



**Fw: Deny Phillips 66 Oil By Rail Spur**  
**Lynn Compton** to: Ryan Hostetter  
Sent by: **Jocelyn Brennan**

11/21/2015 11:35 AM

----- Forwarded by Jocelyn Brennan/BOS/COSLO on 11/21/2015 11:35 AM -----

From: Stanley Fisher <fisherstanley@gmail.com>  
To: lcompton@co.slo.ca.us  
Date: 11/21/2015 11:21 AM  
Subject: Deny Phillips 66 Oil By Rail Spur

---

Supervisor Compton,

Many of your Nipomo residents were alarmed to hear that you said that you had not seen many negative letters regarding the Phillips 66 oil by rail spur project.

Please read the newspapers, every week a letter to the editor request to deny the project has appeared in the San Luis Obispo tribune. Congresswoman Capps held a new energy hearing at Cal Poly PAC and opened with remarks regarding the disasters created by oil spills in Santa Barbara and the need to deny the Phillips 66 Nipomo Oil by Rail spur. Education of your constituents needs to happen now; Some of the farmers and local businessman, including service station owners you represent believe today that their retail petroleum products come directly from the Nipomo Phillips 66 plant and if new sources of crude are not brought to the plant the cost of gasoline and diesel will go up in our county. In your discussions with these people please inform them that not one (1) gallon of usable fuel comes from the Nipomo plant as it is all sent 240 miles North through five pumping stations to the Phillips 66 Radio California processing plant by pipeline.

You Supervisor Compton have said that jobs would be lost at the plant if oil by rail was not a new source of explosive Crude. The regional Vice President of customer relations for Phillips 66 clearly said in the meeting in our county that no jobs would be lost as this plant operates on oil from pipelines and will continue to process their products and send them to Northern California refineries. Plants supply of oil by pipeline has been slowed due to their lack of concern for the community safety of all and have allowed there pipelines to debilitate and all must be fixed and approved before the supply is resumed.

Many of us believe you were elected to protect our financial security in the county and be ever vigilant of the health and welfare of your constituents as well as all residents of your district and the county. The degradation of our air quality from the sand dunes and from the diesel engine congestion which would be caused by the spur will significantly affect the economics of our county housing prices, as well as our health and welfare and increased medical costs. We can only imagine what the economic impact would be from a major explosion as has occurred in Canada and many other places in United States. The number of colleges, hospitals, businesses and homes in such close proximity to the current rail system from both the North and South should be enough for any reasonable person in your capacity to just say no! Not now or ever! The risk is just too great for so little corporate greed profit, when sources of fossil fuels are not now needed in our country or region.

Barbara J Fisher

Please review the list below for your research on the subject. Thank you.

## **22,000+ Oppose San Luis Obispo County Oil Train Plan: Comments from public officials and citizens cite safety, pollution**

[San Luis Obispo, CA] Citizens submitted more than 22,000 individual comments to the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors and Planning Commission today opposing Phillips 66's refinery expansion plan in SLO county. The oil company's proposed 52,000 barrel-per-day oil train terminal is sparking fierce resistance across the region.

Last spring the SLO planning commission delayed their decision on the project and required a revised environmental impact report. The planning department released the revised report October 10 opening a 45 day public comment period that ends today. The SLO planning department will now respond to public comments and prepare a final environmental review that the SLO planning commission will consider at a hearing tentatively scheduled for January 29, 2015. The County Board of Supervisors is expected to vote on a final decision in spring 2015.

Citizen groups also submitted technical comments and released the following statements:

**Ethan Buckner, ForestEthics:** "More than 5.5 million Californians live in the one mile blast zone of an oil train derailment and fire. More oil trains in SLO County would mean more toxic tar sands crude traveling in unsafe rail cars by our homes and schools, over our waterways, and through our remote wild places."

**Valerie Love, Center for Biological Diversity:** "The Phillips 66 rail project is a disaster waiting to happen. The risks to our air, water, wildlife and local economies are just too high. That's why so many Californians are saying no to this dirty and dangerous project."

**Elijah Zarin, CREDO:** "It is absolutely crazy to allow Phillips to increase the number of dangerous oil trains that run through major population centers in California. It's horrifying to imagine what could happen if one of these oil trains derailed and caused a massive explosion in a city like San Jose, Sacramento or Oakland. We simply cannot continue to allow unchecked expansion of dangerous fossil fuels that threaten the climate and public health. This plan is downright dangerous and San Luis Obispo officials should reject it if they care at all about the safety of Californians."

**Recent State Assembly Candidate Heidi Harmon:** "With our record drought, it is highly irresponsible to consider this project as it puts our waterways at risk. In addition, these oil trains will put thousands of residents and Cal Poly students in direct contact with detrimental diesel fumes, not to mention the increased risk of being in the pathway of an exploding train."

**Linda Reynolds, Mesa Refinery Watch:** "Phillips 66 has decided to expand their business with the addition of the Rail Spur, which is potentially inconsistent with land use, the local coastal plan and incompatible with surrounding land uses. There has been considerable expansion of residential neighborhoods over the last 20 years in the area. The rail spur would be approximately half a mile of many homes contaminating the air and introducing visual and noise blight to these areas. Not to mention the dangers to all the communities the trains would pass through."

**Jess Dervin-Ackerman, Sierra Club San Francisco Bay Chapter:** "Phillips 66 is proposing to bring extremely dirty and dangerous Tar Sands through some of California's densest population centers, along a route that imperils our most precious natural resources, including water and prime agricultural land. There is no scenario in which it is acceptable to risk our climate's stability, access to clean air and water, and our communities' health and safety just so that an oil company can make record profits. California needs to be investing in a clean energy economy, not gambling away our future with extreme fossil fuels."

**Andrew Christie, Sierra Club Santa Lucia Chapter:** “Our local residents are keenly aware of the consequences of our county bowing to the demands of the oil industry and living the rest of their lives on a Central Coast transformed by that industry’s ceaseless quest for higher profits at the expense of the environment and public health.”

**David Turnbull, Oil Change International:** “California must choose between promoting the dirtiest oil on the planet that imperils countless communities and our climate or truly being a leader in charting a new course towards safer communities and a livable future for us all. The thousands who have spoken today are telling our representatives loud and clear to stand up to Big Oil, reject this proposal, and to move in a new direction.”

**Lisa Hoyos, Climate Parents:** “Transporting oil by rail through communities across our state puts kids and families at risk from spills and derailments, and burning this dirty oil threatens climate.”

**Greg Karras, Communities for a Better Environment:** “It is impossible for any decision maker to make an informed decision on whether to approve a project without all of the relevant information. This is not only a rail project. This project locks in the refining of extreme tar sands oil in California, and the environmental review document hides, and fails to analyze, the associated dangers to public and worker health and safety. It is critical for communities in California to take a stand against projects that hide the truth about extreme oil and work to build a just transition from conventional fossil fuels to a more clean energy future.”

##