

From: [Gwyneth Smith](#)
To: [Leticia Rosas](#)
Cc: mobilizesonoma@vom.com
Subject: Tankers in Schellville
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 11:42:17 PM

Sirs:

This subject has been addressed before! Loaded LPG tankers should not be stored so close to where people live and work. Just because there are railroad tracks. I believe I saw them stored in an empty field along the Highway from Sonoma to the racetrack. A much more suitable location.

Thank you.

Gwyn Smith

- CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, or copying of this message, or any attachment, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments.

From: [SUZANNE ONEILL](#)
To: [Leticia Rosas](#)
Cc: [Mobilize Sonoma](#)
Subject: LPG Tankers storage in Schellville
Date: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 7:42:14 PM

Hello,

It is almost beyond belief that this is being suggested again after all we homeowners and residents did to make our objections known to the previous board.

We do everything we can as individual property owners and community members to prevent fires including spending many thousands of dollars to have our trees pruned and properties cleared of debris. Also flammable materials like paint, turpentine and gases we carefully dispose of in the designated places by law. Now this old idea to use our valley to store liquid petroleum gas in a completely inappropriate place has returned.

I'm almost incredulous that this is even being broached anew. We already delineated all the reasons why this is a terrible idea and we in Sonoma valley aren't the personal dumping ground for SMART train's detritus.

The reasons have been outlined elsewhere but I can just point to the Fremont fire of last year as one such potential hazard. If the wind had been blowing the other way and the LPG tankers were still there the possibility of a strong fire rapidly sweeping up the valley to our homes would have been disastrous.

One of our most important exits out of the valley is 121...to have that potentially obstructed in any emergency should be unlawful.

This is an a very bad idea. Please spend more time reviewing our more than legitimate objections.

Thank you

Suzanne O'Neill
1209 Apple Tree Court
Sonoma

Sent from my iPhone

- CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, or copying of this message, or any attachment, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments.

From: [Jack](#)
To: [Board Questions](#)
Cc: ["FoSgooglegroup"](#)
Subject: Testimony for Jennings Crossing
Date: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 2:18:53 PM
Importance: High

Ladies and Gentlemen:

What is a system? It can be a set of things working together, or an interconnected network. Consider the Jennings Crossing as an element of a system whose purpose is to enable pedestrians or bicycles to get across the SMART tracks safely and affordably (cost effectively).

If cost was of no concern, we could elevate the tracks through the City—like BART. Would this be 100% safe? People have been killed on the BART tracks. Alternatives include a tunnel, an overcrossing, hiring a crossing guard, and keeping the crossing closed. Recognizing that there is no perfect solution, the systems problem becomes one of optimization. To champion one approach, the champion must compare his/her favorite to all the alternatives—pros and cons, costs and benefits, risk assessment. Weight the variables as preferred but make the assumptions transparent. I submit that this was done and presented to CPUC. The winner was and is an at-grade crossing. If SMART or the City wishes to embellish by adding a crossing guard, it can be done.

I submit that a systems-level assessment is not only mandatory, but it must be based on clearly stated assumptions and the alternatives evaluated together with the weighting factors assigned to the variables—including cost, aesthetic impacts, and induced hazards as well as “direct” risks.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack C. Swearingen, PhD

Chief Scientist & Director

Clear Air Energy Inc.

Web clearairenergy.com

Email jack@clearairenergy.com

- CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This message, together with any attachments, is intended only for the use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is confidential and/or privileged and prohibited from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, or copying of this message, or any attachment, is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the original sender immediately by telephone or by return e-mail and delete this message along with any attachments.