

March 11, 2016 Planning Commission Phillips 66 Comments

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, my name is Jeff Edwards and I am a 40-year county resident. However, it's not as a long-time resident that I wish to address your commission, but as a coastal planner and land use professional. I have followed the Santa Maria Refinery since 2010. In fact, I appeared before this Commission in 2012 regarding the Phillips 66 application to increase by 10% the so called "through-put" capacity for crude oil processing.

At this juncture, this Commission likely understands that as a "major energy facility", the Phillips proposal is appealable to the California Coastal Commission pursuant to Coastal Act Section 30603(a)(5). It is a foregone conclusion, that the Coastal Commission will decide this matter administratively. Moreover, I believe the Coastal Commission will ultimately approve the rail spur project. If the project goes to the Coastal Commission with a local denial, we will be relinquishing our rights to condition the proposal. The Coastal Commission will be left to decide what mitigation measures are appropriate. I am not prepared to let that happen, and I hope this Commission isn't either.

The Phillips 66 proposal has a number of parallels with the Los Osos Wastewater Project. In 2009, the project was approved locally with almost 100 conditions. When the Coastal Commission took the project up on appeal they made a decision to approve it and carried all of the local conditions forward and added their own.

Consequently, I view the role of this Commission, with staff involvement, to prepare an exhaustive set of conditions based upon a full range of potential impacts of the project. Examples include, emergency response, noise mitigation, ESHA restoration and Public Access to name just a few. Also, please task staff with preparing findings, based not on a parochial view of the world, but founded on achieving an independent and diversified energy portfolio for national economic and political security.

With my remaining time, I wish to discuss just one of the potential conditions-that is for Public Access, specifically a new entrance to the Oceano Dunes State Vehicular Recreation Area (ODSVRA). Pier Avenue, in Oceano was intended to be a temporary access based upon the Coastal Development Permit authorizing operation of the ODSVRA. This Commission may know that of the 1600 acres at the refinery, 600 acres are presently included as part of the ODSVRA. Additionally, there is an existing access road to the beach used by Phillips 66 to service an ocean outfall line. I have heard two main objections to a new entrance at this location. One, sensitive dune habitats, by way of comparison, when AT&T constructed a trans-Pacific fiber optic cable project, they were required to improve a new access to the beach in highly sensitive Montana de Oro State Park. Two, Safety has been raised as a fatal flaw in establishing a new access, on the other hand, Phillips has represented that the refinery is safe, so which is it?, you can't have it both ways.

A 2006 Alternative Access Study commissioned by State Parks, ranked the Phillips site (formerly Conoco/Phillips) highest among all potential new access locations. At the end of the day, Phillips has the land and State Parks has the money for a new entrance. As you may know, State Parks has recently spent over \$5 million on temporary silt fencing and thousands of hay bales in connection with the hapless APCD dust rule 1001.

Please direct planning staff to perform the hard work associated with a comprehensive analysis of potential project impacts and craft conditions and findings that your Commission may consider during deliberations as an alternative to an outright denial.

Thank you. I am available for any questions.