planned cuts to the department’s budget, which will result in closure of up to 70 state parks in July.

The Department of Toxic Substance Control will lose funding for nearly 84 staff. Another 52 positions will be shifted from other programs within the department to focus on consumer products work driven by the evolving Green Chemistry effort. New funding will be developed to support timber harvest plans logging companies must produce, and various state agencies must review and monitor, to ensure that logging is done in a way to reduce environmental impacts.

All Californians will be disappointed that the state’s budget shortfall is much larger than anticipated. The shortfall isn’t good for any public effort in California, including environmental quality and public health.

We’re disappointed that state park closures remain in the budget. State parks play a role in education, recreation and physical health for millions of Californians. They also support the state’s tourism industry and local and regional business.

Closing parks will cost the state more than keeping them open, but the governor and his Department of Finance refuse to budge.

State parks would have been a smart investment for the funds the governor is proposing to lend to the General Fund from the Motor Vehicle Account. Every dollar invested in state parks more than doubles its value to the state’s economy.

Californians shouldn’t have to wonder how much poison they are exposed to each day. The Department of Toxic Substance Control is one entity that helps identify and reduce Californians’ exposure to toxins. We are alarmed by the number of positions the governor is proposing to cut from the department that private forest lands lack. And the jobs haven’t been able to keep up with demand for its services.

We look forward to seeing details about the governor’s proposal to develop new revenues to support timber harvest plans. These plans are often all that Californians can rely on to make the environmental services that private forest lands provide—society for habitat for wildlife, collection areas for snowpack and water, soil and hillside stabilization—aren’t wiped out by reckless logging.

But the agencies that review and enforce the plans have been understaffed and need new funding.

Sierra Club California is the legislative and regulatory advocacy arm of the Sierra Club’s 13 chapters and more than 150,000 members in California.

By Kathryn Phillips, Director
Sierra Club California

… and about that budget

Just One Spill

Supervisors will decide Huasna Valley’s fate on August 21

On May 15, Excelaron LLC went to the County Board of Supervisors to appeal the Planning Commission’s denial of a permit to drill for oil in the Huasna Valley.

Over the course of five hours, company reps dangled $390,000 in property taxes before the board, 35 permanent jobs, and the creation of a “solar to schools” program and donations thereof in the amount of $1 per barrel of oil extracted.

Meanwhile, residents of Huasna Valley and Arroyo Grande, armed with exhaustive research, the Planning Commission’s denial of the permit, and the findings of planning staff backing their case, faced a denial of the peremptory Huasna Valley Foundation (see “Huasna Rising,” Sept, 2008), laid out the case against the project.

In addition to an Environmental Impact Report that found the project would result in numerous direct and indirect impacts that can’t be mitigated, project opponents hammered home two main points: this project has been a moving target, with a description that seems to constantly change, and it represents the canes’ nose under the tent. Once Excelaron gets a permit to drill, they can vastly expand operations and switch to techniques more profitable and more environmentally damaging than the ones they’re proposing to use now.

The Sierra Club zeroed in on the threat of a spill. In our comments on the Draft EIR, prior to the Planning Commission’s denial of the permit, we referenced the Yellowstone River oil spill, the occasion on July 1, 2011, when a ruptured pipeline spilled 1,000 barrels of oil into that essential waterway.

In response to that comment, the EIR consultants expressed puzzlement that we would bring up that spill by way of comparison to the possible impacts of a spill from an oil drilling operation in the Huasna Valley, because Yellowstone was a pipeline spill, and this would be a tanker truck operation.

HUASNA continued on page 9

T A K E  A C T I O N

Unless we show the governor there is strong statewide support for clean energy, utilities will do what they have always done. Urge the governor to sign this Clean Energy Bill of Rights for a clean energy future that works for everyone.

Governor Jerry Brown
c/o State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-2841
Fax: (916) 558-3160
E-mail: http://gov.ca.gov/m_contact.php

And visit our website to find out more about the Sierra Club’s My Generation campaign. We need as many people involved as possible to help grow clean energy and jobs in California. Go to www.beyondcoal.org/solutions/california

By Kathryn Phillips, Director
Sierra Club California
Rights vs. Wrongs

Corporations want what they want, and keep coming at communities until they get it. Here’s a modest proposal.

What if someday some community tossed aside the regulatory system that allows corporate hog farm or cement factory - a right not to endure such impacts on our air, water, land and neighborhoods — and stood up and told that corporations want what they want, and keep coming at us until they get it. Here’s a modest proposal.

It would be something of a revolution in self-governance. And that’s exactly what it has been for the 150 communities across the country which have done just that. Weary of constantly fighting off the latest corporate hog farm or cement factory or sludge-spreading proposal to come down the pike, year after year, they figured out what the problem was and passed laws asserting their right of self-governance. In those communities, corporations quickly found that they had no right to demand that it will always get some form of what it wants.

And so far, it’s largely worked out just fine, for one good reason: As scary as it is for a community to go up against the legal system it’s based on, the federal laws, and did so several times the corporate self-governance and start a brushfire of similar revolts.

With such information, Shannon Biggs held a full house rapt at SLO’s Ludwick Center on May 16 (and again at Cal Poly the following night) when Biggs held a full house rapt at SLO’s Ludwick Center on May 16 (and again at Cal Poly the following night) when she introduced her listeners to the idea of “re-localizing” a system that’s been drifting farther and farther toward global economic decision-making. “The problem is not corporations,” she said, “it’s our own structure of laws.”

Those 150 communities that have passed laws punching the ticket of corporations and asserting their own right of self-governance have decided they’re not going to sit at the back of the democracy bus anymore” said Biggs.

Global Exchange and the Pennsylvania-based Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund help communities write and file such ordinances, shepherd them through the process, and defend them in court if subject to legal challenge.

Biggs recounted the saga of Packer Township, Pennsylvania, which in 2010 declared that “Corporations and other business entities shall not be recognized as possessing any legal rights, privileges, powers, or protections which would interfere with the commonwealth’s right to regulate Packer Township to govern themselves and their municipality,” and further declared null and void “State laws which prohibit the people of Packer Township from adopting more stringent environmental, labor, and economic standards within the Township.”

When the Attorney General of Pennsylvania informed the Packer town council that it had to rescind that ordinance and that the township had “no right of self-governing authority,” six outraged neighboring townships passed similar ordinances within a week, and Packer added a clause to the effect that “No State or local regulation or other law or regulation of Packer Township to enforce State laws which prohibit the people of Packer Township from adopting more stringent environmental, labor, or economic standards within the Township.”

Since that burst of legal action, there has been no further challenge to Packer Township’s right of self-governance, or the proclamation of the rights of the half-dozen surrounding townships that the original challenge inadvertently triggered.

“It’s a brushfire of similar revolts. People say ‘I’m going to act like I have the right to do this.’”

And then, suddenly, they do.

For more information, contact:
Community Environmental Legal Defense Fund
PO. Box 366
Mercersburg, PA 17236
(717) 498-0054
www.celdf.org
info@celdf.org

Global Exchange
2017 Mission Street, 2nd Floor
San Francisco, CA 94110
(415) 575-3540
www.globalexchange.org/programs/communityrights/shannon@globalexchange.org

Gas & Oil
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proven oil reserves. Our addiction to oil puts the entire nation at risk, and leaves our economy vulnerable to price shocks. Oil is a leading source of smog and other toxic pollution that contributes to tens of thousands of deaths each year. Oil spills poison our drinking water, pollute our communities and destroy ecosystems.

Replacing one fossil fuel addiction with another is not the way out of our predicament. Current state policy requires large increases in renewable energy, rooftop solar, energy efficiency and peak demand reduction. Natural gas power plants increase air pollution in regions of the state that are in non-attainment for air quality, and particularly affect the neighborhood: homes. And the fracking has been wreaking environmental havoc.

“From its inception, hydraulic fracturing has been an outlaw enterprise,” writes Waterkeeper Alliance President Robert Kennedy Jr. “And its form was born in a provision drafted in secret by oilman Dick Cheney’s clandestine energy task force specifically exempting it from the Safe Drinking Water Act.” If drillers can’t extract natural gas without destroying landscapes and endangering the health of families, then we should not drill for natural gas.

To achieve state mandated reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and to meet the required 33% Renewable Portfolio Standard by 2020, Sierra Club California opposes licensing new natural gas-fired electrical generation power plants in California larger than 50 MW. We don’t oppose licensing of alternative technologies using natural gas fuel — such as cogeneration plants, renewable with natural gas backup, large fuel cell facilities and biogas — if they significantly reduce fossil fuel consumption.

The California Energy Commission has permitted so many new natural gas plants that development has not even been built due to lack of sufficient demand. There are numerous alternatives to large natural gas plants for meeting grid reliability that will not contribute to global warming, including rooftop solar, battery storage, demand reduction and renewable powered “peaker” plants. If current efficiency requirements are implemented, demand should actually shrink.

Each additional 500 megawatt natural gas power plant that is built will emit approximately two million tons of carbon dioxide (plus other greenhouse gasses) for at least thirty years. The cost of inaction against global warming will be devastating to California and the world.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the largest manager of oil and gas resources in the country, just released a set of rules for fracking on federal lands. The rules leave plenty of room for improvement, and we invite you to tell the BLM they can do better.

Tell the BLM we need the strongest possible safeguards for fracking on public lands.

The improvements are common sense: diesel fuel (a known carcinogen) should be banned from use in fracking, open pits of toxic chemicals are not safe, fracking should not take place on our most sensitive lands, and people should know what chemicals are used in fracking before drilling takes place, not 30 days after the fact.

The BLM is looking for your input. Tell them the measures that actually protect our public health and public lands from fracking are the most important measures to include in any proposed rules.

Mike Pool, Acting Director, BLM
849 C Street NW, Bns. 5665
Washington DC 20240
Phone: 202-208-5801
Fax: 202-208-5242
E-mail: Director@BLM.gov
Let's Clear Up a Few Things About National Marine Sanctuaries

by Andrew Christie, Santa Lucia Chapter Director, Sierra Club
Brad Snook, Chair, Surfrider Foundation San Luis Obispo
P.J. Webb, former member, SLO County Marine Interests Group

For the last three months, readers of the SLO Coast Journal (slocoastjournal.com) have been witnessing a full-court press against the idea of National Marine Sanctuary status for the Central Coast. A local fisherman has been given unlimited space in which to voice the fears and allegations that local fishermen -- and their friends on the Morro Bay City Council and the Port San Luis Harbor District board -- have long been voicing to block National Marine Sanctuary protections for the Central Coast.

Whenever we see these arguments, we recall the efforts by the Bureau of Reclamation to run a pipeline from the San Joaquin Valley to dump toxic, selenium-tainted ag waste water into Estero Bay. An alternative proposed route for the pipeline about ten miles north would have dumped that toxic load in the waters off Cambria. This option was rejected for one reason: that site would have been within the boundaries of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary -- no toxic dumping allowed.

No political season for the foreseeable future will be complete without some variation of "drill, baby, drill" or some other way to phrase the expansion of offshore oil drilling, accompanied by solemn promises by oil companies not to spill another drop (or if they do, they'll clean it right up, no problem, you betcha). But in the waters around the Channel Islands, as well as Santa Cruz and Monterey up to the Gulf of the Farallones, the marine life need not worry. They are within the boundaries of national marine sanctuaries -- no more drilling allowed.

Guess who's the hole in that doughnut?

There's only one thing that can protect the waters of the central coast from these threats: only one permanent federal designation, not blown by political winds, or otherwise subject to whatever party happens to be in power at any moment: National Marine Sanctuary designation.

The above examples are things national marine sanctuaries actually do, not projections about what a sanctuary theoretically might do, but hasn't done. Which brings us to the campaign of Mr. Tom Roff to convince readers of the SLO Coast Journal that the SLO Coast does not need what Monterey Bay, Santa Cruz and the Channel Islands have.

In his articles, Mr. Roff attempts to depict research, such as the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary's "Living Fish Habitat review," as regulation. In frequent references to "our community" and "the local communities," allegedly banding together to reject the idea of a marine sanctuary off SLO County, Mr. Roff is actually referring to the success of commercial fishing interests exerting political pressure, as when it ensured that "the Morro Bay City Council voted not to support an expansion of MBNMS to our area."

Mr. Roff repeatedly cites the work of the SLO Marine Interests Group (MIG), which existed from 2003-2011, as though it was a popularly elected parliamentary body that enacted the will of the people. It wasn't. The MIG was stacked with seats for every conceivable subset of the fishing industry, which resulted in a sufficient number of votes to turn the attention of the MIG from consideration of sanctuary expansion. (MIG member Leslie Krinsk wrote that the work of the MIG "was perverted by three factors: an atmosphere of forced consensus-driven discourse, the Sanctuary/active/explosive users; and a paucity of local coastal data, used as an excuse for ‘business as usual.’")

Even so, Mr. Roff's repeated statements to the effect that the MIG concluded "that MBNMS was not suited to manage our area" and "wasn't in the best interests of our communities" are false. In his articles, Mr. Roff supplied a link to the Jan. 20, 2004, Marine Interests Group Progress Report, which he offered as support for the claim. This document attributes to the MIG. But this document does not contain any such statement, and it never received such a statement. The document does, however, state that the MIG's Working Committee concluded that "the MBNMS has not directly impacted fishing regulation." In a MIG poll of the members, every option considered for pursuing selected actions, "the options for ‘extension of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary’ and ‘creation of a new National Marine Sanctuary for the San Luis Obispo County area’ were collectively received more first-place votes than any other option proposed to ‘best fulfill the Shared Hopes for the Future of the Marine Resources.’" Mr. Roff asserts that the "County Board of Supervisors is interested (in a National Marine Sanctuary)." In reality, it is the official policy of San Luis Obispo County to work with federal officials and agencies to study the possibility of the establishment of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary. The most recent update of the County's General Plan, approved by the Board of Supervisors in 2010, includes a provision to secure permanent protection and management of the County's ecologically and economically significant marine resources using the National Marine Sanctuary, National Estuary, or other programs and legislation as vehicles for protection and management. Mr. Roff points out that the central coast is different from Santa Cruz and Monterey. Indeed it is. That's why the County of San Luis Obispo, when it formally submitted a proposal that the central coastal waters be included in the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's evaluation list of suitable sites for marine sanctuaries, noted this region's unique ecological and biological characteris-tics and productivity of an ecosystem with a mixture of marine mammals, fish, shellfish, and plant species that is found nowhere else in the Pacific Basin. They also noted that terms of management and protection are negotiable and that the sanctuary designation process unfolded across the full range of issues -- habitat, species protection, fisheries and other resource issues, aesthetic concerns, tourism and scientific research. Considerable public input would be included in drafting a management plan in which terms of oversight and protection for habitat and resources would be established.

There's another way in which Monterey and Santa Cruz differ from San Luis Obispo, as pointed out by Dr. Chris Harrold, Chair of the Sanctuary Advisory Council. In his February 25 marine sanctuary panel discussion in Avila Beach, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary provides opportunities for two dozen marine science facilities, which employ about 2,000 people, with a combined budget of over $200 million. The ways in which the central coast is the same as Santa Cruz and Monterey include the need for basic protections from toxic discharge into the ocean, the need for the assurance of, on the seabed; disturbance of cultural resources; and new design for protection of oil, gas, or minerals. Sanctuary designation provides this. And, as SLO County stated in its original proposal to grant sanctuary status to the waters of the Central California coast, "Sanctuary designations offer [managed] a means of resolving issues, and promotion of education and research.

Mr. Roff, cherry-picking quotes and interpreting for the reader what was said at the February 25 marine sanctuary panel in Avila Beach, asserts that Dr. Harrold said that "the Monterey fishermen were no longer on board with the Sanctuary." Here's the context for what Dr. Harrold actually said: "The Sanctuary has never imposed any regulations on fishing: "There is I think a growing feeling, especially among younger fishermen that [federal officials and agencies] are willing to step out of the old paradigm that 'the Sanctuary is going to hurt us, the Sanctuary is going to hurt us.'" Second, it is an actually a positive benefit for them. The main problem with the commercial fishing industry is that they are actually getting hammered from so many different directions. There's been a 70 percent reduction in the number of fishing vessels in the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary from 1992 to the present. Fishermen that come from Sicily and Italy and are in their seventies and eighties look at that and say 'Look what the Sanctuary did to us!' I heard this. I heard this in a city council meeting: 'Look what the Sanctuary did. Before they came here, there were a hundred boats and now there are about thirty.' So there's this view that 'the Sanctuary is the federal government, federal government is regulating, regulation hurts us, therefore it's the Sanctuary's fault.'... I think if an objective person investigated this idea, they'd see that sanctuaries are actually friends of commercial fishing.'"


To listen directly to what was said at that highly informative Avila Beach panel discussion, go to santalucia.slocoastjournal.org.

And for an even more expansive picture of the full benefits of National Marine Sanctuary designation, of course, nothing beats going right to the source: http://montereybay.noaa.gov.

We urge the readers of the SLO Coast Journal to seek out reliable sources of information on this subject. When they do, we believe they will support the goal of national marine sanctuary protection for the Central Coast.
The industry is bragging about how the new plants are much safer than the old ones. We need to turn it around and focus on how dangerous the old ones are.

-Dave Freeman

Letters

send to: sierracrabh@gmail.com, or Sierra Club, P.O. Box 15755, San Luis Obispo, CA 93406. Letters may be edited for space.

More on our worst mistake

In “Between Diablo and the Deep Blue Sea” (May), one of the “drips of irony” was characterized as “The Sierra Club’s karmic debt.” In other words, that the choice between [semiconductor] ignorance and harm to sea life can be blamed on the Sierra Club’s own acceptance of the Diablo Canyon site for a nuclear power plant 46 years ago.

I highly recommend revisiting the Sunday, 1992 issue of California History. This entire issue is about the creation of a new environmental Action: the Sierra Club, 1892-1992. “Of particular interest to people of the Central Coast would be the article by Susan R. Schreper called “The Nuclear Crucible: Diablo Canyon and the Transformation of the Sierra Club, 1965-1985.” We all know about the split engendered by the Diablo Canyon controversy; about the subsequent departure of Executive Director David Brower, and the lingering effects on the Club. What is rarely discussed is the actual language of the resolution that the Club passed in May of 1966:

The Sierra Club reaffirms policy that the Nipomo (Oceano, Santa Maria) Dunes should be preserved unimpaired for scenic and recreational use under state management, and considers Diablo Canyon, San Luis Obispo County, a satisfactory alternative site to the Nipomo Dunes for construction of a PG&E generating facility, providing that (1) marine resources will not be adversely affected, (2) high-voltage transmission lines will not pass through Lopez Canyon, and (3) air pollution and radiation will not exceed licensed limits.

The three caveats no doubt made those approving the movement feel better about their action. After all, they weren’t going to tolerate adverse impacts on marine resources, were they? Absent from this resolution was any way of guaranteeing protection of those marine resources, and we all know how much damage is done every day just in routine operation of the generating facility. To have an actual protective effect, this language would have had to be enforceable by some agency. In actual application, it was useless except to convince reluctant people to support the resolution. Three days after it passed, PG&E announced their decision to construct the nuclear plant at Diablo Canyon. The damage to marine resources began over a decade later, and the Sierra Club’s useless objection to it was completely forgotten, as it has remained up to the present day.

The lesson for today is obvious. Again and again, environmental organizations are encouraged to be pragmatic, to not be “against everything,” to accept tradeoffs. Again and again, the discomfort with acceptance of high-impact projects is justified as better than some alternative, and protestations are made that we truly don’t want this or that to happen, as if by so stating, in a futile gesture, the organization can absolve itself of responsibility for endorsing that very harm. Such protestations are as useless as the “reluctant” ayes we hear when horrible projects are approved by public bodies. The only way to make a stand for marine life is for anything else is to make support for any project that could threaten it conditional on enforceable protections that endure for the lifetime of the project.

It would be interesting to know if any of the board members who approved this resolution subsequently learned of the severe damage to marine life spawned by the project for which they greased the skids. It would be interesting to know if they found any way to gain traction in trying to halt the damage, or if they had simply “moved on.” We probably all need to be better at learning not to “move on” so easily.

By the way, how is that unimpaired preservation of the Nipomo Dunes under state management working out?

Eric Greening
Atascadero

...So Let’s Help Meet Them

By Linda Seely, Santa Lucia Chapter Executive Committee Member

With the support of national Sierra Club, the Santa Lucia Chapter, and SLO Mothers for Peace, I took part in the No Nukes Activist Summit in Washington, DC, over the weekend of May 4-6, 2012. What an experience! Eighty participants from all over the United States collaborated to create a coherent No Nukes strategy for Sierra Club to adopt and activate within the next six months to a year. The idea was to start drafting a campaign plan that uses the same language (i.e., outcomes, pathways, tactics) and templates as the priority campaigns beyond Coal.

Most participants, including the core team leaders.

The weekend combined learning from experts (Friday night and Saturday) and campaign planning (Sunday) — more than 80 people came for at least part of the weekend, including several directors and staff. On Sunday, about 50 people participated in a campaign planning session led by Lawson Legate, Eastern Region Organizing Director. The summit kicked off with a tribute from Sierra Club President Robin Mann to longtime anti-nuclear activist Dr. Judith Johnsrud.

Participants were divided into five “issue” groups (nuclear waste; decommissioning; coal; power plant 46 years ago.
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The lesson for today is obvious. Again and again, environmental organizations are encouraged to be pragmatic, to not be “against everything,” to accept tradeoffs. Again and again, the discomfort with acceptance of high-impact projects is justified as better than some alternative, and protestations are made that we truly don’t want this or that to happen, as if by so stating, in a futile gesture, the organization can absolve itself of responsibility for endorsing that very harm. Such protestations are as useless as the “reluctant” ayes we hear when horrible projects are approved by public bodies. The only way to make a stand for marine life is for anything else is to make support for any project that could threaten it conditional on enforceable protections that endure for the lifetime of the project.

It would be interesting to know if any of the board members who approved this resolution subsequently learned of the severe damage to marine life spawned by the project for which they greased the skids. It would be interesting to know if they found any way to gain traction in trying to halt the damage, or if they had simply “moved on.” We probably all need to be better at learning not to “move on” so easily.

By the way, how is that unimpaired preservation of the Nipomo Dunes under state management working out?

Eric Greening
Atascadero
Safety is Their Worst Priority

PG&E’s favorite motto is belied by its history.

For several years, PG&E dug in its heels and denied that a detailed 3D seismic study of the area surrounding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant was something that should be done prior to applying for a 20-year renewal of the plant’s operating permit — a position they took in opposition to the wishes of the California Energy Commission, the Public Utilities Commission, the State Legislature and more than a few residents of San Luis Obispo County.

Post-Fukushima, with the writing on the wall and bleeding into the ground (and after an adverse ruling from a CPUC administrative law judge), PG&E finally acquiesced to the notion that a full seismic survey was something they needed to do prior to applying for relicensing.

Throughout, the utility’s representatives have publicly proclaimed that safety is their first priority; that they are constantly on alert for any seismic hazard, always gathering data on any conceivable earthquake threat, and would shut the plant down immediately should they discover any information that points to a potential risk in continued operation.

On February 10, 2012, Dr. Douglas Hamilton, a certified engineering geologist who conducted surveys of the area for PG&E when the Diablo Canyon plant was being built, testified at the California Public Utilities Commission on behalf of the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility. Dr. Hamilton also assisted in formulating the geology component of PG&E’s Long Term Seismic Program (LTSP) in 1985 and worked on that program for three years.

PG&E’s attorneys chose not to cross-examine Dr. Hamilton on his eye-opening testimony, allowing all of it to enter the record uncontested.

Herewith, some relevant excerpts:

“The Diablo Cove fault...was exposed in the Diablo Creek south headland, where it was first recognized and mapped in 1896 by PG&E’s geologic consultant Professor R.H. Jahns. Subsequently, when PG&E had excavated exploratory trenches crossing the Units 1 and 2 fault for the (then) proposed DCNPP complex, Jahns mapped faulting in the Obispo Formation bedrock exposed in the walls of the trenches in the Unit 1 area.... Both the Jahns site-specific geologic data and the Hall open-file regional geologic map were presented in the 1975 DCNPP Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR) and Supplement extending through 1975. The Units 1 and 2 foundation excavation geologic map was then included as a figure in the PG&E Direct Testimony for the 1978-79 Operating License ASLB hearing. This was the last presentation that included the Jahns geologic data or any mention of the Diablo Cove faulting. This information essentially vanished and might never have existed so far as the LTSP Final Report of 1989 was concerned.

“The geologic and seismologic data now available clearly show that the San Luis Range is a ‘pop-up’ wedge being uplifted above a northeast-dipping master thrust and a southwest-dipping backthrust (the Los Osos fault) and that this seismically active thrust system impinges on the seismically active Shoreline fault at shallow crustal depths. This means that the Diablo Cove fault and the DCNPP are situated above the leading edge of an active thrust fault and that the stress environment in this area is affected by both the San Luis Range/10P (Inferred Offshore Fault) thrust and the Shoreline fault.

“Update presentations on progress in studying the newly recognized Shoreline fault both by the USGS (supported by PG&E) and by PG&E staff and private consultants were presented to the NRC in June of 2009 and on January 5 of 2010. However all of these presentations, either by inadvertent omission or design, avoided touching on the issue of the thrust fault-defining pattern of earthquake hypocenters beneath the Irish Hills immediately adjacent to the Shoreline fault....

“As part of PG&E’s presentation for the California Energy Commission Workshop on April 26, 2011, they show slides entitled ‘Spent Fuel Pool Supplemental Water Sources’ and ‘DCPP Design Overview’. Each slide presents information concerning the DCNPP emergency cooling systems, and each identifies the two 2.5 million gallon raw water storage reservoirs at the site as supplemental or backup sources of emergency cooling water.... The effect of earthquake-induced seiches that were widespread in the San Francisco Bay area as effects of the 1989 M6 Loma Prieta earthquake was that swimming pools..."
Every year, massive oil companies like Exxon and Chevron make headlines for the billions in profits they rake in at the expense of our environment, our economy and the health of our families. And every year, those same companies reap the benefits of tax giveaways that are expected to total more than $110 billion over the next decade.

On May 10, Senator Bernie Sanders (I-VT) and Representative Keith Ellison (D-MN) offered a solution, backed by a coalition of environmental and labor organizations. Two environmental champions introduced the “End Polluter Welfare Act” in the House of Representatives, calling for a halt to this economic absurdity with the most comprehensive legislation to end tax subsidies for oil companies to date.

Sierra Club proudly supports this common sense bill and – as Rep. Ellison noted – so do a vast majority of Americans. 80 percent of Americans agree: it’s time to put an end to tax giveaways for big polluters.

The fossil fuel industry considers us “unreasonable.” The same “reasoning” they employed at a press conference held outside the Capitol Building, “They don’t deserve it.”

While oil executives roll in record profits, they’re demanding handouts to support their very industry that puts the health of our kids at risk. There is no reason why American taxpayers should be forced to invest in the bloated dirty energy industry of the 19th century when the clean energy economy is already creating tens of thousands of new American jobs while protecting our families. Rather than supporting dirty, outdated fossil fuels, we should be investing in emerging technologies that will benefit every American -- not just a handful of billionaire CEOs.

Big Oil has fought tooth and nail to protect their subsidies before, and they’re guaranteed to fight this legislation, too. That’s why Rep. Ellison says the fight is just beginning:

“We have to work together to get the rest of the voices of the American people heard,” he said. “Spread the word – the coalition is not yet big enough.”

My Generation
continued from page 7

fossil fuels,” said Evan Gillespie, My Generation Campaign Director. “Rooftop solar is better for our kids’ health, better for our wallets, and better for jobs. It’s time utilities got out of the way of local clean energy.”

Local clean energy refers to various forms of clean and renewable sources of power, such as rooftop solar, solar energy efficiency, combined heat and power, and energy storage programs. All of these offer immense benefits -- such as energy savings and cash back -- for homeowners and families. Additionally, local clean energy investment presents enormous jobs benefits over investments in fossil fuel based energy. According to a recent report by Next 10, employment and business opportunities in clean energy infrastructure grew by 14% while the state’s overall job market shrunk by 7%.

Communities across the state are already reaping the benefits of local clean energy. In Hemet, a homeowner was able to reduce her monthly energy bill from over $200 a month to one dollar by installing rooftop solar. And in Oxnard, the local school district will save $36 million by moving its six schools onto local clean energy.

“Now more than ever, people across California need jobs,” said Alex Avila, officer of 4e Institute, a major new youth focused organization emerging in San Bernardino. “Local clean energy policies that promote rooftop solar, solar energy efficiency and more are bringing good paying jobs, economic investment, and progress to local communities. As we prepare members of our community for a good career in these industries, it’s crucial that our state leaders stand up to special interests that would halt future progress.”

The campaign launch comes at a time when the Public Utilities Commission is considering approval of a proposal that would boost renewable energy use by homeowners, schools and businesses and lower energy costs for ratepayers. The state currently has limits to cap the amount of local renewable energy at 5%. Unlike Big Oil, who fight tooth and nail to prevent the growth of clean local energy and the jobs, savings and other benefits associated with the expanded use of rooftop solar.

“Too many utilities are stuck in the past and fighting the inevitable growth of local clean energy in the economy rather than embracing it,” said Danny Kennedy, President of Sungevity. “The solar industry, with tens of thousands of jobs at stake in California, should get behind the My Generation campaign and demand that our public officials ensure Californians access to more affordable clean energy.”

The campaign has released the “Clean Energy Bill of Rights,” which establishes the foundational principles for California’s local clean energy future, such as universal access to local clean energy, increased access for low income communities and communities of color, to the right to earn money from the sun that falls on your roof. As part of the statewide effort to move California onto 30% local clean energy, “My Generation” is also urging California Governor Jerry Brown to stand with California families and schools by signing the “Clean Energy Bill of Rights” (see page 3) and creating a plan for a local clean energy future. Go to sierraclub.org/mygeneration.

Getting bigger Representative Keith Ellison drums up support for the End Polluter Welfare Act, cutting off government subsidies for big oil companies.
The Yellowstone spill. The potential hazards of a spill are as great as the hazards of an oil spill. The pipeline operator in question was Exxon/Mobil, a company with more resources at its command than any other company in history. The upshot of all those advantageous circumstances: the company initially reported that the oil was contained in a ten-mile stretch of the river near the pipeline; the next day, company officials insisted that oil had been sighted no more than 25 miles away.

In the case of the Yellowstone Spill, the pipeline had recently been reported as meeting “all regulatory requirements,” “the pipeline operator had a spill response plan in place, and the operator in question was Exxon/Mobil, a company with more resources at its command than any other company in history. The upshot of all those advantageous circumstances: the company initially reported that the oil was contained in a ten-mile stretch of the river near the pipeline; the next day, company officials insisted that oil had been sighted no more than 25 miles away.

The spilled crude had spread deep into the woods and across farm fields, making it difficult to find and remove. “Nobody would have guessed how hard it would be,” said ExxonMobil Pipeline Company vice president Geoff Craft. Exxon is proposing to store produced water on site. The hazards of that water entering the watershed are as great as the hazards of an oil spill. The potential hazards of a wastewater spill are insufficiently analyzed in the EIR, as the County Health Commission has pointed out, relative to the EIR’s lack of any assessment of a “field lifetime cumulative impact” for “the inevitable oil/produced water spill, which will add high concentrations of dissolved solids into the ground water of the Huasna River tributaries adjacent to the proposed production areas. These higher concentrations of dissolved solids have a health impact to humans…animals, and riparian species.” At the May 15 hearing, all discussion of spill hazards centered on tanker trucks. But the EIR admits that “The most likely spills from the facility would involve crude oil and/or produced water prior to reclamation.” For potential mitigation, it points to the implementation of “oil spill prevention plans and measures” in the form of an impressive looking list of industry policies and federal regulations…all of which were in effect at the time of, but did not prevent or adequately contain, the Yellowstone River spill.

The response to the Yellowstone spill came down to crews picking their way through hundreds of acres of underbrush, per the Associated Press, “lopping off oil-stained plants and tree branches with hand clippers and hauling the material away in plastic bags.” Again: this was ExxonMobil, world’s richest company, with access to resources Exxon can only dream of; the spill didn’t happen in ice floes above the Arctic Circle nor a mile beneath the Gulf of Mexico, and this was the best they could do. Exxon was mistaken in its belief of how quick and easy cleanup would be, and was thwarted in its efforts. It’s response came down to a series of attempts to minimize and downplay—followed by admissions that it was “more difficult than expected,” “nobody would have guessed how hard it would be,” said ExxonMobil Pipeline Company vice president Geoff Craft.

In the case of the Yellowstone Spill, the pipeline had recently been reported as meeting “all regulatory requirements,” “the pipeline operator had a spill response plan in place, and the operator in question was Exxon/Mobil, a company with more resources at its command than any other company in history. The upshot of all those advantageous circumstances: the company initially reported that the oil was contained in a ten-mile stretch of the river near the pipeline; the next day, company officials insisted that oil had been sighted no more than 25 miles away.

Supervisor Gibson asked staff to come back with answers to questions about exactly what the claimed financial benefit of the project to the County would be, and noted that the potential oilfield in the Huasna Valley is substantially larger than the area the applicant is proposing to explore. Hence, the County needs to know “whether there would be a cumulative impact” from possible expansion of the wells over a larger area via the “pretty clear suggestion that others with mineral rights would certainly be interested in the development of their mineral rights.” Gibson also raised a question raised by the Sierra Club in our comments on the Draft EIR concerning the restriction of the calculation of the project’s greenhouse gas impacts, and wanted to know if supervisors should also be considering the impacts from subsequent refining and burning of the oil rather than analyzing only the direct emissions related to getting the oil out of the ground. The wildlife, fisheries, and environment of the Yellowstone River are expected to suffer long-term consequences from last summer’s spill. Conservation biologist Charles Preston of the Draper Museum of Natural History told CNN “It could take years to really understand the impact of the spill.” In addition to fish kills, the many water fowl and birds of prey would be particularly vulnerable because of their fish-dependent diets, and toxins may also kill off insects that are critical food for both. What was true for the Yellowstone is true here. It is not worth it. The Board of Supervisors needs to protect the Huasna Valley, uphold the General Plan, and deny this permit.

Historical Virginia Trip Sept. 23-30

If you always wanted to see some of the most famous historical sites in and around the State of Virginia, this is the trip for you. We will fly into Washington Dulles Airport, then bus to the restored Revolutionary Era Town of Williamsburg; Jamestown, the site of the first permanent settlement in America; and the Yorktown Battlefield. We will tour such historical sites as Appomattox Court House where Lee surrendered to Grant, and Monticello, home of Thomas Jefferson. We’ll take in the Shenandoah Valley, Skyline Drive and the Appalachian Trail, Harpers Ferry, Gettysburg Battlefield, and finish up with Fort McHenry, the City of Annapolis, the U.S. Naval Academy and maybe even a cruise on the Chesapeake.

8 days, 7 nights. $1250 for SC members ($1350 for non-members). Includes all lodging costs, transportation to and from Dulles Airport and while on the trip, all admission fees to scheduled locations and all breakfasts. Lunches and dinners and airfare to and from Dulles not included. $500 will reserve your spot on the trip, with the remainder due July 1. For info, call (949-768-610; mikeasapp@cox.net), or write Mike Sappingfield at 26352 Via Juanita, Mission Viejo, CA 92691. If you prefer postal delivery to email, please include 2 addressed stamped envelopes (SASE). To register, send $500, made out to Sierra Club, with the application forms to Mike at the above address. Outing leaders: Mary Morales, Mike & Patty Sappingfield.
This interpretation suited PG&E's evident need to constrain the length, magnitude and capability of the Hosgri fault.

presentation known to the writer. This has resulted in non-recognition or non-acknowledgment by PG&E of what may well be the controlling seismic hazard to the seismic safety of DCNPP, i.e., the offshore fault along San Luis Range/10'F active thrust fault that available seismologic data suggests underlies the DCNPP site at shallow depth. This has the likely consequence of putting the safety of the plant and the electricity it provides to the State power grid, and potentially the health and safety of the public and its property at risk.

"PG&E has sponsored the collection of various forms of low energy seismic reflection data, according to a program to its own design that apparently partly responded to the requirement mandated by AB1632 for a 3D seismic reflection survey.... None of this data provided any information useful for significantly improving understanding of the seismic potential for nothing in the planned additional surveys, both onshore and offshore, offers any prospect for any result beyond marginal improvement to what is already known.

"During the 43 years since PG&E submitted the FSAR for a Construction Permit for DCNPP Unit 1 to the AEC, it has made a series of submittals with representations regarding geologic and seismic conditions that concern the seismic safety of the nuclear power plant. The submittals and testimony...essentially all presented by PG&E's consultants.... Representations of potentially more adverse seismic conditions presented by intervenors and some academics,

however, were generally countered by PG&E with support by the AEC/NRC even though with 20/20 hindsight it has since become evident that many of those intervenors concerns were valid.

"From its inception the Long Term Seismic Program (LTSP) was very tightly controlled by PG&E geologist Lloyd Cuff and his principal lieutenants. This resulted in a study that was wide ranging but not excessive, where benefit to PG&E that nothing in it indicated any hazard to the seismic safety of the DCNPP that exceeded that already accounted for. The LTSP results thus fulfilled the license condition that had mandated the program, validated the seismic safety of the plant to the satisfaction of the AEC, and now known to be the cutting edge of state-of-the-art geologic and seismic research. Or so it appeared. However, retrospective review reveals several noteworthy deficiencies in the LTSP, as are described below.

"The best known of the deficiencies in the LTSP findings is the failure to recognize the Shoreline fault.... Much of the seismologic evidence used by Harderchief to identify the Shoreline fault in 2008 was available but not acknowledged as significant by PG&E in 1988. In addition to this seismologic evidence, PG&E prepared an Onshore-Offshore Geologic Correlation Map (LTSP Plate 19/58) which included exact delineations of the scarps along the Shoreline fault as it is now known and the onshore trace of the Diablo Cove fault (but not the onshore trace as precisely delineated on PG&E's previous PSAR and FSAR submittals). The Shoreline fault scarp bower was represented by a symbol for "Lineament related to old shoreline" and the Diablo Cove offshore trace by a symbol simply described as "unidentified "rectilinear defined lineament." Both features were therefore conveniently harmless, and to the map later cited by PG&E in its response to an NRC Request for Information, arguing that there was no fault along the shoreline.

The real basis for this request by the NRC reviewers was an interpretation by a participant with the NRC-sponsored UNR (University of Nevada at Reno) team directed by UNR Professor David 'Burt' Slemon, also by Dr. Robert Brown of the USGS, to the effect that the neotectonics of the Irish Hills/San Luis Range required the existence of a fault in the near-shore parallel to the Irish Hills range front. This interpretation was documented in an M.S. thesis completed by UNR graduate student Steven Nitchman in May 1988, but was known by PG&E several months earlier.

However, Nitchman's shoreline-parallel reverse (thrust) fault, later referred to as the unmerged offshore fault [10F], was dismissed by PG&E. Instead, the undeniable tectonic requirement to explain the level uplift of the Irish Hills was replaced with a vaguely defined 'Southwest Boundary Zone.' This zone conventionally amounted to an 'IOF' and the company's continuing extension into the offshore opposite the DCNPP site was the 'Pecho' fault, which was shown to parallel to but slightly more than a km from the Irish Hills shoreline. This safely distant 'Pecho' fault — PG&E's rationalization for the level uplift of the Irish Hills — was not accorded the importance of an earthquake magnitude assignment...

However, when the Shoreline fault was identified in 2008, part of the data used to define the surface expression of the Shoreline Fault also showed that there was no 'Pecho' fault. So, with the 'Pecho' fault now 'disappeared,' PG&E has yet to provide a replacement tectonic explanation for the southwest side level uplift of the Irish Hills. Additionally, to the best of this writer's knowledge, PG&E has never acknowledged, either in the 1988 LTSP or the 2011 Shoreline fault investigation, even a possibility that the pattern of earthquake hypocenters beneath the Irish Hills has any implications for either the uplift of the Hills, or the earthquake hazard to the DCNPP.

"During the LTSP of 1985-1991 and the following Shoreline fault investiga-
tion of 2008-2011, the 'Cambria Stepover' was preserved in PG&E's representations of the relationship between the purported separate San Simeon and Hosgri segments of an overall San Gregorio-Hosgri regional fault. This interpretation well suited PG&E's evident need to constrain the length, hence the magnitude, capability and possibly also the slip rate, of the Hosgri fault by the end of the year their representation of the Hosgri at a point opposite the 'stepover' area, they were able to limit its overall length to around 110 km and therewith its maximum magnitude to MT2. And when, during its review of the LTSP report, the NRC asked for documentation of the existence and nature of the Cambria Stepover, PG&E responded with a supplemental study that showed an extensional pull-apart basin in front of the Hosgri on the west and the San Simeon fault on the east, opposite the shoreline south of Cambria. This was clearly at odds with a USGS-backed investigation by then UC Santa Cruz graduate geophysics student Bob Leslie [that showed] there was no 'stepover' structure and that since there was no confirming evidence the San Simeon and Hosgri faults, these faults names simply referred to northerly and southerly reaches of the same approximately 150-km-long fault... PG&E's application requesting ratepayer funding to conduct yet another investigation of the 'Cambria Stepover' by its geology and geophysics consultants is an unnecessary expenditure given the exhaustive body of work in this area already completed by the USGS, and represents resources that could better be focused on the under-explored areas of concern previously identified in this testimony.

"From the establishment of PG&E's Geosciences Department in 1985 through its presentations at its SSNEC workshop in late 2011 (the Diablo Cove Fault), it previously well-documented zone of faulting extending through the foundation of DCNPP Unit 1, has never been mentioned."

...
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Hold Your Water

“Slow it, sink it, spread it” is the mantra of enlightened water managers who know that water works best when it stays on the land where it falls.

Now that mantra can be yours, too, along with healthier soils, happier wildlife, and reductions in your water bill, thanks to the tips and techniques in Rainwater Management for Low Impact Development, a publication of the Appropriate Technology Coalition – SLO Green Build, the Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club and the Surfrider Foundation, available for $10 postage paid, while supplies last. Mail your check to Sierra Club, P.O. Box 15755, SLO 93406.
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Heimholz Consulting
Business Computer Networks

Phone: (805) 547-0293
E-mail: dave@heimholz.net

Providing personalized computer service to businesses in San Luis Obispo county.

A Will is a Way
Make a commitment to the next generation by remembering the Sierra Club in your will. Your support will help others preserve the intricate balance of nature.

Contact: John Calisiery
Director of Gift Planning at (800) 927-6527 or email: plannedgiving@sierraclub.org

Rainwater Management
Low Impact Development
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Paul J. McCluskey - Photo-Paintings
“New Visions of the Central Coast”
P.O. Box 9013 • San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
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email: pauljmcluskey@lightstudio.com
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www.claire.wright.natalieweary.rilightstudio.com

“Summer Light - Old Days Farm”
San Luis Obispo, CA
Outings and Activities Calendar

Seller of travel registration information: CST 2087766-40. Registration as a seller of travel does not constitute approval by the State of California.

All our hikes and activities are open to all Club members and the general public. Please bring drinking water to all outings and optionally a lunch. Sturdy footwear is recommended. All phone numbers listed are within area code 805 unless otherwise noted. Pets are generally not allowed. A parent or responsible adult must accompany children under the age of 18. If you have any suggestions for hikes or outdoor activities, questions about the Chapter’s outing policies, or would like to be an outings leader, call Outings Chair Joe Morris, 549-0355. For information on a specific outing, please call the listed outing leader.

Sun., June 10, 1 p.m. City Walk: The Mill St. Historic District. An easy, guided stroll through neighborhood of splendid century-old homes to reveal SLO in the era of Hearst, coming of the railroad, WW I, and the twenties. Learn the stories of both the rich and the not-so-famous who shaped the city of today. Duration about 1 1/2 hrs. Meet at corner of Monterey and Johnson Sts, SLO. Info.: Joe Morris, 549-0355.

Fri-Sun, June 15-17, Santa Rosa Wilderness Trail Maintenance. Join the Friends of Nevada Wilderness to build an enclosure on a spring near Mahogany Creek, north of Winne- mucca and the Black Rock NCA, not far from the Summit Lake reserva- tion. This is a family-friendly event, and all meals except lunch are included. For details, contact Leader Graham Stafford, 775-688-8478 or grahambstafford@gmail.com Great Basin Group-Toiyabe Chapter.

Fri-Sun, June 29-July 1, Emigrant Trails in the Black Rock Desert. On Friday, come to Double Hot Springs, about 30 miles north of Gerlach, Nevada, to meet up with Trails West people surveying the Emigrant Trail between Double Hot Springs and Mud Meadows, about 20 miles north. Get in some hiking, driving, and time in the hot springs. Probable visit to Hardin City ghost town. No RVs or trailers allowed. 4 WD strongly preferred. Sign up 6/15-6/27 with Leader: David Book, 775-843-6443. Great Basin Group-Toiyabe Chapter.

Fri-Sun, July 13-15, Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge. Work with U.S. Fish & Wildlife to remove old barbed wire fence, which is a threat to native pronghorn antelope and sage grouse. This is a family-friendly event, and all meals except lunch are provided. For details, contact Graham Stafford, 775-688-8478, grahambstafford@gmail.com or Pat Bruce of Friends of Nevada Wilder- ness, pbruce@nevadawilderness.org Great Basin Group-Toiyabe Chapter.

Morro Mania Day!

Hike the Five Morros, Saturday, June 9th.

Join botanist Bill Waycott, Andrea Ortiz, and Joe Morris for a unique, one-day ascent of the five publicly accessible morros, near San Luis Obispo and Morro Bay. You’re invited to hike all five morros in succession or select one or more of them to suit your preferences. Each has a beautiful, but different vista—from city to grassland to the seashore. Round-trip distance for all five is about 13 miles, with 3,500 ft. elevation gain. Please realistically assess your hiking skills and plan accordingly. No reservations taken. Bring plenty of water (store extra water in your vehicle), lunch and snacks, and dress in layers for changing weather. The day is likely to start and end cool, but be quite warm at mid-day. A hat, sunscreen, and sturdy hiking shoes are essential. For more information, call Bill at 459-2103 or email: bill.waycott@gmail.com.

Morros hike schedule:

7:30 a.m. Islay Hill, 2 miles, 500 ft. gain, moderate. The easternmost of the morros, with views of five others. To trailhead, take Tank Farm Rd. east past Orcutt Rd, then south on Spanish Oaks Dr., then east on Sweet Bay Lane to end.

9:30 a.m. Cerro San Luis, 4 miles, 1,100 ft. gain, moderately strenuous. Has knockout views of SLO. Trailhead at the end of Marsh St., just before onramp to Hwy 101 south.

12:30 p.m. Bishop Peak. 3.5 miles, 950 ft. gain, moderately strenuous. Highest of all the morros. Hike begins with lunch at 12:30, then up the trail at 1 p.m. From Hwy 1, go west on Highland Dr. (opposite Cal Poly entrance), then right on Patricia Drive. Park at trailhead on Patricia Dr just before reaching Aracapa Circle.

4:30 p.m. Cerro Cabrillo, 2.5 miles, 800 ft. gain, moderate. 360-degree views from the Santa Lucia Mts. to the coastline. Meet at Quarry Trail trailhead on South Bay Blvd, 1.4 miles south of Hwy 1 or .4 mile north of Torri Rd.

6:30 p.m. Black Hill. .5 mile, 100 ft. gain, easy. Ocean views from Montana de Oro north to San Simeon. From South Bay Blvd, drive into Morro Bay State Park, turn right at first fork onto Park View Rd., then right onto Black Hill Road to end.

If you have never done the Morros, or if you have, do join us for this day to remember.