



Rail Spur

Janice Porter to: lcompton, fmecham, bgibson, ahill,
darnold, p66-railspur-comments

03/06/2015 11:23 AM

Please vote NO on proposed rail spur on the Nipomo/Arroyo Grande mesa. The air quality on the mesa is already below acceptable levels. Adding a train diesel engine running 12 hours a day is only going to make it worse! The engine runs the whole time they are unloading for however long it takes. We can't even go outside now on many afternoons. Please vote NO - don't turn us into the City of Industry!

Thank you for your time and consideration.



Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension

Lee, Anna, Public Health, OOD to: 'p66-railspur-comment s@co.slo.ca.us',
'rhedges@co.slo.ca.us'
Cc: "Davis M.D., Muntu, Public Health, OOD", "Watkins-Tartt, Kimi, Public Health, OOD"

02/24/2015 02:36 PM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Please accept the attached comment letter on behalf of Dr. Muntu Davis, Alameda County Health Officer, regarding the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension and Crude Unloading Project in Santa Maria. Let me know if you have any questions.

Best,
Anna

Anna Lee
Local Policy Coordinator
Place Matters, Office of the Director
Alameda County Public Health Department
1000 Broadway, Suite 500
Oakland, CA 94607
anna.lee@acgov.org | Phone: (510) 267-8019
Like us on [Facebook](#) | Visit our [Website](#)



Please consider the environment before printing this email.



Phillips 66 Santa Maria Crude by Rail - ACPHD letter.pdf



Please vote against Phillips 66 proposal
A Nafisi to: p66-railspur-comments

02/22/2015 12:42 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Planning Officials

Thank you for great service you are providing to our county. We are very concerned hearing that Philips refinery is planning expansion of their rail facilities to include oil transport to their facility in Nipomo Mesa area via railroad.

We are following horrible accidents involving transportation of crude by trains in places like North Dakota, Canada, and recently in West Virginia. We believe this expansion will adversely affect our community and environment.

We are particularly worried about the train routs close to populated areas such as Cal Poly and the student housing nearby. We hope that you feel the same way and oppose this expansion.

Best Regards,

Mitra and Adam Nafisi

810 Noddy Court

Arroyo Grande, CA 93420



Deny the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project

Linda Pollard to: p66-railspur-comments

02/12/2015 10:34 AM

Cc: Maureen Forney, Diana Prola, Evelyn Gonzalez, Lance James, Lance James, Leo Sheridan, Monique Tate, Ron Carey, Ron Carey, Vince Rosato, John Thompson, Mark

Planning Commissioners:

Attached is a signed copy of a letter from the San Leandro Unified School District regarding the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project.

On February 10, 2015, the San Leandro Unified School District Board of Education voted to respectfully request that the San Luis Obispo Planning Commission vote to deny the project.

I have also sent the original-signed letter in the mail.

Sincerely,

Linda Pollard, Administrative Assistant to the
Superintendent & Board of Education
San Leandro Unified School District
835 E. 14th Street, Suite 200
San Leandro, CA 94577
Office: 510-667-3522; Fax: 510-667-6234
lpollard@slusd.us



Signed Letter from San Leandro Unified to Deny Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project.pdf



Vote NO on the Keystone XL pipeline !
Olivia Lim to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to "Olivia Lim"

02/10/2015 01:29 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed oil by rail project at the Santa Maria refinery. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our kids, communities and climate. The final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must disclose the full climate impacts of the proposed rail project, including the likelihood that it will increase the transport and burning of toxic tar sands oil. Tar sands oil means more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption. The toxic air emissions resulting from this proposed project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, San Luis Obispo County must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state. Please protect California families and children by rejecting Phillips 66's toxic oil train plan. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Olivia Lim
Davis, CA



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
cali.pmc@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

01/30/2015 06:27 PM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Say NO to the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
Charles Heimstadt to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to chickheimstadt

01/26/2015 07:21 AM

I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Tar sands means more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than other sources of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

Say NO to the Phillips 66 oil train proposal.

Charles Heimstadt
743 Larch Ave.
South San Francisco, CA 94080



Vote NO on the Keystone XL pipeline !
Jacki Hunter to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to "Jacki Hunter"

01/24/2015 01:41 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed oil by rail project at the Santa Maria refinery. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our kids, communities and climate. The final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must disclose the full climate impacts of the proposed rail project, including the likelihood that it will increase the transport and burning of toxic tar sands oil. Tar sands oil means more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption. The toxic air emissions resulting from this proposed project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, San Luis Obispo County must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state. Please protect California families and children by rejecting Phillips 66's toxic oil train plan. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Jacki Hunter
Los Angeles, CA



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
deniseknight@mac.com to: p66-railspur-comments

01/22/2015 10:56 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
ernabelle@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

01/22/2015 10:03 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project

Duenas, Norberto to: mwilson@co.slo.ca.us

Cc: "P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"

01/21/2015 10:00 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

As directed by the San Jose City Council at their January 13 Council meeting attached is correspondence regarding their concerns over the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project.

Thank you,

Norberto Duenas



Interim City Manager

City of San Jose letter to Murry Wilson.PDF



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
maryengle@verizon.net to: p66-railspur-comments

01/16/2015 12:50 PM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. It is only a matter of time before an accident will cause huge damage to a community in the path of these trains. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project. It is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Phillips 66 railspur
John & Laurie Slama to: p66-railspur-comments

01/14/2015 08:25 AM

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to oppose Phillips 66 crude-by-rail proposal, due to its impacts on public health and safety, air pollution, and its threats to California's water supplies. Volatile toxic chemicals will leak out of tank cars, poisoning communities along rail lines, including "significant and unavoidable" (quote by Phillips' proposal) levels of air pollution, including sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians.

Please do not allow this dangerous project. Thank you.

Laurie Slama
5366 Lawton Ave.
Oakland CA 94618



Vote NO on the Keystone XL pipeline !

Brigitte Nogosek -Chandler to: p66-railspur-comments

Please respond to "Brigitte Nogosek -Chandler"

01/09/2015 11:13 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed oil by rail project at the Santa Maria refinery. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our kids, communities and climate. The final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must disclose the full climate impacts of the proposed rail project, including the likelihood that it will increase the transport and burning of toxic tar sands oil. Tar sands oil means more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption. The toxic air emissions resulting from this proposed project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, San Luis Obispo County must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state. Please protect California families and children by rejecting Phillips 66's toxic oil train plan. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Brigitte Nogosek-Chandler
San Jose, CA



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
missbeachbabe@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

01/08/2015 11:26 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
hypatia3000@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

01/07/2015 11:20 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Vote NO on the Keystone XL pipeline !
Yvette Sanchez to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to "Yvette Sanchez "

01/01/2015 02:23 PM

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed oil by rail project at the Santa Maria refinery. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our kids, communities and climate. The final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must disclose the full climate impacts of the proposed rail project, including the likelihood that it will increase the transport and burning of toxic tar sands oil. Tar sands oil means more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption. The toxic air emissions resulting from this proposed project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, San Luis Obispo County must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state. Please protect California families and children by rejecting Phillips 66's toxic oil train plan. Thank you for consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Yvette Sanchez
Riverside, CA



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
catslady3@verizon.net to: p66-railspur-comments

12/28/2014 11:30 PM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



lkmpub44@gmail.com
lkmpub44@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

12/25/2014 09:48 PM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

lkmpub44@gmail.com



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
rochelleinoak@gmail.com to: p66-railspur-comments

12/19/2014 01:51 PM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Re: EIR comment-Piecemeal Review

John Phipps to: phipps.john, p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Piecemeal review of projects under CEQA is not allowed. The California Supreme Court has a test to define piecemeal review as follows:

"that an EIR must include an analysis of the environmental effects of future expansion or other action if : (1) it is a reasonably foreseeable consequence of the initial project: and (2) the future expansion or action will be significant in that it will likely change the scope or nature of the initial project or its environmental effects"

The EIR for increasing the thru put for Phillips 66 and this EIR are the same project. This EIR indicates that a train source is needed to supplement a declining local supply of crude, therefore the EIR for a thru put increase is not sustainable without a train supplied source of crude oil.

This EIR (Rail Spur Expansion) must be combined with the EIR for increased thru put for this EIR (Rail Spur Expansion) to be legal under the laws of California.

Sincerely,

John Phipps
1149 Tyler Court
Nipomo, CA 93444
343-5107



Reject Phillips 66 Oil Train Proposal
mbartleman@cox.net to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo Decision-Makers:

I am concerned about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Sincerely,



EIR comment - Locomotive Horn Use
John Phipps to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

According to the latest EIR a contract between Phillips 66 and the Railroad would prevent any use of the locomotive horn during night time unloading operations. This is in direct conflict with Federal Regulation Title 49 Part 222 that states :

a locomotive engineer may sound the locomotive horn to provide a warning to animals , vehicle operators, pedestrians, trespassers or crews on other trains in an emergency situation if , in the locomotive engineer's sole judgement, such action is appropriate in order to prevent imminent injury , death, or property damage.

John Phipps
1149 Tyler Court
Nipomo, Ca 93444



train proposal for Phillips 66

Karen to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Please respond to Karen

History: This message has been forwarded.

The Phillips 66 proposal to allow train deliveries of oil to the Nipomo mesa has many residents extremely concerned, myself among them.

I moved to SLO county from Bellingham, WA where trains ran almost hourly through what had been a quiet little town. The trains carried coal and although quite different from oil, the noise, pollution and disruption caused by these trains cannot and was not mitigated in any way. It will be that way here in Nipomo should Phillips be allowed to change from delivering its oil by pipeline to train .

PLEASE DON'T ALLOW THIS!!! One way to get the oil to the refinery is enough. I am sure that when the pipeline was proposed there was a lot of opposition. And now there is more. How much money does Phillips have to make? Doesn't the pipeline cause enough damage? Why would they need another 5 parallel lines?

DON'T ALLOW PHILLIPS TO DAMAGE AN ALREADY FRAGILE ECOLOGY. STOP IT BEFORE IT RUINS OUR BEAUTIFUL COUNTY.

[Karen Iwrey](#)
[Karen For Your Cats](#)
www.karen4cats.com
805.540.9348

There's no human problem that couldn't be solved if people would only do as I advise.

G. Vidal and me. If only I'd said it first.



Re:EIR Comment-Noise

John Phipps to: phipps.john, p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

The current EIR noise study is insufficient to allow anyone not involved in the noise study field to evaluate the increase in noise levels, so residents close to the area impacted by the noise do not understand what the impacts of increased noise will have on their life. The evaluation of the increases in noise levels as put forth in Table 4.9.9 of the Draft EIR as Significant or Not Significant are completely arbitrary, as there are no standards that define what is or is not significant noise level increases at a given site.

Therefore I am requesting that the EIR include another noise study that all residents close to the rail project can understand. The current EIR indicates that locomotive horns can be used and will be used for emergency situations, which are the same rules railroads have been following for the past 150 years. To evaluate the effects of this type of impulsive noise another type of noise test is required. The test would require a locomotive to be placed at the existing Phillips 66 rail spur at approximately 10:00 pm in the evening. That locomotive would have a horn that would be tested for the proper noise level output, it would then sound the horn 5 seconds every 30 seconds for 5 minutes. The local residents would be informed of the test by mail (local residents do not reside in Los Osos!). The mailing would contain an evaluation sheet for comments to return to the county planning department. This is a better way to evaluate the effects of increased noise at the Phillips 66 site.

Having a contract to limit the use of locomotive horns is in violation of federal rules and would be unenforceable, locomotive horns have been used for 150 years for emergency and safety situations. The county needs to evaluate the use of the horns in the real world of Nipomo , CA. A proper test is in order.

Sincerely,
John Phipps
1149 Tyler Court
Nipomo, CA 93444
343-5107



No to the crude!

Jennifer Randall to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

“This project provides more disadvantages to the community in terms of adverse health issues than advantages ... such as added jobs,” Richard Wright, the public safety representative on the council, wrote in his comments.”

This quote says it all for me.

I think we should be protecting the delicate environment over all else at this point in time. With pollution and climate change at the forefront of the news, it is a sure thing that adding risk by what is proposed, is NOT a good idea.

I vote NO! Do not allow the crude oil by train. And produce some cleaner energy options anyway!

Sincerely

Jennifer Randall

Read more here:

<http://www.sanluisobispo.com/2014/11/12/3346403/phillips-66-oil-rail-spur-nipomo.html#storylink=cpy>

Art Saves Lives



DERAIL THE SPUR

Tom2amy to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Cc: jim, ktopping, frenchbicycles, elcarroll, rhedges, lcompton,
bgibson, ahill, darnold, fmecham, boardofsups, lreynolds151

History:

This message has been forwarded.

My name is Amy Hedges. I am a resident of Trilogy in Nipomo and have been for 5 years. My husband and I moved here from Washington State upon retirement, looking for the clean living that the state of California boasts. Little did we know that the Spur project was looming in our future. This is a crime to the citizens of all of California and, regarding the Spur, more specifically to the residents of the Mesa. Among my biggest concerns is the air quality that so many of us breathe and play in on a daily basis. It is no secret that the sand blowing off the Oceano Dunes has proven to be the driver to our polluted air, but now, with the Spur, the threat of adding diesel carcinogens to that sand is a huge increased risk of cancer!

I am asking that you vote for the No-Project alternative. We cannot tolerate our clean living with the threat of the Spur. I will be in attendance at the county board of supervisors meeting in the coming new year.

Thank you for your consideration to my email.

Amy Hedges

1611 Payton Way

Nipomo, Ca. 93444



**LETTER IN OPPOSITION TO THE PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL
PROJECT**

Gary McKible to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I recall that the Draft EIR contained comments from citizens who thought that Phillips 66 was a good neighbor who supported local business and provided jobs for the community. Some letters went into great detail about Phillips' good deeds.

As you know, there is no provision in the EIR for approving a project based on how much good will an Applicant has bestowed upon the County.

I suspect that this Revised EIR will, likewise, attract many letters focused purely on issues that are completely irrelevant to the decision process, so please append my comment to those.

This project should be **DISAPPROVED**.

Thank you.

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, CA 93444



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposa
jpmccarthy90@yahoo.com to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



P66 Rail Terminal Projects - Comments on revised DEIR

Mike Segor to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Please respond to Mike Segor

History: This message has been forwarded.

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department,

The October revision of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) acknowledges the existence of additional Class I air quality risks. It demonstrates that the county faces significant air pollution risks with the P66 Rail Spur project that cannot be mitigated. The DEIR is still fundamentally deceptive, because it obscures the real purpose of the refinery's expansion. The purpose of the upgrade is to take advantage of the current glut of dirty, heavy crude coming out of North Dakota and Alberta.

Several California refineries are gearing up to handle volatile Bakken shale oil and sulfurous Alberta bitumen. This scramble is already increasing the toxic industrial blight to Bay Area locations. Now this blight is being brought to a location in SLO County that was planned and promoted to be free of undue visual, sonic and chemical pollution. Removal of the heavy sulfur content from tar sands crude creates significant sulfur dioxide fumes. Residential communities are located downwind of the Nipomo Mesa plant. Many of the residents are retired and suffer from impaired heart or respiratory function and would suffer under this new pollution source.

The CPUC has identified a number of Local Safety Hazard Sites (LSHS) within California, including the Cuesta Grade. Over the past 5 years there have been 58 derailments at or near LSHS sites. The DEIR acknowledges that the Cuesta Grade could be subject to a runaway train event (4.11-23). Most of the heavy crude shipments will come from the north down the Cuesta Grade. The top of the grade, at the Cuesta Pass, has a 7% slope. The weight of an 80-car oil train is estimated to be 11,600 tons. A runaway train could end up spilling its load and possibly burning in or near the city of San Luis Obispo. Hydrocarbon deposits are abundant in the Alberta tar sands region and bitumen will be extracted for many years to come. In approving this project, the County would be making a long-term commitment to a lower quality of life and a significant risk of catastrophic damage.

This project makes no sense in the context of an ongoing market glut of gas and oil. Existing California refinery capacity is capable of processing all the conventional crude we produce and import.

It may be that some special interests would like to turn San Luis Obispo County into another Kern County. This project would be a big first step down that road. Once this was accomplished it would be easier to justify expanding hydraulic fracturing into our agricultural zones.

This project makes no sense while our scientists are beseeching policy makers to find ways to leave as much of the dirty stuff as possible in the ground. Ignoring the scientific consensus on climate change is the supreme folly of our time. I'm asking our County leadership not to join this march of folly. Further investments in high-intensity fossil fuel extraction make a mockery of California's leadership position in reducing greenhouse gas pollution.

The Phillips 66 refinery upgrade represents a betrayal of neighboring area residents who believed they were investing their life savings in a safe, peaceful and pollution-free environment. It is a hazard to all other County residents who live within oil-spill range of the UP rail line or depend on the tourist trade. Those investments in high-quality living are now threatened. Please do not approve this project.

Michael Segor
1776 Royal Way
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
805-546-0931



Proposed Oil Train Project in Our Community Should be Stopped

p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us,

Heidi Harmon to: Mecham Frank, Arnold Debbie, Caren Ray, Adam Hill, Bruce Gibson

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Please respond to Heidi Harmon

History: This message has been forwarded.

Proposed Oil Train Project in Our Community Should be Stopped

The revision of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) regarding the proposed rail spur at the Nipomo Mesa Refinery has just come out and it acknowledges the existence of additional Class I air quality risks. It demonstrates that the county faces significant air pollution risks that cannot be mitigated .

Several California refineries are gearing up to handle volatile Bakken shale oil and sulfurous Alberta bitumen. This scramble is already increasing the toxic industrial blight to Bay Area locations. Now this blight is being brought to a location in SLO County that was planned and promoted to be free of undue visual, sonic and chemical pollution .

The CPUC has identified a number of Local Safety Hazard Sites (LSHS) within California, including the Cuesta Grade. Over the past 5 years there have been 58 derailments at or near LSHS sites. The DEIR acknowledges that the Cuesta Grade could be subject to a runaway train event (4.11-23). A runaway train could end up spilling its load and possibly burning in or near the city of San Luis Obispo.

Hydrocarbon deposits are abundant in the Alberta tar sands region and bitumen will be extracted for many years to come. In approving this project, the County would be making a long-term commitment to a lower quality of life and a significant risk of catastrophic damage. Ignoring the scientific consensus on climate change is the supreme folly of our time. Further investments in high-intensity fossil fuel extraction make a mockery of California's leadership position in reducing greenhouse gas pollution .

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue, Heidi Harmon

=====
"We need system change to fight climate change."

Heidi Harmon for Assembly
heidiharmon.org
Twitter: @standwithheidi
[Facebook.com/heidiharmon4assembly](https://www.facebook.com/heidiharmon4assembly)

PO Box 13024, San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
(805) 550-8444
FPPC# 1366156
=====



Mesa Rail Spur Proposal

Eileen Lussier to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Murry

I am writing this letter out of concern regarding the proposed Phillips 66 Rail Spur. I would like to focus on the environmental impact study that was recently released and some of the issues that were brought out and some that were not covered satisfactorily.

Air pollution is one of the many major concerns for this project but pollution of our air and water I feel is one that is not adequately addressed in the study and will have a major impact on the lives of the residents of the county of San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara County. Particulate matter doesn't stop at the refinery boundaries, it is blown by the wind into the air we breathe, the water we drink and onto and into the plants and animals we eat. The study recognizes that the project will bring about increases in cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, premature death in the elderly and the very young. They may even quantify the possibility in a general population and it may not sound unusually high to an ear that is not truly involved or concerned or is looking for a way to justify something they know is not good.

However, I work with the cancer patients in our community who represent those numbers. I would like to present my concerns regarding the probability that this disease would increase even by a "seemingly small" amount due to this project. I would like to give those numbers faces for you to envision. Think of sitting with a 36 year old women who has worked hard and loves her family and is told that she will die soon and would not be around to care for her children of 6, and 12 years of age; or the man who is no longer able to support or be around for his family of 2 teenagers due to his lung disease; or the women and men who had worked hard all their lives and planned to have a good retirement spending time with their grandchildren, but suddenly have been given a diagnosis that told them that their time was very short. I would like to present the large number of our young people, 32 year old, 36 year old, 40 year olds who are suddenly developing cancers in the prime of their lives. Unable to work, needing assistance. Who will be there to help them when they need it? These are real people, not just numbers.

The current board of supervisors has the unique opportunity to make a decision that will impact the health and safety of 25 million Americans that the Sierra Club estimates would be in the "blast zone" of an environmental disaster from a potential oil spill. You are also making a decision regarding the health of your family, your neighbors, and your friends. The next time a friend or acquaintance tells you they have received a diagnosis, I hope you can feel good about having made the right decision.

The oil companies want to use train cars that are known to not be secure to transport crude; they are not worried about how they will pollute our air, water and food and how that will impact our health. They want to transport these dangerous products from Canada to Nipomo polluting the air with their diesel and risking lives; not even slowing down when they carry dangerous chemicals through some of our most highly populated areas; through Silicon Valley, San Luis Obispo, near your house and mine, so that the large corporations can

increase their profits. We are just collateral damage to them.

Eileen Lussier



REJECT OIL TRAIN EXPANSION !!! PROTECT OUR TOWNS!

Joan Weaver to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Please respond to hoansw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Weaver

22351 Mission Circle
Chatsworth, CA 91311
US



Reject the dangerous Phillips 66 oil train proposal
grossman_mark@yahoo.com to: p66-railsur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal - protect San Jose and it's families

zkwowski@yahoo.com to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

People of San Jose need protection against this potential threat. With more and more residential housing being built around the downtown San Jose tracks, it becomes more concerning that hazardous materials will be railed through our streets. Please make a point to reach out to current SJ Mayor Reed and Mayor-elect Sam Liccardo before making decisions which affect our homes.

I am expressing deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project. It is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge you to REJECT the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Regards,



Please reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal
Lisaar@yahoo.com to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours,



Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion / what if your family lived near those tracks ?

mary rojeski to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:08 AM

Please respond to jero .book

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

mary rojeski
2603 3rd st
santa monica, CA 90405
US



Protect Our Towns -- Reject Oil Train Expansion !
Valerie Face to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to vdf

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Please deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.
2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons! Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, wildlife, homes and local economies.
3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.
4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an absolutely unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.
5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.
6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Valerie Face
2371 Sutter Ave Apt 6
Santa Clara, CA 95050
US



Steve Pax to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Murry Wilson

SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building

Dear Mr. Wilson --

I am very concerned about the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension proposal.

I'm concerned about the county, and certainly my community being adversely affected by this proposal.

I am afraid our safety is at risk because of the possibility of a train accident involving so much highly flammable cargo. Trains of this size and regularity traveling down Cuesta Grade, into San Luis Obispo, pose an unusually dangerous scenario for us. Dangerous in terms of the risk of explosions, fires and oil spills.

I am concerned about pollution increasing as a result of this project. Pollution in the form of noise from the trains and from the additional processing. Pollution in the form of lighting required at the processing location negatively affecting quality of life nearby.

Certainly, air quality is at risk from the addition emissions from the trains and the processing plant.

Please consider my concerns regarding this issue, and do what you can to prevent this proposal from being accepted.

Sincerely,

Steven Pax



Oil Trains; NO!

Jim Taylor to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Please! Don't bring the Alberta Tar Sands to Santa Maria!

--

Jim Taylor
Carpe Data
jim@carpedata.com

5563 Calle Ocho
Carpinteria CA 93013

408-666-7356



Phillips Rail Terminal Project .

peter to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

[Attn please: Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning and Development.](#)

Dear Mr. Wilson,

[Pls reject this P66 Rail Terminal Project](#) not only for the [safety and wellbeing](#) of the residents in this Trilogy Nipomo neighborhood [but for all the residents of San Luis Obispo County](#). Pls see below and my comments below.... I CAN'T IMAGINE HOW YOU WOULD APPROVE SUCH A PROJECT. I would never have invested my hard earned money here in Trilogy knowing this could ever have been a possibility. Thank you. Peter Morreale RN 1775 Louise Lane, Nipomo CA 93444. Phone 805-343-2415.

Discrepancies And Unanswered Questions:

1. Year-Long Pollution & Congestion Accompanying Construction - Not Addressed: The proposed Rail Terminal construction will last approximately 10 months. This will add an estimated 916 additional truck/worker trips to and from the construction site. Truck traffic will include heavy duty dump trucks, concrete trucks, water trucks, flatbed semi-trucks and various other construction equipment.

The majority of these trips will be on Willow Road between the construction site and Highway 101, primarily during daylight hours. This will add significant air, noise, visual pollution and congestion to this area that has many thousands of existing residents.

How will this year-long pollution and congestion be alleviated?

2. Discrepancy - Length Of Trains Vs. Length Of Tracks: The inbound 80-car unit trains will consist of three locomotives, two buffer cars, and the 80 tank cars at 90 ft. each. This makes the total length of the train almost 8,000 feet, or over a mile and a half long. The proposal states they will only be building 6,915 feet of new track. They do not give specific dimensions for the length of any spur. But they do state that each track will (supposedly) be long enough to hold an entire 8,000 foot train.

A-3a. AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES:

Visual Impacts That Cannot Be Mitigated

1. A Misrepresentation Of What Will Be Visible: Sections of the Rail Terminal Project would be seen from public roadways, walking paths and residences within the Trilogy community, looking west past Highway 1. This includes views from Via Concha Road, Louise Lane, etc. These views would include the unloading facility, railroad tracks and trains as they arrive and depart.

The "Known Viewing Area" (KVA) photos presented in the REIR were taken at the intersection of Via Concha and Highway 1. The elevation at that point is only about 197 feet above sea level. This is misleading by 50%! For example, a more telling, accurate KVA would have been from the Trilogy homes adjacent to the second tee on the Monarch Dunes golf course. That elevation point is approximately 297 feet ... 100 feet (50%) higher! The view from that higher elevation, where the community actually resides, is far more encompassing of the Rail Terminal Project than specified in the REIR.

2. Inserting A Rail Terminal That Blocks The "Scenic Vista": According to the REIR -- the view looking west from Highway 1 is considered a scenic vista because of the panoramic composition of natural and agricultural land use patterns, sweeping views of the dunes and the coastline, and the Pacific Ocean beyond. The REIR indicates that the Rail Terminal and its associated trains would reduce views of the open space in the mid-ground -- which is an "important visual contributor" to the overall scenic vista. Therefore the REIR states, this would be a significant impact.

3. A Major Increase In Onsite Activity: The REIR states (4.5.1.4) that "between 1994 and 2011 (an 18 year period in which the Nipomo Mesa residential communities were built) the only discernible activity is within the coke yard." Therefore, building a rail terminal and unloading facility, plus the arrival and departure of 520 trains per year, each a 1.5 miles long, will be a sea change in the amount of activity residents will be exposed to.

4. A Mitigation Solution That Will Not Work: To alleviate the damage to the "scenic vista", the REIR suggests that an earthen berm be constructed around the eastern perimeter of the Rail Terminal. It theorizes that a berm 10 - 20 feet tall would block the views of the rail spur and trains. That solution simply will not work, given that homes in Trilogy are actually at an elevation some 100' higher than presented in the study. The visual destruction would remain.

The math does not even add up for one train. However, the REIR also states that the facility could hold a second train if needed. This discrepancy is not taken into account in the REIR. There must be a far greater understanding of exactly what Phillips is proposing ... track length and other dimensions that properly support statements in the REIR.

3. Noise Generated By Train Repairs - Not Addressed: The REIR states (section 2.3.1) that existing track 765 will be repurposed as a "bad order" track. Bad order tracks are used to repair railcars that require repair before they can be moved again. Repairs of railcars can be very noisy and time consuming depending on the type of repair. There is no description of the type of repairs to be done on-site at Phillips, when they will be done during the day (daytime or nighttime), the level of anticipated noise, nor whether and how that noise will be alleviated.

A-3b. AESTHETICS AND VISUAL RESOURCES:

Lighting Impacts That Cannot Be Mitigated

1. New Lighting Introduced For 50 - 60 Hours Per Week: New outdoor lighting is proposed throughout the Rail Terminal Project. The unloading facility lights would introduce light into a new area. The perimeter of the crude oil unloading area would have floodlights on 30-foot tall poles every 300 feet. The unloading area lights would be used during the unloading operations, which could be five times per week for about 10 to 12 hours per unloading (i.e., 50 - 60 hours per week).

2. Residents Will Definitely See The New Lights: The closest area residents would be approximately between one-half to one mile away ... well within sight during evening hours. The earthen berms that the REIR theorizes might be a mitigation approach, is a counter-intuitive solution. The berms would be 10' - 20' high. Yet the floodlights will be 30' high, 10' higher than the berms. Therefore, the impact of the lights will be visible from the elevated sites on Louise Lane, Eucalyptus Road, Tomas Court, etc.

3. Pointing The Lights Downward Is Not A Solution: We're told the new lights would be pointed downward. However, while the lights would point downward, they'd obviously be illuminating the offloading facility and tank cars beneath them. Those surfaces will be lit up brightly to help employees go about their complex work.

The result - residents would see the bright reflected light on the surface of everything that's lit up at the unloading facility ... including the tracks, tank cars and the pumping station. Before them would be a brightly lit movie set, with all the machinery and characters in motion. And residents would have a front row seat.

4. Incompatibility With Residential Zoning: All of this is highly incompatible with SLO County's having created and zoned the area next to the refinery as a residential community. To date, the community and refinery have lived harmoniously, with respect for the well-being of one another. The residents invested in their homes on the Mesa facing agricultural fields, dunes, the Pacific Ocean, and a relatively serene refinery, whose raw material was delivered by pipeline.

But if the rail terminal is approved, the entire environment would change, in the reflected bath of bright lights. So no matter which direction Phillips promises to point their new lights, the Rail Project should not see the light of day.

A-4a. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES:

The Serious Environmental Threats - Five "Class I" Damaging Impacts

The original EIR recognized only two air quality impacts as "Class I" (i.e., impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels). However, in the REIR, the number of Class I impacts has more than doubled to five in that are "significant and unavoidable" ... obviously proving that the original analysis either purposely minimized these issues or was woefully inadequate in its observations.

In the new REIR, the following project impacts were classified as Class I:

1. (AQ.2): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project at the Refinery would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed SLOCAPD thresholds.

2. (AQ.3): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route outside of SLO County associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds.

3. (AQ.4): Operational activities at the Refinery associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

4. (AQ.5): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed thresholds.

5. (AQ.6): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

The Key Issues ...

- **Heightened Recognition Of Specific Threats To Citizens' Health:** This REIR recognizes the serious nature of the health risks raised by this project. Increased risks in important health categories such as cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease (especially in the very young and very old) and premature death are recognized and in some cases the risks are quantified.
- **Heightened Recognition Of A Threat To Global Climate Change:** The impact of this project on California's and SLO County's programs to reduce the threat of global climate change is also quantified in this REIR and the increase in greenhouse gas emissions of this project are found to exceed thresholds.
- **Impractical And Unenforceable Mitigation Measures** Although there are mitigation measures discussed in this EIR for all five Class I impacts, the EIR's discussion of the measures, for the most part, makes it very clear they are not truly feasible or adequately enforceable.
- **Not Taking Into Account All The Criteria For Determining Compliance With Air Pollution Standards:** An issue of great concern with the REIR is its singular reliance on emissions increase thresholds as the sole criteria for the determination of significance under CEQA. The County has identified a list of criteria that can be used as a basis for determining "significance" under CEQA. An emissions increase threshold is only one of them.

Given that this project lies in the heart of a region where the state health standard for particulate matter is violated over 70 times per year and where the federal health standard has been violated in each of the last three years, we believe that any increase in the emissions of particulate matter at this project site violates additional CEQA significance criteria.

A-4b. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GASES:

The Refining Of Tar Sands Leads To A Host Of Major Health Problems

1. **The Arrival Of "Tar Sands" In SLO County:** The Nipomo refinery's superintendent has told us that with the Rail Terminal Project, there's a good possibility (we think probability) they will ship in "tar sands" crude oil from Alberta, Canada. Tar sands (a "heavy" crude) has substantially higher concentrations of sulfur, copper, nickel, nitrogen, lead and benzene than are found in conventional crude.
2. **Health Issue #1 - Higher Levels Of Sulfur Dioxide:** The main danger to communities is that facilities that refine tar sands could emit significantly higher amounts of sulfur dioxide. And that could lead to chest tightness, asthma, reduced lung function, respiratory weakness and cardiovascular issues, as well as cancer. Sulfur dioxide is especially dangerous for people who have preexisting heart and lung conditions.
3. **Health Issue #2 - Increased Quantities Of Petroleum Coke:** But the refining of tar sands also yields a significantly higher amount of petroleum coke, known as "petcoke." Phillips' Nipomo refinery already produces petcoke. And it's left onsite as widespread, open hills of black granules and dust. This waste product can easily be blown into residential areas by onshore winds and breathed in by residents. Petcoke is linked to a potential increase in heart attacks and respiratory issues.

A-5. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

A Myriad Of Impacts On Wildlife, Our Land, Tourism & Residents

1. **Impact On Wildlife:** Wildlife will be impacted by fuel management, vegetation removal, night lighting and storm run off of pollutants. Aquatic resources on the adjacent property could be impacted by hazardous material spills. (sec. 4.4-22) The REIR doesn't address how the loss of wildlife would affect people on the Mesa and tourism. Cleanups would involve heavy traffic and polluting diesel trucks, further damaging wildlife.
2. **Impact On The Monarch Butterfly Habitat:** Impacts from construction and operational activities on the Butterfly Habitat are unknown due to a lack of sufficient scientific information. A lack of information doesn't mean there won't be an impact. The Habitat is located in the Trilogy development. It's an area walkers, tourists and naturalists enjoy and are drawn to. It's been stated that the Monarchs often do not return when areas become polluted. Loss of the Habitat would cause a loss of tourists, and negatively affect local residents and SLO County overall. (4.4-43)
3. **Impact On SLO County Tourism:** SLO county has a minimum of 76 streams and crossings along the UPRR mainline. To clean a hazardous oil spill would require the mobilization of emergency response units and equipment. This would harm our reputation as a vacation area. Oil contaminated areas would alienate people who now travel to here for camping, hiking and our area's natural beauty.
4. **Impact On SLO County Residents:** The Rail Terminal project will have a negative effect on our community. Damage to our unique plant species, animal species and waterways would harm our tourism economy. The residential growth (which been encouraged and approved by the SLO

planning commission) would be negatively impacted. Homeowners are attracted to the area because the County has been willing to put a protective emphasis on our natural environment. This has been a significant attraction to people who want a quality of life with a protection of our natural habitat and biological resources. The County has not been an area where heavy industry is allowed to be developed next to our sensitive biological resources and developing residential areas.

A-6. GEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

REIR Lacks A Facility Inspection Plan To Counter Earthquakes & Liquefaction

The REIR* states that damage to structures from liquefaction** and ground accelerations from earthquakes "could be severe", are considered potentially significant, and could result in hazardous oil spills, risk of fire, and surface and groundwater contamination.

The REIR further states - "As discovered (from experience) ... existing building codes are often inadequate to completely protect engineered structures from hazards associated with large ground accelerations." As is typical of large scale industrial facilities, there is no local permit oversight for the aging structures and equipment at the Santa Maria Refinery beyond initial construction permitting.

Given the severe potential consequences to nearby residences of a structural failure within the refinery operation should severe ground shaking or liquefaction occur, there should be a mechanism in place for periodic inspection and review of existing and newly constructed facilities to account for corrosion and stressing of components over time.

The potential for nearby residents to suffer harm from an incompatible and intensified industrial facility is inconsistent with the goals of the San Luis Obispo General Plan.

* Page 4.8-12, section 4.6.4, paragraphs 3 & 4

**Definition: saturated or partially saturated [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soil"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Soil) soil substantially loses [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shear_strength_\(soil\)"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shear_strength_(soil)) strength and [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stiffness"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stiffness) stiffness in response to an applied [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shear_stress"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shear_stress) stress, usually [HYPERLINK "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earthquake"](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earthquake) earthquake shaking or other sudden change in stress condition, causing it to behave like a liquid.

A-7a. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

The Historical Odds Of Rail Accidents Versus What's Actually Occurring

Railroads and oil companies are shipping ever-larger amounts of crude by rail. And they're attempting to calm citizens' fears about rail accidents by citing outdated, historical statistics. For example ...

- The Association of American Railroads proudly notes that in the past, 99.9% of rail shipments of hazardous materials, including oil, reached their destination without a spill.

Unfortunately, current data is far more sobering. Looking strictly at oil shipments, spills are spiking. According to the Associated Press -- in 2009, before the oil drilling boom, just one rail oil spill was reported. But now, with the flood of new oil, the landscape is far different. Through November 2013, crude oil releases were reported from 137 rail cars versus just one car.

Here's another more current statistic. In the last five years, the number of tankers of crude transported by train in the U.S. has grown from under 10,000 to about 400,000 -- that's a 40-fold increase.

And over the next decade, rail oil shipments are forecast to increase from 1 million barrels each day to more than 4.5 million barrels every single day.

Therefore, you can toss the industry's outdated "odds" out the window. All you need do is read the news to learn the real facts. Freight trains carrying crude oil, propane and other hazardous materials are going off their tracks at alarming rates. Why? Because more trains are carrying that material.

The reality of what's actually happening and will continue to happen, flies in the face of the outdated, 99% odds and statistics handed out by railroads and oil companies. Simply put -- regardless of improvements in tank cars, far more crude oil shipped by rail equals far more trains derailing and far more disasters. It's all in the new numbers.

A-7b. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Phillips' "New" Rail Cars - They're Not As Safe As They Claim

Early this year (Feb. '14) in a flyer to residents, Phillips stated it is "committed to the safety of everyone in the communities where we operate. (Our) crude railcar fleet is one of the newest and are all DOT-111 cars ... including 2,000 that meet or exceed the Association of American Railroads safety standards*. We are committed to our crude-by-rail strategy."

However, they fail to mention that it's the DOT-111 tank cars that have been involved in most or all of

the previous derailments, explosions, fires and oil spills. While those cars may be state-of-the-art, the state-of-the-art has proven beyond doubt that it's not good enough.

- A May, 2013 Phillips press release reported on their new cars - "During the first quarter (of 2013), the company took delivery of 400 railcars, which will transport crude to its refineries on the East and West Coasts."

- Yet, two months later, U.S. Senator Charles Schumer warned - "DOT-111 tank cars are tragically flawed, causing potential damage & catastrophic loss of hazardous materials during derailments." He called for the "Feds to require a phase-out plan of DOT-111 cars carrying oil. The DOT-111 tank car has proven particularly prone to spills, tears and fires in the event of a derailment, and it's simply unacceptable."

- A February '14 AP article quoted Ed Hamberger, the president and CEO of the Association of American Railroads, who said the industry has strongly urged the government to set new tank car standards. He said - "We believe there needs to be a safer tank car."

So despite Phillips' desire for SLO County residents and officials to believe their new DOT-111 cars are a non-issue, they are and remain a state-of-the-art safety risk. At the local level, Phillips may be committed to the safety of our communities. But it appears that at the corporate level they're far more committed to their "crude-by-rail strategy."

*As of October 22, 2014, the company had bought or ordered 3,200 railcars, and planned to boost its fleet to 3,700. HYPERLINK "

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/10/23/crude-freight-unloading-idUSL2N0SI03D20141023>"

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/10/23/crude-freight-unloading-idUSL2N0SI03D20141023>

A-7c. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

Phillips' New DOT-111 Rail Cars - The REIR Bans Them From The Santa Maria Refinery

In recent years, Phillips 66 rushed to take advantage of low cost crude and low cost transportation of that crude by purchasing thousands of their own rail tank cars. Each of these cars is the model DOT-111. This model has been involved in many derailments, during which the cars puncture or break open, spill crude oil, catch on fire and sometimes explode.

Yet this is the car Phillips continued to purchase. Their February, 2014 flyer to SLO citizens stated - "Our fleet includes 2,000 newly acquired cars ... and all are DOT 111 cars."*

But on July 23, 2014, U.S. Federal regulators determined that oil companies and railroads were dead wrong in their huge escalation of crude-by-rail, using outmoded DOT-111 tank cars. The Department of Transportation (DOT) decided it would now require shippers to use dramatically different cars.

- The serious deficiencies of the DOT-111 are well known and therefore taken into account in the REIR. It states (4.7-69; page 489) -- "Only rail cars in Table 4.7.6 (on page 447), shall be allowed to unload crude oil at the Santa Maria Refinery." And that table requires shippers to use a new model car that's yet to be produced -- the DOT-117.

Therefore, the tankers Phillips intends to use to ship its crude oil to SLO County, will be outdated DOT-111 tankers that have proven to be failure-prone.

*As of October 22, 2014, the company had bought or ordered 3,200 railcars, and planned to boost its fleet to 3,700. HYPERLINK "

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/10/23/crude-freight-unloading-idUSL2N0SI03D20141023>"

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/10/23/crude-freight-unloading-idUSL2N0SI03D20141023>

A-7d. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

The Danger Of Transporting Crude Oil Down The Cuesta Grade

Under the Phillips 66 proposal, five trains each with 80 fully-loaded oil tankers would arrive at the Santa Maria Refinery each week. This means that 20,800 loaded tank cars per year would be entering our County headed to the Nipomo Mesa.

A great many of these trains will come from the north and have to pass up over and then down the Cuesta Grade ... a very mountainous area north of SLO with an extremely steep pass (7% slope).

If you've ever driven south down the grade on Highway 101, you know how hair-raising and potentially dangerous that area is. Regardless of the precautions one takes, it's perfectly made for "runaway" cars and trains. And under the Phillips plan, their fully loaded tank cars would make their way, precariously down the Cuesta Grade. And on their return north, the same tankers would navigate the Grade yet again.

We estimate that each train will weigh approximately 11,632 tons coming down the Cuesta Grade. Therefore, when an almost twelve-thousand ton object carrying crude attempts to come down the Cuesta Grade, somewhere in our future is a disaster.

Indeed, the REIR states (4.11-25) "In San Luis Obispo County, the Cuesta Grade represents an area where a runaway train could occur. A runaway train coming down the Cuesta Grade could result in spills of crude oil and associated fires."

A-7e. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS:

The Widespread Evacuation Required By A Major Rail Accident

If we've learned at least one thing from the crude oil train accidents that have already occurred, it's that the immediate impact is not limited to the accident site alone. For example, let's take the Casselton, ND accident ... where 18 tank cars exploded, toxic fumes were released, and 400,000 gallons of crude oil spilled. What happened immediately after the accident?

- All 2,300 Casselton residents were asked to evacuate their town. In fact, there was a 5-mile evacuation zone set up. Shelters were then set up outside the zone, where townspeople could then wait out the evacuation period.

Heaven forbid, but if such an accident occurred in SLO County, there would be one major difference between us and the Casselton disaster. Instead of having 2,300 residents, SLO County has 274,000 residents. And it's likely that far more people would be included in a 5-mile evacuation zone.

Let's take the city of San Luis Obispo, with a population of 45,000, not to mention the 18,000 students at Cal Poly. The oil trains would come right past the campus into downtown SLO. If downtown SLO were ground zero, and we drew a 5-mile evacuation circle around downtown, how many men, women, children and students would be encircled? We don't know that answer and don't wish to find out. And we don't wish to find out how long they'd be homeless.

So we need to learn from what other communities have gone through. We need to recognize that these accidents happen in a single spot, but the impact mushrooms out across huge swaths of those communities.

A-8. LAND USE:

A Crude Oil Rail Yard & Terminal Is A Vastly Intensified Use Of The Refinery, Incompatible With Adjacent Residential Zoning

Over the last two decades, SLO County planners have encouraged residential growth and master planned communities as desirable land use on the western Nipomo Mesa, near the Santa Maria Refinery. More specifically, their intended strategies triggered the building of communities with above-average tax bases per home.

In response to the planners' blessing, far more than 5,000 residents have already decided to live on the West Mesa, and the population continues to grow. Indeed, the County encourages expansion of existing communities and the construction of entirely new ones.

The growth of these communities was obviously applauded by past SLO County planning commissioners. The communities were purposely licensed, to be built with the expectations of beautiful views, golf courses, a resort hotel, and a serene way of life. The area was to become and has become, a divine place to visit and play, and a prime place to live and retire.

However, an oil-terminal RAIL yard, will generate far greater intense activity than the historic, benign delivery of crude by pipeline. Instead of crude conveyed silently, safely and unobtrusively, an entire new facility will be constructed ... with 520, 1.5 mile-long crude oil trains arriving and departing each year. Tankers would noisily be uncoupled from their locomotives. A half-billion gallons of crude would have to be pumped out. The tankers would then have to be hooked up to locomotives again. Plus, there would be numerous support machines and vehicles, all in constant motion, all year long.

The REIR states (4.5.1.4) that "between 1994 and 2011 (an 18 year period in which the Nipomo Mesa residential communities were built) the only discernible activity is within the coke yard."

Therefore, building a rail terminal and unloading facility, plus the arrival and departure of 520 trains per year, will be a sea change in the amount of activity residents will be exposed to.

The greatly enhanced intensity and danger of what Phillips proposes, changes the entire game for Mesa residents and for the citizens of SLO County. In effect, it pulls the rug out from what was originally intended by the planners.

Simply stated - delivery of crude oil to a rail terminal station conflicts dramatically with delivery of crude via pipeline. There is no comparison. It's an entirely new method of operating.

Therefore, approving the project is inconsistent with the historical decisions made by planning commissioners for the Nipomo Mesa. It would be incompatible with the long-term residential land use, planning and zoning decisions previously and consciously made for the area. The specific promise to residents of a safe, peaceful and pollution-free environment, must be kept.

A-9. NOISE AND VIBRATION:

Unacceptable Noise Levels From The New Rail Terminal

1. The Results Of What P66 Proposes

The REIR indicates that "The noise model produced similar noise increases with the project as the November, 2013 DEIR" ... and that "The exceedances of the noise thresholds at noise-sensitive receptors are a potentially significant impact." (see 4.9-25 of REIR).

The REIR further indicates (4.9-24) that:

"There are a number of uncertainties associated with estimating noise impacts. Meteorological conditions can strongly affect noise propagation and impacts, as most people have had experiences of hearing noisy activities a long distance from the source when the conditions are right. In addition, characterizing noise sources is challenging, as there are a number of potential activities, including hooking up rail cars, potential emergency annunciators and the low frequency locomotive noises that can travel long distances.

"The models capture many of these issues, but there is not extensive data available on some issues, such as good octave band analyses of different locomotive arrangements, for example, that bring in a range of potential errors into the analysis."

Furthermore, Phillips's noise testing could be unreliable on its face. For example, let's look at the test it conducted to measure the noise level of moving railcars. (Noise Modeling Appendix at D.1-4).

This test lasted less than 30 minutes and consisted of moving full and empty rail cars around the spur. A total of 34 rail cars (not 80) and 2 locomotives (not 3) were used in this supposed exhaustive noise test. The conclusion drawn by Phillips was that the highest noise levels measured for the locomotive engines and rail cars at the spur "is more than 10 dBA below the daytime ambient noise levels, which indicate that activity on the existing rail spur ... is inaudible."

The public should not assume that "all is well" based upon this very limited and unrealistic noise test.

2. How The Noise Will Be Generated: Let's take a close look at what we'd be hearing from Phillips all year long ...

- Noise will come from blaring train whistles, as 260 fully-loaded, 1.5-mile-long trains enter SLO County each year, moving from north to south.
- Noise will come from blaring train whistles, as another 260 empty, mile-long trains leave SLO County each year, moving from south to north.
- Even more noise will come from the same 260 empty trains leaving the County, because empty cars have a tendency to shake, rattle and roll with even greater intensity than fully-loaded cars.
- Track noise will be generated by the 520 trains coming and going each year. That's the seemingly, never-ending, "clickety-clack" sound produced by the wheels of trains moving over the rails.
- Engine and vibration noise will be heard as 200-ton locomotives are forced to idle at crossings, in virtually every town in SLO County.

In addition, locally on the Nipomo Mesa, here's what residents would now be hearing from the new Rail Terminal ...

- Engine and vibration noise will be heard as locomotives idle at the Nipomo refinery.
- Onsite, ongoing mechanical, operational noise will be heard on the Mesa from the new crude oil offloading facility, new pumping systems, HVAC equipment, and air compressors.
- Onsite, sharp clatter will be generated as locomotives disengage and then connect again with their tank cars ... 520 trains and 41,600 tankers a year.
- And also onsite, noise will be heard from additional vehicles, as cars, trucks and other construction and transport vehicles work to service the new rail operations.

3. Our Response: It is a given that trains would be moving about the spur at all hours of the night. However, the REIR leaves many details of their management plan to be developed in the future ... therefore, we have no way of knowing or assessing what mitigation measures Phillips would take.

The bottom line ... we cannot, nor should we accept on blind faith that Phillips has in fact properly monitored noise levels in the past. Likewise, we should not accept that Phillips would monitor noise levels properly in the future.

A-10. EMERGENCY RESPONSE SERVICES:

Underfunded, Undertrained, Underequipped, Unprepared, Preempted

The REIR states ...

- a. Fire Protection Services: (4.11.1.3) The SMR is within a High Fire Hazard Zone. Cal Fire can

request assistance from other departments. There are 5 Hazardous Materials Emergency Response teams between Paso Robles and Santa Barbara. The one in Santa Barbara is a Level 1 certified team (highest level). The others are non-certified.

b. Emergency Response: (4.11.2.2) Many state agencies bear responsibilities (for emergency response). They are beginning to prepare for the heightened risks posed by oil by rail. Senate Bill 861 Oil Spill Prevention and Response provides funding for preparedness, spill response ... the law also imposes a tax on each barrel of crude to cover the cost of expanded spill response programs. (UPDATE: As of 10/8/14, Union Pacific, BNSF and the Association of American Railroads sued California over its proposed law SB 861 requiring them to come up with an oil spill prevention and response plan. They contend that federal laws are safe enough and that the laws prohibit California from imposing safety rules on trains carrying crude oil.)

c. Fire Protection and Emergency Response at SMR: (4.11-23) A single significant event at the rail unloading facility could overwhelm the first responder resources and additional emergency responders and equipment could be required. Without proper fire protection design, training, and resources the impacts of a release of crude oil or fire could have significant impacts on fire protection and emergency response services.

d. Fire Protection and Emergency Response Along the UPRR Rail Routes: (4.11-23) The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has identified a number of Local Safety Hazard Sites (LSHS) within California, including the Cuesta Grade. Over the past 5 years there have been 58 derailments at or near LSHS sites. The Cuesta Grade represents an area where a runaway train could occur. OES (Office of Emergency Services) analysis revealed that numerous local emergency response offices lack adequate resources to respond to oil by rail accidents. Rural areas have little or no funding for firefighters and rely on volunteer firefighters. They lack the capacity to support a HAZMAT team and lack capacity to purchase or maintain necessary specialized vehicles and equipment, or to obtain training. Their response time could be hours.

Emergency responders lack adequate training in the specialized areas of oil rail safety and flammable liquid, lack critical information needed to help plan for and respond to oil by rail incidents, and how they would respond to potential worst-case scenarios.

e. Residual Impact: Oil spill impacts to fire protection and emergency response services along the UPRR mainline tracks would be significant and unavoidable (Class 1).

f. Preemption: The County may be preempted by federal law from implementing (mitigation) measures because they might improperly impact interstate commerce or the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act (ICCTA) which preempts state laws.

g. Cumulative Analysis: The Rail Spur Project combined with the proposed expansion of the Arroyo Grande Oil Field and the proposed Phillips 66 crude oil pipeline would increase the demand for specialized rescue services.

The Nipomo Mesa has thousands of homes in the initial response area of the Mesa fire Station 22. Specialized rapid and adequately staffed response is crucial. It is necessary to provide additional prevention and operational staffing to aggressively plan and train for effective mitigation of incidents.

As discussed in impact PS.4, an analysis by OES clearly indicates that fire and emergency responders lack resources, training and information in order to adequately respond to a crude oil train incident.

OUR CONCLUSIONS: The Rail Terminal Project brings a full spectrum of never-before-seen dangers to all of SLO County ... including the very real potential for toxic fires, smoke, explosions and oil spills.

The REIR clearly states that local emergency services are currently underfunded, undertrained, underequipped and unprepared to deal with these dangers. Certainly, if the emergency services were built completely different and every single suggested mitigation measure correctly implemented, then possibly those dangers could be eliminated. But reality tells us that there is no practical way to make that happen.

Of course, then there's the federal preemption issue, which makes the implementation of all proper mitigation measures impossible.

Additionally, all of these measures are in response to disasters, not methods to prevent such

occurrences. It's almost as if the REIR assumes that we must accept these calamities as a "new normal", and try to deal with them the best we can. Our opinion is that we simply need to say "no" to Phillips ... that we will not allow this kind of new normal to take hold in SLO County.

Lastly, there's the issue of who would pay for the huge spectrum of mitigation measures necessary to handle the catastrophes. SLO County Supervisor Caren Ray remarked on the Phillips proposal (10/10/14) -- "We have emergency preparation we have to deal with including funding for decision making that we don't make here in the County. We have to make sure that our local tax payers don't get stuck with the bill for the rail."

B-1. OVERVIEW:

Phillips 66 Project And Why It's Wrong For SLO County

- Phillips' Proposal: Since 1955, Phillips' Santa Maria Refinery (SMR) on the Nipomo Mesa has received crude oil only by pipeline ... not one drop by rail. Phillips proposes, for the first time, to bring in 20,800* rail tankers per year to its refinery, fully loaded with crude oil.

Each year, 260 trains, each approximately a 1.5 miles-long, would traverse the county to the refinery and unload their crude. Then the same 260 trains would depart (520 trains in total per year).

Along with the arrival of loaded tankers, would come, for the first time, the construction of a "railcar unloading facility" at the refinery, a pumping station, and a new pipeline to move the crude within the refinery. This new operation would be accompanied by trucks and other vehicles to service the facility.

- Phillips' True Motivation: Phillips claims that the refinery is running out of the crude oil it receives via pipeline. Therefore, to keep the plant open, and to save the 140 jobs at the site, they must begin receiving crude by rail.

This is false. The output from the refinery is the same as it was 10 years ago, and sources of California crude continue to exist and grow. The true reason is that Phillips' corporate strategy has changed. As stated in its annual reports, the firm has switched to a "crude-by-rail" approach in order to access far cheaper crude oil from Canada and elsewhere the U.S. And the only way to access that crude is via rail.

- The Negative Impacts Of Conducting Business In An Entirely New Way: This represents an entirely new business model for Phillips - it's a dramatic transformation in the way they operate in SLO County. This is not a benign, unobtrusive "rail spur." The issue is the new intensity of their operations and what they intend to bring in on those rails -- a half-billion gallons of crude oil (561,800,000 gallons) transiting through SLO County by rail each year, forever.

Not only will the 520 trains and new rail terminal be highly invasive to SLO County, and not only will they bring significant pollution and the potential of major oil spills, but the types of crude likely to be delivered are highly dangerous to both the health and safety of our citizens.

This will very likely include the pollution-intensive "tar sands" (which has been called "one of the world's dirtiest and most environmentally destructive sources of fuel"). Previously, Phillips attempted to gain approval to ship in the highly explosive Bakken crude, but the outcry of SLO citizens forced the company to reverse course and finally say "no Bakken."

- What SLO County Officials Must Do: Given the extreme opportunity for derailments, explosions and fires, along with air, odor, noise, motion, visual and light pollution, as well as potential oil spills anywhere in the County, the Planning Commission should reject Phillips' proposal to bring "crude-by-rail" to its Nipomo Mesa refinery.

*Five trains per week x 80 tankers each x 52 weeks = 20,800 tanker cars.

B-2. THE PRIMARY REASON TO REJECT THE RAIL PROJECT:

The New Risks To SLO Citizens Vastly Outweigh The Benefits To Phillips 66

Phillips 66 Rail Terminal project would be a dramatic transformation in its business model and method of operation in SLO County. Their revamped corporate business model is to maximize profits by turning our nation's rail lines into inherently unsafe "tank car pipelines," to take advantage of the new flood of lower-cost crude. This new business model brings a full suite of risks and consequences for the people of SLO County ...

- Air pollution that further increases an already unlawful situation on the Nipomo Mesa.
- Additional noise pollution.
- Additional light pollution.
- The visual pollution of 1.5 mile long trains, each hauling 80 crude oil tankers (520 trains arriving and departing each year ... averaging 10 each week, twice each working day!).
- The potential for oil spills.

- The potential for fires.
- The potential for explosions.
- The potential to damage the reputation of SLO County as a place to live, work and visit.
- And the potential to damage the economic well-being of our County overall and homeowners on the Nipomo Mesa.

Phillips' response to all of this has been ...

- "Don't worry ... trust us - we can mitigate all of that." We don't think so.
- Or, their response is "We don't have to do anything, because we have 'credits' to spend based on what we fixed many years ago. We simply have to do nothing."

We believe the vastly increased risks that this proposal brings to the citizens and businesses of SLO County are unacceptable. The risks of explosions, fires, oil spills, and air/noise/odor and light pollution enormously outweigh the benefits the plan bestows on an individual business entity -- that is, Phillips 66. Any honest risk/benefit analysis would lead to that conclusion.

Phillips wants to introduce a "new normal" into SLO County and the Nipomo Mesa ... hazards and dangers that do not currently exist here.

If a company that had never conducted business in SLO County came to the Planning Commission and Supervisors tomorrow, with the same new business model, new normal and associated risks, we're certain it would be rejected. The safety and well-being of our citizens trumps the new direction in which Phillips intends to take us all. That's why our Planning Commissioners must vote "No Project."

B-3. The Real Motivation Behind Why Phillips Wants To Bring In Crude By Rail

In its communications to SLO citizens, Phillips 66 states - "the pipeline limits us to sources on the Central coast, and as oil production in California has diminished, our sources for crude have declined." Therefore, they need rail delivery of crude and the need to build a rail yard, terminal and pumping station in Nipomo.

However, the true driver behind their desire to use rail is in their Annual Report issued early 2013. It was issued prior to their rail terminal application. And that report never once mentioned California nor their Nipomo refinery.

- The report's cover boldly claimed - "We're Taking A Classic (Company) In A New Direction." Inside it stated - "The American shale revolution has the potential to give Phillips 66 a competitive advantage in the global marketplace. However, limited domestic pipeline creates a challenge to transporting lower-cost crudes."

Their report continued -- "In 2012, we reached an agreement to manufacture 2,000 railcars for the transport of shale crude to our refineries. The report called it their "crude-by-rail strategy". They said - "These railcars provide a 'pipeline on wheels' to deliver crude to our refineries. "

- What did this tell us? It's corporate-speak for: Phillips has a major opportunity to generate profits from lower-cost crude. They can't quickly or inexpensively ship it to the U.S. coast via pipeline; so they've developed a "crude-by-rail strategy." And, they've already invested big bucks to be big players in "rail", and are attempting to leverage that investment.
- It also tells us Phillips' motivation is not altruistic in providing the U.S. with "energy independence." Rather, they want to take advantage of the growing export market to Asia.

The bottom line -- Phillips' claim of running out of crude to deliver by pipeline and the threat of lost jobs, is a red herring. It's meant to distract us from their true motivation. The company simply wants to change the types of crude they refine, because they're far more profitable. And that type of crude needs to be shipped to SLO County by rail.

B-4. The Reality Of The Scope Of What Phillips Intends To Deliver To SLO County

In its communications to SLO citizens, Phillips has consistently minimized the facts regarding what they intend to deliver via its rail project. They continually describe it simply as delivering ...

"Five trains per week - a maximum of 80 cars each."

However, their statistics fail to mention the reality of what they actually intend to deliver to us ...

- First of all, the 5 trains per week x 80 tank cars equals 400 tank cars per week.
- Those 400 tank cars x 52 weeks equals 20,800 tank cars arriving + another 20,800 tank cars departing per year. That's 41,600 tank cars working their way through SLO County.
- Within each of the arriving cars will be approximately 27,000 gallons of crude oil.*
- So what's the annual bottom line? 20,800 tank cars carrying 27,000 gallons of crude oil each, equals 562 million gallons of crude oil ... more than one-half billion gallons each and every year moving into SLO County by rail.

In contrast, not one drop of crude currently arrives by rail to their facility. Historically, it's all arrived via pipeline.

Therefore, a never-before half-billion gallons of crude would move down the tracks through our county, then be offloaded and refined on the Nipomo Mesa, every single year. This will inevitably and irrefutably inflict dangers and serious changes in the quality of life on our citizens, throughout SLO County.

*The REIR issued 10/10/14 states that each car would carry between 26,076 and 28,105 gallons of crude.

B-5. Jobs At The Phillips Facility - Is SLO County Willing To Accept "Jobs At Any Cost"?

We take no issue with the way Phillips currently operates, bringing in crude via pipeline. In fact, they've said that even if the rail terminal is approved, they'll continue bringing in crude by pipeline ... so pipeline delivery will remain part of their strategy. We also welcome the fact that their pipeline approach creates local jobs ... and we hope those jobs will be secure long into the future.

Unfortunately, their rail plan comes with unacceptable risks to the citizens of SLO County. Most prominently, there's the risk of disastrous accidents, as is happening and will continue to happen throughout the U.S. and Canada ... derailments followed by explosions, fire, death and destruction of property. Let's look at just two examples:

- In Lac-Megantic, Canada, a train carrying crude broke loose and rolled downhill into the town. All 72-cars on the train derailed on a sharp curve, crashed and exploded. The accident killed 47 people -- vaporizing many of their bodies. It flattened the center of their town.
- And just outside Casselton, North Dakota, a freight train derailed and crashed into a mile-long crude oil train. Thirty tank cars exploded. A huge fireball and plumes of black smoke went skyward. The blasts went on for hours, shaking homes and businesses. Toxic fumes were released, causing all 2,300 residents to evacuate. 400,000 gallons of crude oil spilled out of the tank cars.

These rail incidents all involved jobs. Jobs at refineries and on the railroads. But the citizens have rights as well. They have the right to remain free from fear, free from bodily harm, free from having to mourn the loss of friends and neighbors, free from having their property destroyed, and free from their environment being polluted.

And let's look at the other side of the coin. If a major rail accident occurred in SLO County, hundreds or thousands of County jobs could be lost. Residential and commercial construction jobs could be lost. Agricultural jobs could be lost. Leisure and hospitality jobs could be lost. Proposed office parks and hotels might not be built. Those looking to invest in new restaurants, shops, and professional businesses would look elsewhere. Simply put, do you think those kinds of investments are now being made or planned for places like Lac-Megantic, Canada or Casselton, South Dakota?

SLO County has approximately 275,000 men, women, children, parents and grandparents living here ... with 36,000 now living in South County alone. An additional 31,000 college students live in the county. There are an estimated 81,000 non-farm workers employed at 7,700 non-farm businesses. That's what's at risk with the Rail Terminal Project.

We hate to say it, but "jobs at any cost" is unacceptable. We respect the 140 people who work at the Nipomo refinery. We know they have families ... so do we. We hope Phillips, with their vast resources and many alternatives for crude oil, will see fit to keep those people employed. But jobs at any cost, if it causes intolerable risk for the citizens of SLO county, is far too costly.

B-6. The Contributions Of Nipomo Mesa Communities To Job Growth In SLO County

A meaningful discussion of jobs at the Nipomo refinery must also include a discussion of jobs in the communities directly adjacent to that facility. In 1955, when the refinery was opened, our guess is that a relatively small number of jobs existed on the Mesa, outside the refinery.

But the scenario is now far different. SLO County gave its blessing to build multiple residential communities in that area ... houses paying higher-than-average taxes to the County. They're communities like Cypress Ridge (375 homes), Black Lake (554), Trilogy (1,320 at build-out), and others under construction or planned. Those three communities alone represent 2,249 homes ... roughly 4,500 adults.

What does that have to do with jobs? Quite simply, those residents generate jobs - lots of them. Let's take just one community ... Trilogy. Here are our best guesstimates ...

- Let's start with long-term construction jobs. This means work for dozens of local, skilled businesses with head of household jobs. We estimate 40 small-to-mid-size companies are involved - carpenters, HVAC contractors, electricians, landscapers, painters, decorators, cabinet people, flooring professionals,, and others. If each firm employs just five people, that's 200 jobs.
- Then there are the existing homes. Residents employ services such as landscapers, plumbers,

electricians, painters, flooring people, etc. Let's say Trilogy's 600 existing homes already account for 75 permanent service jobs.

- Of course, those residents also shop throughout Nipomo and Arroyo Grande, accounting for hundreds of retail jobs.
- Then there's Trilogy's Monarch Club. Our best guesstimate is 40 permanent jobs in leisure, hospitality, maintenance and management.
- There's the Monarch Dunes Golf Course. Let's estimate another 25 year-round jobs.

B-7. The Impact On The Reputation & Financial Well Being Of SLO County

With this proposed project, the entire reputation of SLO County is at stake -- as being a model for environmental protection, as a community concerned for the well being of its citizens, as a destination for tourists, as a location for parents to send their children to college, and as a primary example of what a community can stand for in an otherwise corporate-first world.

If a serious rail tanker accident or oil spill occurred in one or more of our towns, imagine the depth of the impact on SLO county overall. Let's start with ...

- Housing -- would you want to live in a county that sets itself up for such disasters?
- Leisure and hospitality -- would you want to vacation in such a county?
- Launching new businesses -- would you want to start a business in a "damaged" county?
- Employment -- would you want to work in such a county?
 - Education -- would you want to send your children to school or college in such a county? (By the way, the tracks which would carry the crude oil trains, are directly across the street from Cal Poly, where more than 18,000 students reside.)

But let's take a specific example - the business of agriculture. If there were a rail accident, smoke and residue from oil fires settling on downwind crops would make them unmarketable. It would also potentially poison soil, so fields or vineyards would be useless for several growing seasons.

As another example, local leisure and hospitality losses quite possibly would not be recoverable, with detrimental effects on local economies.

If even one such serious incident occurred, the social and business reputations of the entire county would suffer ... and damage to that reputation would have severe economic & lifestyle consequences.

- No longer would Travel & Leisure rank SLO as one of the top three Best College Towns in America.
- No longer would TopRetirements count SLO County among the "the most popular places to retire."
- No longer would Conde Nast Traveler call SLO "the perfect weekend getaway."
- No longer would Oprah Winfrey select SLO as "the happiest place in America."
- No longer would Gallup rank SLO & Paso Robles as one of the top 10 cities for overall well-being.
- And no longer could a National Geographic author write that SLO residents "enjoy stratospheric levels of emotional well being." No longer could he write - "It's a place filled with people not only happy IN their city but happy WITH their city - having much higher
- There's the community landscaping, maintenance and repair about another 20 permanent jobs.
- There's the planned Trilogy Business Park - a conservative guesstimate is 250 permanent jobs.
- There's a planned 500-room, resort-style hotel - perhaps another 250 permanent jobs.
- And Trilogy plans a Village Center with retail shops and services - another 100 permanent jobs.

That's about 1,000 in total, many being head-of-household jobs. And that's from Trilogy alone. Add in Cypress Ridge and Black Lake and we're talking about 2,000 or more jobs. And that doesn't include the planned developments in the area.

What does this have to do with the Phillips Rail Terminal project? It provides perspective about the 140 jobs Phillips implies will be lost if the project is denied. As a County, we need all the jobs that are created on the Mesa ... including both the Phillips jobs as well as those generated by the adjacent communities.

However, it also tells us that if a rail terminal were built there with all of its dangers, disruptions and pollution, countless jobs would be at risk.

Why? Because the existing communities' reputations would be severely tarnished. They'd be far less desirable places to live and visit. Who would want to invest in a home or vacation next to a busy, polluting, dangerous oil rail terminal?

Very likely, fewer homes would be built. Construction jobs would be lost. Home values could suffer, along with declining taxes. Fewer services would be required. It's less likely that a resort hotel

would be built. The Village Center retail shops would be less likely. Other shopping at downtown retail stores would be in jeopardy.

And what would happen to jobs if there were a major accident at or near the rail terminal? Not only would the communities' reputations be tarnished, but part of the communities might be physically destroyed or dangerously polluted. And we don't have to go into detail how that would affect jobs ... from leisure/hospitality jobs to tradesmen to retail and other service jobs.

So, any time you hear that the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project will have an impact on jobs, please broaden your thinking. Thousands of existing and future jobs are at stake ... throughout the Nipomo Mesa, and throughout SLO County.

rates of satisfaction with their local government than citizens of other municipalities.”

I'm sure you've heard the phrase that's often attached to SLO County - that it's "paradise." That's a great description, because it's been true.

But please, we ask that you not allow this generation of SLO County citizens and government officials to be the ones who allowed our County to become "paradise lost."

B-8. The Rail Project - Putting The Economic Health Of San Luis Obispo County In Serious Jeopardy

Given statistics available early in 2014 -- we see that SLO County ranks a sterling second in California job expansion. And similarly, it has the fourth lowest unemployment, well below the state average.

SLO County also enjoys a double-A plus bond rating (AA+) from Fitch Ratings, one of only three counties in the state to receive this type of high overall credit rating.

Two sectors contribute greatly to this economic success -- the leisure/hospitality sector, and agriculture. These industries, and others such as real estate and retail, have spurred increases, not only in employment, but in local spending, reinvigorating virtually all sectors of the local economy. Let's look at specific examples ...

- In the real estate market -- defaults and foreclosures have dropped and home prices are rising.
- Regarding consumer spending -- across all cities in SLO County, spending is growing with considerably higher taxable sales compared to our state and other coastal counties. This speaks to our county's strength as a whole.
- Taxable receipts from businesses increased by 53% in 2013, versus only 7% statewide.
- Of note is that our county's leisure/hospitality, agricultural and retail sectors have become increasingly intertwined with the wine regions of the county. For example, both Paso Robles and the South County are now spotlighted as destinations on the state and national levels ... with both regions contributing to our county's thriving economy overall. The leisure/hospitality sector alone employs 16,000 people, many of which are head-of-household jobs.
- Next -- construction of residential real estate is expanding. Home prices are rising. In the way SLO County currently goes about its business, expectations for the residential market is extremely positive.

So how does all of this relate to the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project? We totally respect the contributions of their Nipomo refinery in terms of its 140 jobs, taxes, ongoing support of activities such as sports teams, and the past good will they've developed.

However, we suggest that the economic life and reputation of our county is not dependent on the Phillips 66 Rail Project being approved. That is -- our economic well being is not dependent on 1.5 mile-long trains laden with dangerous crude oil crossing our entire county 260 times each year.

Our economic lives are dependent more on fundamental industries such as leisure & hospitality, agriculture, retail and real estate. It's dependent on the contributions of local businesses. It's not dependent on satisfying the corporate objectives set by Phillips' executives in Houston ... executives who wish to vastly expand their profits via a "crude-by-rail" strategy.

What's the bottom line? We suggest that our county's economy, continued growth, high quality of life, desirability, and natural beauty, will be seriously jeopardized by bringing in 20,800 tank cars of crude oil by rail, year after year. At the very least, our economic health will be in peril, let alone our lives.

The solution - rejection of the Phillips Rail Terminal project.

I would never have spent 1/4 of a million dollars for a home in San Luis Obispo County, Trilogy neighborhood if I thought this would have ever been a possibility. Not only will this affect my view from my front yard

but it will be a constant reminder of the risk it puts on my safety and wellbeing. My property value will decrease; who would want to live in this area? Pls oppose this terrible project for the sake of not only the folks like myself who live on the Mesa but for all the residents of San Luis Obispo County. Thank you.

Peter Morreale

Home owner: 1775 Louise Lane, Nipomo Ca 93444 (Trilogy neighborhood.)

Phone 805-343-2415



***PLEASE* Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion**

Cassidi Howell to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

Please respond to cassidi _howell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

*****As a resident of Roseville Ca I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cassidi Howell
717 Jo Anne ln
Roseville, CA 95678
US

**Derail the spur****Jennifer** to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

Please respond to Jennifer

History: This message has been forwarded.

Mr Murry,

I am writing as a concerned citizen about the potential construction of the Phillips 66 rail spur project. I would like to address the significant air and noise pollution and unsightly views that would go above and beyond the current situation that we now have if construction begins on this project. I am a home owner in Trilogy. I can see the refinery from my street. Currently the odors coming from the Phillips 66 plant when the wind is in the right direction are obnoxious and give me a headache. The elevation of Trilogy is about 300 feet above the Phillips plant. The propose man made sand dune to block unsightly views is to be approximately 20 feet high. Trilogy residents are 280 feet higher! No man made sand dune will block the view of rail cars and proposed new infrastructure. Why even bother with moving all that sand? Night time lighting will be on 30 foot poles 300 feet apart, again how will a 20 foot berm block the light.? Currently Air quality frequently goes above acceptable limits . It's my understanding the Phillips 66 will be using "air quality credits" that they have banked over past years to allow them to pollute emissions that exceed SLOCAPD thresholds.. Sounds like smoke and mirrors to me. There is a serious health threat looming if this project begins.

Please vote NO on the Phillips 66 rail spur project.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Williams
cell 559-816-1411



Reject the Phillips 66 oil train proposal!

gloria.camarillo@att.net to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Respectfully yours, Gloria Camarillo & Family



Oil Train Expansion Puts People /Towns at Risk
Kathy Sabatini to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ksabatini 53

11/25/2014 11:07 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project because:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.
2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.
3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.
4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.
5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.
6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathy Sabatini

4728 Isabella Ave
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
US



STOP expanding fossil fuels START protecting your community

Annie Kaskade to: p66-rails-pur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to annieppk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I have had a family member living near Santa Maria for 40 years, and I have been coming there all my life. Please protect what I know and love.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66

proposed rail spur.

Annie Kaskade
231 Hillside Dr
Woodside, CA 94062
US



Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department;

Six years ago, my husband and I purchased a home in Trilogy where we have since retired. We lived in Orange County for over 30 years. When we first began visiting this area over 20 years ago we appreciated the tranquility, the lack of traffic and the rural beauty of this unique area. We felt it was a wonderful escape from the crowding and congestion of our home in Laguna Niguel. You see, when we first moved to Laguna Niguel it too was a type of paradise, there were open spaces, rural areas and minimal traffic. While it is naive to think property will not be developed, a clear and logical plan enhances the worth and preserves the dignity of area. South Orange County is an area where poor planning and greed for land development have ruined a once pristine area. The hills are no longer visible and are now covered with homes. Traffic is a nightmare. We are once again facing the same conundrum. The proposed rail terminal project will destroy for us our motivation for living here and for many of the Trilogy residents and in our opinion will greatly devalue our property value.

Specifically:

The Aesthetic and visual impact-Instead of viewing the agricultural areas, the sand dunes and the ocean from top of our hill on Northwood Rd(we are also golfers)we will see a huge trainyard where unloading will be taking place 50-60 hours per week. In the past we have enjoyed bringing our grandchildren up to look at the evening sky - now we will be hindered by the bright lights needed to unload trains well into the evening hours. Pointing the lights in another direction is not a solution to diffusing the lights. This visual eyesore will completely alter our lifestyle and and the marketability of our homes.

The noise - At this time one can hear, on occasion,in the distant background, the clickity- clack and the occasional whistles of the trains as they travel close by. I can only imagine the noise and vibration the will be created by the incessant moving of 260 fully-loaded, 1.5 mile-long trains as they move from north to south across the mesa.

The pollution - The air quality near the dunes and the Nipomo Mesa is already seriously compromised by the off-road vehicles. Personally, I have developed asthma since moving to Nipomo. I can only imagine the damage that will be done to the air quality that would be generated by increased diesel emissions from the continuous operation of the trains.

The danger of an oil spill - It is naive to think that any large petroleum business will put safety before profit. We have witnessed over and over the damage done to our environment, to our property, and the loss of human lives when we place our trust in the hands of large oil companies. The multitude of potential hazards have already been well-documented.

In short, we have touted this area to friends and encouraged them to relocate to this beautiful area. The property values are returning to the pre-recession value. Why would you destroy that which makes this county so unique? Why would you risk yet another oil spill having finally recovered from the damage done to Avila Beach? We beseech you to think of the future and the generations to come who love living on the Central Coast.

Sincerely,
Linda and Michael Garza
1777 Northwood RD.
Nipomo, CA 93444



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur
Jason Rosenbaum to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jason

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the

public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A

derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jason
Rosenbaum
14 Cornel Drive
Goldens Bridge,
New York 10526



Fwd: REIR
David Bottom to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department,

The REIR has been brought to our attention because we are residents on the Nipomo Mesa.

I am deeply concerned about REIR for many reasons. We have been coming up to the Central Coast for over 35 years on vacation to escape the environmental issues we grew up in, lived in and drove

in daily in the southern California area. We could not wait until one day we could retire in a community

that would bring healthy well being both physically as well as mentally. We moved up to the Nipomo area five years ago to a peaceful environment after my husband succumbed and survived stage 4 cancer, open heart

surgery as a result of the cancer treatment as well as spinal cord surgery. The cancer was brought about by the carcinogens

that resulted after living through the massive wildfires in Southern California. My 90 year old mother, my husband

as well as at least 40 neighbors were diagnosed with cancer of some organ, or suffered a massive heart

attack due to the carcinogens left by the ash of these fires within 1 to 2 years. It was stated to me by a rescue team member,

after sharing what my husband and mom were going through "I won't even tell you what the carcinogens from

a fire will do to the human organs".

In REIR, it states that there is a definite possibility that "tar sands" crude oil from Alberta, Canada will be shipped

in. Tar sands emit and have high amounts of sulfur dioxide. These carcinogens will have a major effect on

my husband with his preexisting heart conditions. We purchased a home two years ago where our bedroom

faces Phillips 66. We leave our door open for fresh air and I can tell you over the past two years we have

already had to close the door in the middle of the night due to the intense odor coming from the refinery. I

actually made a trip to emergency in September as I thought I was having a heart attack. I am a healthy

58 year old. If this tar is brought into the refinery, it will only produce more of a health threat to my husband

and myself. I don't think I want to live in an environment like that.

We also lived in the city where noise was prevalent, that is why we moved to the country. Peace, quiet and

mental peace of mind. With the proposed site for the rail terminal, that will also be taken away from us.

The construction of the terminal will be offensive not to mention the trains that will be coming in daily for the

rest of our lives. I love the sound of a distance train every once in a while, however, many in a day loading

and unloading, repairs and trucks going up and down Willow constantly taking their loads is not what I

find romantic. I drove in and heard traffic in L.A., Orange County and San Diego for 54 years, I don't want to

find that in my backyard now. I have only mentioned a few of our concerns, but there are many

more.

I appreciate your time in reading these concerns, now I would like to ask you to take them to heart.
If this

was your wife, your children facing such concerns, would you go ahead and approve REIR. There are definite health hazards on the rise if this goes through.

Sincerely,

Karen Bottom

concerned community resident



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Karina Alvarez to: p66-railsbur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Karina Alvarez**
<alvarezkarinar@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to alvarezkarinar

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karina Alvarez
1 LMU Drive
MSB 1192
Los Angeles,
California 90045



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Valerie Love to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Valerie Love**
<vmontanalove@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to vmontanalove

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Valerie Love
1304 Monterey Ave
Berkeley,
California 94707



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Emili Abdel-Ghany to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: Emili Abdel-Ghany
<emabdel@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to emabdel

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emili
Abdel-Ghany
815 Ashland Ave

SANTA

MONICA,
California 90405



P66 Rail Terminal Project

Gary Nemetz to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to Gary Nemetz

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

During the past 8 years we have lived in the Shea Homes Trilogy Development in Nipomo. Our concerns with respect to this project relate not only to Trilogy directly, since we are "in the direct line of fire" so to speak, but the impact approval of this reinvention of the refinery will have on the quality of life to SLO County at large. Specific concerns:

1. Our oldest son attended Cal Poly. Every parent has an expectation that protections will be taken and decisions made by those in power to minimize threats to our children while attending school at any level. While not all threats can be eliminated the introduction of heavy crude trains descending Cuesta grade is an invitation for disaster. One only need look at the many videos on-line to see the potential in the event of a derailment. Why take this chance with our young people? I personally viewed a train accident near San Bernardino in the late 1980's where a train lost control descending Cajon Summit and it is a horrific sight.

2. As a lifelong asthmatic a major draw for us with the Central Coast was the attraction of clean air. While the refinery currently has periodic discharges into the air we understand the refinery was here first and our failure to do a more adequate investigation into air quality is our problem. However, what the refinery is now proposing is a game changer as it is a complete transition in the way business will be conducted. Mitigation measures as outlined in the REIR related to visual, sound, and air particulates are not adequate to justify approval of this project. Typically, even well intentioned mitigation starts strong and slippage occurs over time. In this case mitigation is not adequate in the first place. It is obvious where we will be in a few years after the makeover is complete.

We understand that P66 is running a business which has profit maximization as a primary objective. We also understand businesses need to change in order adapt with changing markets. Unfortunately, the counter to these interests is the well being of SLO County residents. We have a right as residents to expect clean air. We should not have to live in fear that we will hear a siren requiring us to evacuate or otherwise hunker down in our homes. We should not have to absorb the collateral environmental damage from P66 so that they may change with the times. Frankly, the business pressures facing P66 are just not the problem of SLO County residents.

We urge denial of this project.

Gary & Christi Nemetz

1914 Northwood Rd., Nipomo, CA 93444



Subject: Opposition to the P 66 Rail Terminal Project

K. N. Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson, SLO County Planning Department,

In the new REIR, the following project impacts were classified as Class I:

1. (AQ.2): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project at the Refinery would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed SLOCAPD thresholds.
2. (AQ.3): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route outside of SLO County associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds.
3. (AQ.4): Operational activities at the Refinery associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.
4. (AQ.5): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed thresholds.
5. (AQ.6): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

The Key Issues ...

- **Heightened Recognition Of Specific Threats To Citizens' Health:** This REIR recognizes the serious nature of the health risks raised by this project. Increased risks in important health categories such as cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease (especially in the very young and very old) and premature death are recognized and in some cases the risks are quantified.
- **Heightened Recognition Of A Threat To Global Climate Change:** The impact of this project on California's and SLO County's programs to reduce the threat of global climate change is also quantified in this REIR and the increase in greenhouse gas emissions of this project are found to exceed thresholds.
- **Impractical And Unenforceable Mitigation Measures** Although there are mitigation measures discussed in this EIR for all five Class I impacts, the EIR's discussion of the measures, for the most part, makes it very clear they are not truly feasible or adequately enforceable.
- **Not Taking Into Account All The Criteria For Determining Compliance With Air Pollution Standards:** An issue of great concern with the REIR is its singular reliance on emissions increase thresholds as the sole criteria for the determination of significance under CEQA. The County has identified a list of criteria that can be used as a basis for determining "significance" under CEQA. An emissions increase threshold is only one of them.

Given that this project lies in the heart of a region where the state health standard for particulate matter is violated over 70 times per year and where the federal health standard has been violated in each of the last three years, we believe that any increase in the emissions of particulate matter at this project site violates additional CEQA significance criteria.

Therefore, it would be unconscionable for the SLO County Planning Department to agree to the P66 Rail Terminal Project.

Sincerely,
K. Anderson
Nipomo, CA



Phillips 66 Crude-by-Rail Plan - A New Worry for Cancer !!!

Steve DuBow to: SLO, Murry Wilson

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to sfdubow

History: This message has been forwarded.

Hello Mr. Wilson:

We are writing to you again to express our ever growing concerns about the Phillips 66 Rail Spur plan.

Given all the existing problems that SLO county in general and the Nipomo Mesa in particular have with cancer causing pollution, why would anyone allow a project like the Phillips 66 plan to be developed?

It will, with a 100% certainty, increase the level of carcinogenic pollution throughout the county and beyond. Their own REIR makes this perfectly clear:

"Air toxic emissions at the SMR would be significant and unavoidable (Class I) since the cancer

risk over a 30-year exposure period would be greater than the 10 in a million threshold established by the SLOCAPCD. This cancer risk is driven mainly by diesel particulate emissions. About half of this cancer risk is due to the diesel particulate emissions from the existing trucking operations at the SMR. Use of Tier 4 locomotives would reduce most of the

cancer risk from the rail operations, but the cancer risk would remain significant and unavoidable

since the baseline risk is already about the SLOCAPCD threshold. As stated above, the County

may be preempted by Federal law from applying mitigation to the UPRR locomotives.

Air toxic emissions from the mainline rail operations would be significant and unavoidable (Class I) for areas along the mainline that are in close proximity to populated areas, and there is a

speed limit restriction on trains of less than 30 mph (when more emissions occur per length of

rail due to the slower speeds). In these locations the 30-year cancer risk would exceed the SLOCAPCD thresholds beyond the railroad right-of-way. There are areas along the mainline rail

route that have reduced speed limits for trains that pass in proximity of sensitive receptors. For

example, in the City of San Luis Obispo, trains are limited to a speed of 25 miles per hour. In the

City of Davis, there are stretches of track that are limited in speed to 10 mph."

We are not the only ones troubled over the cancer causing risks associated with a plan like this. The State of California is too. The following clip came from Tuesday's edition of the SLO Tribune on page

WARNING

Chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm are contained in crude oil, gasoline, diesel fuel and other petroleum products and byproducts.

Chemicals known to the State of California to cause cancer, birth defects or other reproductive harm are also contained in and around oil fields, service stations, refineries, chemical plants, transport and storage operations, including pipelines, marine terminals and tank trucks, and other facilities and equipment that manufacture, produce, process, handle, distribute, transport, store, sell or otherwise transfer crude oil, gasoline, diesel fuel or other petroleum products or byproducts.

The foregoing warning is provided pursuant to Proposition 65. This law requires the Governor of California to publish a list of chemicals "known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive toxicity." This list is compiled in accordance with a procedure established by the Proposition, and can be obtained from the California Environmental Protection Agency. Proposition 65 requires that clear and reasonable warnings be given to persons exposed to the listed chemicals in certain situations.

**BP America Inc. and its subsidiaries
(and under the trademarks
ARCO and Castrol)**

**Chevron Corporation
its affiliates and subsidiaries**

**Phillips 66
including its divisions and subsidiaries
(and under the trademark 76)**

Aera Energy LLC

**Venoco Inc.
its affiliates and subsidiaries**

**Exxon Mobil Corporation
its affiliates and subsidiaries**

Shell Oil Products US

**Tesoro Refining and Marketing Company
and its subsidiaries (and under the
trademark ARCO and USA Gasoline
and licensee of ampm, Shell
and Thrifty trademarks)**

Valero and CST Brands, Inc.

Ultramar

Beacon

**For more information, please call:
1-800-523-3157**

11-14

Approving the Phillips 66 Rail Spur plan is simply unacceptable as far as we're concerned. What we have mentioned above is just one of many reasons why this crazy project should never be allowed to happen. We are implorng you to do the right thing for the citizens of San Luis Obispo county. REJECT THIS PLAN.

Respectfully,

Steve and Sandy DuBow

email: sfdubow@yahoo.com

home: 805-219-0408

mobile: 530-570-0912



PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL PROJECT FOR CRUDE -BY-RAIL

Vivi Justesen to: mwilson@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Cc: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"

History: This message has been forwarded.

To Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Dpt.

It is difficult to fathom that such a project is even under consideration given the potential extreme hazards and catastrophes that it will present to the Central Coast.

- - 520 oil trains coming through SLO County each year, each about 1.5 miles long crossing several road crossings such as Foothill - California and Orcutt, just name a few - - and adjacent to Cal Poly campus for quite a stretch. Is this really under serious consideration?

The REIR clearly states that local emergency services are currently underfunded and underprepared to deal with these potential dangers. Emergency measures are in response to disasters, not methods to prevent such disasters. Seeing reportage films of oil tank train disasters in other parts of the country should leave one with with NO doubt that this proposal must never happen.

Thank you,

Evy Justesen
2065 McCollum St
SLO 93405

546-8907



Detailed Concerns Regarding the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project and its REIR

Charles Davis to: p66-railspur-comments
Cc: cray, bgibson, ahjill, darnold, fmecham

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Murry

I have carefully evaluated the Revised Environmental Impact Report issued two months ago and hoped that this document would address and resolve many of the issues raised over the previous DEIR. The purpose of this email is to advise you of my disappointment over the quality of this new document---and specifically its failure to address meaningful, realistic and actionable measures to mitigate the many negative consequences of this project to the residents of SLO County, and those, like me, who live on the Nipomo Mesa. The Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project presents unacceptable dangers to my community in Nipomo's Trilogy development, located within a 1/2 mile of the proposed rail spur. All aspects of this project present unacceptable threats to the health, economy and environment of our area. Please do your job and protect the citizens of our County as opposed to the welfare of Phillips 66. By copy of this email, I'm requesting that all 5 SLO county supervisors, should this project reach them, cast a negative vote against this ill-conceived and dangerous project.

There are many aspects of this project that are inimical to our well-being, but I would like to concentrate in this email solely on those relating to our Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases.

The original EIR recognized only two air quality impacts as "Class I" (i.e., impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels). However, in the REIR, the number of Class I impacts has more than doubled to five which are "significant and unavoidable" ... obviously proving that the original analysis either purposely minimized these issues or was woefully inadequate in its observations. In the new REIR, the following project impacts were classified as Class I:

1. (AQ.2): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project at the Refinery would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed SLOCAPD thresholds.
2. (AQ.3): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route outside of SLO County associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds.
3. (AQ.4): Operational activities at the Refinery associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.
4. (AQ.5): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed thresholds.
5. (AQ.6): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

The Key Issues ...

- Heightened Recognition Of Specific Threats To Citizens' Health: This REIR recognizes the serious nature of the health risks raised by this project. Increased risks in important health categories such as cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease (especially in the very young and very old) and premature death are recognized and in some cases the risks are quantified.
- Heightened Recognition Of A Threat To Global Climate Change: The impact of this project on California's and SLO County's programs to reduce the threat of global climate change is also quantified in this REIR and the increase in greenhouse gas emissions of this project are

found to exceed thresholds.

- Impractical And Unenforceable Mitigation Measures: Although there are mitigation measures discussed in this EIR for all five Class I impacts, the EIR's discussion of the measures, for the most part, makes it very clear they are not truly feasible or adequately enforceable.
- Not Taking Into Account All The Criteria For Determining Compliance With Air Pollution Standards: An issue of great concern with the REIR is its singular reliance on emissions increase thresholds as the sole criteria for the determination of significance under CEQA. The County has identified a list of criteria that can be used as a basis for determining "significance" under CEQA. An emissions increase threshold is only one of them.

Given that this project lies in the heart of a region where the state health standard for particulate matter is violated over 70 times per year and where the federal health standard has been violated in each of the last three years, I believe that any increase in the emissions of particulate matter at this project site violates additional CEQA significance criteria.

In addition to all the above concerns, I have further issue with the refining of tar sands, which can lead to a host of major health problems:

1. The Arrival Of "Tar Sands" In SLO County: The Nipomo refinery's superintendent has told us that with the Rail Terminal Project, there's a good possibility they will ship in "tar sands" crude oil from Alberta, Canada. Tar sands (a "heavy" crude) has substantially higher concentrations of sulfur, copper, nickel, nitrogen, lead and benzene than are found in conventional crude.
2. Health Issue #1 - Higher Levels Of Sulfur Dioxide: The main danger to communities is that facilities that refine tar sands could emit significantly higher amounts of sulfur dioxide. And that could lead to chest tightness, asthma, reduced lung function, respiratory weakness and cardiovascular issues, as well as cancer. Sulfur dioxide is especially dangerous for people who have preexisting heart and lung conditions.
3. Health Issue #2 - Increased Quantities Of Petroleum Coke: But the refining of tar sands also yields a significantly higher amount of petroleum coke, known as "petcoke." Phillips' Nipomo refinery already produces petcoke. And it's left onsite as widespread, open hills of black granules and dust. This waste product can easily be blown into residential areas by onshore winds and breathed in by residents. Petcoke is linked to a potential increase in heart attacks and respiratory issues.

The REIR fails to adequately address these concerns, or presents "mitigation" measures that are problematic, at best, given the pre-emption status of interstate commerce and the railroads' historic (and current) hostility to any attempt to impose or enforce state or local community health standards. That leaves us with a host of unresolved health issues without any meaningful way to address or mitigate them, under current laws and regulations. In this environment, clearly the project should and must be rejected.

Thank you in advance for your attention to these issues.

Charles Davis
1874 Northwood Road
Nipomo, CA 93444
(805)343-0193



Rail Terminal Project
Sue Allen to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr Murry

After reading the REIR report, my concerns as a home owner of the Mesa Dunes and citizen of the San Luis Obispo county resident is the environmental impact, the dangers to the area and the agriculture . Presently we have enough problems with the air quality due to Oceano sand dunes when the wind blow 3 months of the year.To add all the toxic fumes to this is just plan wrong. We are endangering so many people knowing that there will be many toxic chemical in the air. Not to mention the 80 train that will be coming and going each week. The noise factor is tremendous . Mainly if there is an potential explosion we are doomed. Our fire dept is understaffed and isn't equipped to handle such a a disaster. Know all the dangers it doesn't make sense to go thru with this project.

One more thing, these train will be traveling down the quest grade over a bridge that was built in the 1893 which is dangers in of itself. That is a scary thought if they were to derail.

Please listen to the people and then make your decision based on what is the right thing to do, rather than how much money can be made. I am all for people making money of course just not where there are so many factors that could endanger many lives. We live in such beautiful we want to keep it that way.

Sincerely



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Wesley Adrianson to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Wesley Adrianson**
<wadrianson@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to wadrianson

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wesley
Adrianson
2600 Ridge
Road
Berkeley,

California 94709



History: This message has been forwarded.

Please read my attached letter.

Thank You,

November 20, 2014

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department
976 Osos Street Room 200
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Concerning: Phillips 66 Rail Spur REIR proposal

Dear Mr. Wilson:

I am writing as a 20 year resident of the Central Coast and as a grandmother who hopes her grand children can enjoy this beautiful area with their grand children and so on to their grandchildren too. I am very concerned that my hope for this future cannot become a reality if Phillips 66 gets to implement their corporate business plan and start shipping crude oil by rail through San Luis Obispo County.

I believe this 'rail spur expansion' is not merely a simply rail spur addition but a total change in the overall business plan of Phillips 66, nationwide. As stated in its annual report, the firm has switched to a "crude-by-rail" approach in order to access far cheaper crude oil from Canada and elsewhere in the northern USA. The only way to access this northern crude is via rail since no pipelines exist. This is a corporate plan for expansion, however our County is unique and does not deserve to be smudged and degraded by an expanded oil refinery and train traffic through this beautifully preserved tourist area.

I believe the consequences of approving this oil-by- rail plan locally will have MAJOR negative impacts on San Luis Obispo County's way of life, our tourism, our economy, our health, our air quality and the safety of our people. It is estimated that each train will weigh approximately 11,632 tons coming down the Cuesta Grade. Sadly I can foresee a disaster when an almost twelve-thousand ton object carrying crude attempts to come down the Cuesta Grade, alone hundreds of them per year!

According to the Phillips 66 literature, each year, 260 trains, each approximately a 1.5 miles-long, will traverse our county to the Nipomo mesa refinery and unload their crude oil. Then the same 260 trains will depart, traveling through San Luis Obispo County, often through cities, near residences and schools, even traveling the periphery of Cal Poly San Luis Obispo. So the Phillips 66 proposal is for a total of 520, 1.5 mile long train trips per year, through San Luis Obispo County. This intensity equals a half-billion gallons of crude oil (561,800,000 gallons) transiting through San Luis Obispo County annually – all with the potential to dirty our air, harm our tourism, change our way of life, and when a rail disaster occurs – change our beautiful, unique and God given County forever.

Please before you approve this 'rail spur expansion' in the name of saving 140 jobs please

think of the thousands of jobs that can be lost if a disaster occurs. Think of the hundreds of jobs that can diminish if our air quality, inconvenience and noise levels caused by these trains affect tourism. Please focus on our safety, our health, our way-of-life as a reason to deny this expansion. Specifically see these areas in the REIR:

4.11.1.3 The Santa Maria Refinery is in a High Fire Hazard Zone and the only certified Level 1 Hazardous Materials Emergency Response Team s in Santa Barbara. The other four teams along the coast are non-certified. Emergency responders lack adequate training in the specialized areas of oil rail safety and flammable liquid, lack critical information needed to help plan for and respond to oil by rail incidents, and how they would respond to potential worst-case scenarios.

4.11-23 A single significant event at the rail unloading facility could overwhelm the first responder resources and additional emergency responders and equipment could be required. Without proper fire protection design, training, and resources the impacts of a release of crude oil or fire could have significant impacts on fire protection and emergency response services.

The California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC) has identified a number of Local Safety Hazard Sites (LSHS) within California, including the Cuesta Grade. Over the past 5 years there have been 58 derailments at or near LSHS sites. The Cuesta Grade represents an area where a runaway train could occur.

OES (Office of Emergency Services) analysis revealed that numerous local emergency response offices lack adequate resources to respond to oil by rail accidents. Rural areas have little or no funding for firefighters and rely on volunteer firefighters. They lack the capacity to support a HAZMAT team and lack capacity to purchase or maintain necessary specialized vehicles and equipment, or to obtain training. Their response time could be hours.

If the above alone wasn't enough to stop this project since the 520 trains and new rail terminal will be highly invasive to San Luis Obispo County, and will bring significant pollution and the potential of major oil spills, the types of crude likely to be delivered are highly dangerous to both the health and safety of our citizens too! The types of crude will very likely include the pollution-intensive "tar sands," (which has been called "one of the world's dirtiest and most environmentally destructive sources of fuel"). Previously, Phillips 66 attempted to gain approval to ship in the highly explosive Bakken crude, but the outcry of San Luis Obispo County citizens forced the company to reverse course and finally state "no Bakken," but what could these dangerous sources of fuel be in the future?

Bottom line: this expansion is not the right Fit for San Luis Obispo County. It doesn't Fit: our unique natural beauty of the area; our unique climate; our economy based on tourism; our safety based on locations of rail tracks and the routes that will be used by 520, 1.5 mile-long trains per year; our safety due to what substances will be in the trains; our safety due to lack of proper response forces; our air quality; and so much more.

Phillips 66 is changing their business plan to include heavy crude shipped by rail but it is just not the right Fit for San Luis Obispo County.

Sincerely,

Ethel M. Landers
1045 La Serenata Way
Nipomo, CA 93444

805 929-1444



REIR letter.docx



Opposition to the P 66 Rail Terminal Project
Michael Young to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson,

I hereby raise my strenuous objection to the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project in Nipomo.

As residents of a home at 1928 Eucalyptus Road, Nipomo, my wife and I along with all our immediate neighbors on Eucalyptus Road facing westerly are among the closest homes to the proposed project and doubtless would be recipients of its obviously deleterious impacts on the air quality, the noise levels, the light levels, and other environmental pollution effects clearly described in the Revised Environmental Impact Statement.

The size and scope of the project would be visible and audible from our property. The peaceful enjoyment of our property would be adversely affected. At present, the oil refinery is an acceptable albeit less than ideal neighbor. Yes, there are noxious odors and some level of air and visual pollution but we purchased this home in July with the knowledge. Indeed, we sought a reduction in price and obtained some because of the refinery.

Should the project go forward, there may be a reduction in property values proximate to the site. There is ample evidence of this adverse impact in the academic real estate literature that can support challenges to ad valorem property tax assessments that I will assemble for tax appeals if this project goes forward. I am a long-time member of the American Real Estate Society, where much of this research has been published and presented.

"First do no harm" is a motto doctors follow. We sincerely hope that the Supervisors will do no less by rejecting the proposed project.

Michael Young
1928 Eucalyptus Road
Nipomo, CA 93444



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Kiyomi de Zoysa to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Kiyomi de Zoysa**
<kiyomidezoyso@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to kiyomidezoyso

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kiyomi de Zoysa

6719 Sabado
Tarde
Goleta,

California 93117



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Yustina Salnikova to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Yustina Salnikova**
<yustinasalnikova @actionnetwork .org>

Please respond to yustinasalnikova

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Yustina
Salnikova
154 Panoramic
Way
Berkeley,

California 94704



P66 Rail Terminal Project

Jackie Jones to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to Jackie Jones

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr, Murry:

Seven years ago I retired and left LA to get away from the smog, the noise , the traffic and the pollution. The central coast is the BEST and now with the proposed Rail project we will be starting to look like LA.

520 trains / year and each 1.5 miles long I'm sure will make no noise!!

With all the oil being drained from the rail cars , there will be no pollution!!!

During the 10 month construction , there will no no traffic !!!

When the trains need repairs , there will no no noise!!!

When they work at night with lights on , it will not take away the view of the stars!!! (in LA some people don't even know there are stars)

It seems to me the way it's been done for years with the pipeline has worked just fine, but no , corporate needs more money at many homeowners expense.

Thank you ,

Don Walcott,

1789 Waterview Place , Nipomo Ca.

DRwalcott72@gmail.com



Phillips 66 stop the Nipomo Mesa Rail Terminal

Stanley Fisher to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Cc: newsroom

I hope you will take the time to read the points below and those who we elect stand up for the people in South SLO County who's health and welfare is on the firing line as we speak. Please don't leave it to the State or Federal Government as a cop-out for not voting NOW to reject any expansion at the Phillips 66 refinery in Nipomo CA. We need your support and votes to reject the Phillips 66 rail spur project and any production expansion at this plant. The plant is old, the underground pipe to Rodeo Phillips 66 plant is old and no approval permits to expand production in Rodeo have surfaced in an EIR.

Thank you

Stanley Fisher

1948 Eucalyptus Road

Nipomo, CA 93444

1) An immediate ban on the transport of crude oil in dangerous DOT-111 rail cars. The proposal gives the oil and rail industry as long as seven years to take volatile tanker cars off the tracks. In 1991 federal rail safety officials first declared these tanker cars unsafe to carry crude oil because they too easily derail, spill, and catch fire. Seven years is far too long to wait to remove rail cars that have been called the Ford Pinto of the rails. That's why we're suing the [Obama administration](#) to take those cars off the rails right now.

2) Provide an accurate assessment of the risks and consequences of crude oil accidents in highly populated areas and to critical drinking water supplies. The administration used accounting tricks to reduce their estimate of the likelihood and severity of "high consequence accidents" and the potential costs, in lives and dollars, of an oil train derailment, spill, or fire. The oil and rail industries need to treat oil trains as the dangerous threat to public safety, drinking water, and wildlife that they are.

3) Eliminate exemptions so that all volatile crude oil moving on trains is subject to safety rules. The administration ignores safety completely when it comes to shorter trains and some train operators. A single tanker car carries 30,000 gallons of explosive crude oil. That's way more than most US fire departments can fight, and it's far more than enough toxic crude oil to permanently damage rivers, wild areas, and drinking water supplies. There's no reason why every train carrying crude oil shouldn't be held to the highest safety standards.

4) New 30 mile per hour speed limits for all hazardous crude oil transport through populous areas. Turns out the slower you go, the fewer accidents you have. Nearly every city and town in America has an oil train route right through the heart of it. Same goes for our most important rivers and [national parks](#). The US rail system was built to carry people and products between population centers, not to transport hazardous crude oil. Yet the oil and rail industry believe that the same speed limits for passengers and grain should apply to the heaviest, most dangerous trains on the rails. They are wrong.

5) Protect Americans who already face the biggest threats from industrial accidents and pollution. The administration's proposed rules ignore environmental justice. Executive Order 12898 requires the federal government to write safety standards that protect communities of color who already face a larger threat from industrial pollution and accidents. ForestEthics evaluated our [Blast Zone](#) data and found that more than 16 million—or 60 percent of the 25 million Americans in the evacuation zone—are communities of color. The threat here isn't just catastrophic fires. Our partners at the National Resources Defense Council estimate that as much as three percent of crude oil in a tank car leaks out into the air as these trains roll down the track. That's as much as 900 gallons of toxic air pollution per car. Now multiply that by a single unit train 100 cars long and we're talking about people breathing a massive amount of cancer-causing, asthma-inducing and carbon-polluting poisons along oil train routes.

The elected Federal establishment, State of CA legislators and the SLO Board of Supervisors are asleep at the switch. The oil industry has turned to America's railroads to move explosive, toxic North Dakota Bakken and Alberta tar sands crude oil. We're talking about millions and millions of barrels moving each day on US tracks, through our cities and by our homes and schools, on a rail system that was designed in the 19th century to move people and freight across America. The oil industry is turning US rail lines into hazardous crude oil corridors and the Obama administration's anemic response, and weak regulations leave far too many Americans in peril.

The good news is that communities across the US are speaking up for stronger controls and better safety. There's a growing network of community groups rising up to oppose these dangerous oil trains. They are demanding answers from their public officials, holding decision-makers accountable, and refusing to back down. ForestEthics and partners helped more than 150,000 Americans [submit comments](#) criticizing the government's proposed new standards. We are working with communities across the country and demanding that the oil and rail industries, and the federal government, put public safety first. Every level of government administration needs to get serious about protecting 25 million Americans, and there's no doubt that many of those Americans and the millions more who live downwind and downstream of an oil train route, are watching closely.

Two comments on a blog that have merit and should be discussed by the SLO BOS.

A resident of Crockett, CA, a town next to the Rodeo Phillips 66 Refinery. The Rodeo refinery is the recipient of the semi-processed crude piped from the Mesa refinery. They have a proposed "Propane Recovery Project" and EIR here that doesn't mention your project, as your's doesn't mention ours. They are, however, inexorably linked. By not disclosing the impacts your project has on us (with it's higher quantity of dirty crude), Phillips 66 is violating the intent of the EIR process in both instances, and breaking the law. It is called "piece-mealing" in the trade. The true nature of these projects needs to be revealed and either fully mitigated or stopped. Please see <http://www.crgna.org>

Let's stop this project before another disaster... San Luis Obispo County has a history of limited oil production and severe

oil-related disasters: the Tank Farm fire and the Guadalupe Dunes and Avila Beach spills represent, “three of the largest on-shore spills in North America.” Furthermore, according to the 1998 report by the US Department of the Interior analyzing the economic impact of oil industry activity in SLO County, “the region would have been equally as well off economically had there been no such activity.”

S



P66 Rail Terminal Project

Gary Nemetz to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to Gary Nemetz

History: This message has been forwarded.

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

We have spent some amount of time reviewing the REIR for the proposed reinvention of the Phillips refinery located in SLO County. In particular we have reviewed Class I Impacts (Impacts that may not be fully mitigated to less than significant levels).

We were horrified to learn that any of the following occurrences will have a residual impact that is "Significant and Unavoidable".

* Adverse effects on agricultural land in the event of a spill including air-soil-water contamination and fire risk.

* Refinery operations would generate pollutant emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

* Refinery operations would generate toxic emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds

* Refinery operations would generate GHG

* Oil spills that may damage vegetation and wildlife both at the refinery and along the rail path.

* Oil spills that may disturb or destroy cultural resources along the mainline routes (including persons in proximity to such resources)

The use of emission credits unfortunately does not do anything for those of us being subjected to the increased potentially toxic discharges from the refinery outlined in the REIR. Approval of this project in our mind is completely counter to the image being promoted by SLO County and there is not doubt in our minds that the appeal of this area for residency and tourism will be seriously damaged if construction of the oil car processing facility proceeds. San Luis Obispo is sometimes portrayed as the happiest place in America. Are we really willing to jeopardize this hard earned image for the sake of an Oil Company that is responding to market forces? Is it really our job to assume additional risk and pollution of many types so that the Oil Company can reinvent itself? We do not believe so.

Thank you for considering our input.

Gary & Christi Nemetz

1914 Northwood Rd., Nipomo, CA 93444



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Alyssa Lee to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Alyssa Lee**
<alyssa.dabichi.lee@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to alyssa.dabichi.lee

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alyssa Lee
2113 Bristol
Park Circle
Turlock,
California 95382



Phillips 66 - Rail Terminal Project
kschmeiss to: P66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Murry.

As a Nipomo Mesa resident, I am extremely concerned over the proposed "Phillips 66 refinery Rail Terminal project, which I believe, will have a negative and potentially disastrous impact on the Nipomo Mesa and throughout SLO County. The 520 trains that would traverse the county to and from the refinery each year, would be highly invasive, not to mention the significant pollution they would bring, and the potential of major oil spills. The types of crude oils, likely to be delivered, are highly dangerous, to both the health and safety to all the citizens of the SLO County. The quality of life would drastically be reduced for all of us, and should an accident occur, the life's of students at SLO Polytech and Nipomo, would be particularly endangered.

The County would certainly lose revenues due to a drop in the Real Estate Market and declining business as a result of it.

The "Keystone Pipeline" was voted down, and Senator Barbara Boxer, called the proposed oil "filthy and disgusting." It is my hope that County Officials reject the Phillips proposal as well.

Sincerely,

Reinhard and Karin Schmeiss
1652 Waterview Place
Nipomo, CA 93444



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Abby Peterson to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Abby Peterson**
<awoolperson@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to awoolperson

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Abby Peterson
2519 Ridge Rd
Berkeley ,
California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Victoria Fernandez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Victoria Fernandez**
<v.fernandez201015@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to v.fernandez201015

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Victoria
Fernandez
2519 college ave

CA, California

94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Colin Loustalot to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: Colin Loustalot
<watermillvillage@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to watermillvillage

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Colin Loustalot
17 w pueblo st
santa barbara,
California 93105



p66 Railspur project
dfsweet to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Mr. Murry;

Since the Railspur project was initially proposed, I have made a point of reviewing the EIR and the REIR. My concerns over this project have increased since the REIR has been presented, especially as it relates to the issue of air quality.

Residents of the Mesa are already living in an environment which violates state health standards for particulate matter multiple times per year. Class One Impacts cited in the REIR have increased and proposed mitigation efforts are inadequate and enforcement would be questionable. Until these impacts can be adequately addressed, I strongly urge you to request withdrawal of this plan.

Please understand that my concerns relate to numerous other issues affecting our entire county and the effect on quality of life, safety, and tourism. These are too numerous to elaborate upon in one letter. My hope is that you seriously consider the impact county-wide and again, request withdrawal of this plan.

Sincerely,

Nancy Sweet
1425 Vicki Lane
Nipomo, CA 93444
805 343-6323



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

David Shugar to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: David Shugar
<david.h.shugar@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to david .h.shugar

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Shugar
150 Tehama Ct.
San Bruno,
California 94066



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

amber norori to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **amber norori** <ambenorori@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to ambenorori

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

amber norori
1642 Iron Horse
Circle
Colton,
California 92324



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Karaline Bridgeford to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Karaline Bridgeford**
<karalinerose@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to karalinerose

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karaline
Bridgeford
Berkeley
CA, California
94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Anna Leopold to: p66-railsur-comments

Sent by: **Anna Leopold** <aleopold@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to aleopold

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anna Leopold
1050 N. Mills
#577
Claremont, CA,
California 91711



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jonathan Lake to: p66-railsur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Jonathan Lake**
<Jonathan.lake@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to Jonathan .lake

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jonathan Lake
24333 Little
Valley Road
Hidden Hills,
California 91302



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Miranda Hernandez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Miranda Hernandez**
<mhernandez2852@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to **mhernandez 2852**

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miranda
Hernandez
1984 Leslie
Court
Arcata,

California 95521



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Lauren Hartz to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Lauren Hartz** <lhartz6029@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to lhartz 6029

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Hartz
676 Equador Pl
Davis, California
95616



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Joohi Kasliwal to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Joohi Kasliwal** <joohi@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to joohi

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joohi Kasliwal
1608 Rhode
Island Ave. NW
Washington,
District of
Columbia 20036



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Radha Patel to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Sent by: **Radha Patel**
<candymonster108@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to candymonster 108

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Radha Patel
115 timber hitch
rd
Cary, North
Carolina 27513



Jack Brill to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Mile long trains are disruptive to normal train traffic. They are noisy and dangerous to everyone. I have been in towns such as Paonia Colorado that has a coal mine owned by one of the Koch brothers. There they transport mile long coal trains day and night blasting horns at crossings that are heard for miles. We do not need this kind of nuisance anywhere in this state.

We do not need oil transported in endless oil tank car trains. The environment of our central coast area is really very special. Don't allow greedy oil companies to spoil our beautiful central coast peace and quiet.

Jack Brill



Paula Mathes to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Dear Mr. Wilson:

In this letter, I would like to say a word for two groups that so far have remained silent on the subject of Phillips 66's profit driven plan to use rail traffic to bring more crude into its refinery on Lompoc Mesa.

The first group are those who haven't yet heard of the potential dangers to our health, safety, and lifestyle that this plan poses. I have good reason to think that there are many. People I've spoken to and those spoken to by some of my friends and acquaintances have strongly reinforced my belief that, given more time, the floodgates of dissent would be opened even wider than they are now. Along with the near universal resistance to this project, two other ideas are frequently shared. How has this plan have even gotten off the ground? Given all the dangers that it poses and will bring should it be adopted, the answer should be a resounding "No". Also questioned is the apparent lack of mention of zoning restrictions. After all, Viva Farms tried to exceed its zoning mandate and was stopped. The environmental dangers of the Phillips project greatly surpass those posed by Viva Farms, and they would take place in the Coastal Protection Zone.

The second group that are, at this point unable to express concerns about the proposed project, are those whose health will be adversely effected if this project gains approval. This group includes residents living near the rail lines or downwind from the Phillips 66 plant who would have to move because of compromised breathing caused or worsened by the pollutants that would be put into the air by this proposal. It includes grandchildren who could not visit these areas. It includes those who are more likely to develop asthma as is the case in areas such as Fresno, and it includes those who will suffer cancer or other illnesses because of the above mentioned pollutants. This group cannot yet speak because they have not yet materialized. But, if they do materialize, it will be too late.

Please, these two groups and all the rest of us need you, the decision makers, to protect us and give a resounding "No" to the Phillips 66 proposal.

Thanks,

Paula Mathes



History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Murry, SLO County Planning Department,

We recently moved to the Central Coast community of Trilogy Monarch Dunes. My first connection to the area came when my daughter attended and graduated from Cal Poly in the 1980's. We then had friends move here and we were once again struck by the wonderful lifestyle we could have here. After visiting them for the past 6 years, we became convinced that this was the area we most wanted to live out our retirement years. We drive past the Phillips 66 plant quite often and only then do we realize it is even there. We never see and barely hear the activity of the facility. Although, quite often, we are exposed to smells from the refinery from our home in Monarch Dunes. But it's not so bad that we would want to move, YET.

One of the things I am concerned about is the air quality and greenhouse gases. The smell of the deisel now at times makes several people nauseous. I shutter to think what will we be faced with if this proposal is granted. Their original EIR, recognized only 2 air quality impacts as Class 1. Yet in the REIR (A-4a Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases) recognizes 5 of them. These are impacts that can't be mitigated to less than significant levels. How did they come up with the additional ones in the months they had to revise it? What else are they hiding or using insufficient evidence or facts to plead their case for expansion?

A-4b Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases. If, as Phillips 66 says, there is a "good possibility" they will ship in "Tar Sands" crude oil from Alberta, Canada, the entire project will become unbearable for my community. This heavy crude has a substantially higher concentration of sulfur, copper, nickel, nitrogen, lead and benzene than are found in the conventional crude they are refining now. It goes up in the air and the wind from the West and North West will blow it straight across the Mesa and right over Trilogy Monarch Dunes and the surrounding communities, affecting thousands of people, none of them Phillips 66 decision makers. If they lived in this community, they wouldn't be proposing this expansion.

I believe that Phillips 66 has not been dealing in an honest way. Too many of the things they stated in their original EIR are proving to be misleading at best. I encourage you to not approve this expansion.

Thank you for your consideration,

John Traversaro



EIR Comments

Caroline Hall to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr Murry:

I am very concerned about the proposed Philips 66 spur line for many reasons:

1. There are already significant concerns about the air quality on the Nipomo Mesa. This project would have an additional severe impact, increasing asthma and other respiratory problems among local residents.
2. Nipomo Mesa is intended to be a residential area. The proposed Rail Terminal would lead to visual, light and noise pollution and would remove the buffer zone between residents and the refinery.
3. County emergency services would have to be prepared to respond to a major catastrophe as mile-long trains full of oil would pass through the county daily. This would require significant funding to achieve and maintain the necessary level of readiness.

For all these reasons, I believe that the proposed project will have a detrimental effect in public health and also on our environment and I urge you to turn down thisplannign application.

Thank you,

Rev. Dr. Caroline Hall
Rector, St Benedict's, Los Osos



NO OIL TRAINS!!

dbmjmaj to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

NO TRAINS WITH OIL! EVER!

What does it take for you all to get the message!! We want a safe, clean, earth for our grandchildren and teir grandchildren!



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Pam Tuttle to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Pam Tuttle** <pennielane286@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to pennielane 286

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pam Tuttle
2851 w 232nd st
Torrance,
California 90505



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Grace Lihn to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Grace Lihn** <glihn@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to glihn

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Grace Lihn
2601 Warring St.

Berkeley,
California 94720



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

John Reid to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **John Reid** <jreidsd@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to jreidsd

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Reid
506 Primero
Grove
Davis, California
95616



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Peter Launier to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Sent by: **Peter Launier**
<marianastrenchabr@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to marianastrenchabr

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Peter Launier
30364 Barcelona
Rd
Castaic,
California 91384



Reject crude oil by rail

MARGARET DAWSON to: p66-railspur-comments@co.sl
o.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Please reject the ConocoPhillips crude oil by rail proposal. It is much too dangerous to transport the highly explosive oil on California's outdated and under equipped rail system and would be dangerously polluting to our treasured central coastline.

Please reject the proposal.

Thank you,

Maggie Dawson
17 Toussin Ave
Kentfield, CA 94904

dawson.maggie@gmail.com
www.valleywhitecrane.com

into Autumn dusk
cranes
carry my passion - Hakyo 1913-1969



P66 Railspur

Kerstin Gutierrez to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Please respond to Kerstin Gutierrez

History: This message has been forwarded.

Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO PLANNING DEPARTMENT
DEAR MR. WILSON:

This letter is to convey my deepest concerns regarding the proposed P66 Rail Terminal Project in Nipomo.

Firstly, a 45 day comment period does not provide the public with enough time to adequately and thoughtfully consider what could be significant and multiple impact of this project. Secondly, there appear to be several discrepancies in the REIR (such as how the proposed length of the trains will function given the proposed length and numbers of tracks). Lastly, missing from the REIR entirely, is discussion of the potential for noise disruption by train repairs. (Section 2.3.1 notes that existing track 765 will be repurposed as a "bad order" track, requiring repair before being moved again. Which repairs will be done on-site at Phillips, what time of day or night will they occur, what is the projected level of noise, and the proposed means of "mitigation"?).

Based on information from the REIR, it seems clear that there are several aspects of this project that not only cannot be "mitigated", but that can become increasingly noxious and variously threatening if this project is allowed to go through without substantial oversight and revision by the community representatives we've elected, as well as professionals duly equipped to offer substantive evaluation of the issues.

The major concerns of myself and my community include the negative impact from odors, gases and potential spills on the health and safety of the environment as well as on the human inhabitants of San Luis Obispo county; the potential for aesthetic decline from noise and light pollution (Trilogy residents will definitely see the lights from the project); negative consequence resulting from the inherent lack of safety in the construction of the rail cars proposed; and the lack of coordinated and compatible land use of the proposed site in conjunction with the surrounding areas which are agricultural and residential. (As depicted in the REIR, the KVA (Known viewing Area) appears to indicate that the rail terminal project would not be viewed by current residents and individuals participating in recreational activities in the area. However the photos presented are taken from a location that is at the intersection of Highway 1 and Via Concha, at an elevation which is much lower than that of the current residential community of Trilogy. This apparent misrepresentation seems of the proposed project is cause for additional concern, in that decisions about this project should not be made based on misinformation.)

In addition, with regard to odors and air pollutants, as noted in the REIR on page 7 (section 4.3), ozone is already of concern in the Nipomo region. When the additive effect of increased refinery practices and emissions is considered, it is clear that the Nipomo region will be exposed to even greater health risks. It is imperative that the planning commission consider the lack of compatibility of this project with the residential zoning of the region. Although compatible in the past, when raw material was delivered to the refinery by pipeline, the new project would significantly and negatively impact the economic and environmental status of this region, causing irrevocable damage to individual and public real estate values.

Our air quality should not be forfeited. It should be noted that according to the REIR itself, the number of CLASS I (e.g. impacts that cannot be mitigated to less than significant levels) air quality impacts has been increased to more than double of the previous report. These include criteria pollutant emissions that exceed SLOCAPD thresholds; toxic emissions from the refinery and the activities of trains along the mainline rail route throughout SLOC that would generate toxic emissions that exceed thresholds; and greenhouse gas emissions that would exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.

Furthermore, please carefully scrutinize the claims that such a project would help the local economy by creating more jobs or adding to the revenues of the area. In fact, if one weighs the benefit of adding what is likely to be a mere ten or twelve jobs against the cost of the potential negative impacts, it doesn't make sense. Additionally, our government representatives should be aware that the economic contributions of the SLO community and the dollars brought to the community by the scenic and cultural attractions of the area would be greatly diminished by this project, whether or not an unwanted gas release occurred, or a rail car derailment occurred, or whether the initial flood of crude-oil-laden train cars failed to arouse concern.

Finally, of major concern, is the fact that P66 Railspur REIR fails to adequately address any of the very real and reasonable concerns of the residents of San Luis Obispo county, concerns that have been the basis of mutually agreed upon standards of living, of governing, and of planning.

If our representatives fail to take adequate steps to protect our health, our environment, and our economy, they will have violated the trust of the community as well as of future generations who deserve the same healthful, clean and beautiful surroundings that have brought so much gratification to those of us fortunate enough to live here now.

Please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

K. Kerstin Gutierrez
968 Michele Court
Nipomo, CA 93444

Cc: file

K. Kerstin Gutierrez, Psy.D.
Licensed Clinical Psychologist

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:

This email is intended solely for use of the individual to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or otherwise exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify me by replying to the original sender of this e-mail, or by calling me at (925) 552-5255. Thank you.



Reject Phillips 66 oil trains
ivars1999@yahoo.com to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Mr. Murry Wilson
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department

Dear San Luis Obispo decision-makers,

I am writing to express deep concern about the proposed oil by rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. The Phillips 66 project puts communities throughout California at risk. This project presents significant and unacceptable risks to our communities across California.

First and foremost, emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public. The recirculated draft EIR dangerously misinforms first responders because it does not adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster.

The draft EIR's analysis of potential accidents and spills is flawed because it only evaluates rail accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill release rates between 2005 and 2009, and omits important data about crude rail accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than spilled during the past four decades. The EIR must look at recent data, including accident data from Canada which has also experienced increased crude by rail incidents. This data reflects the increased quantities of dangerous crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars and will provide a more accurate assessment of accident risk and magnitude along the rail lines that would serve this project.

Moreover, the EIR's worst case scenario spill analysis estimates a spill of approximately 180,000 gallons, that's approximately six tank cars of crude. This must be an error because we know that most crude trains are comprised of 100 or more tank cars. Indeed, a worst case scenario spill would be on the order of millions of gallons of crude. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, property and our local economy, and would pose a significant threat to public health and safety. This project cannot be approved without analyzing and mitigating its true impacts.

Second, the toxic air emissions resulting from this problem pose an unacceptable risk to public health. The Phillips 66 project will create unacceptable levels of toxic air emissions that will impact my community. Volatile toxic chemicals leak out of tank cars into the air poisoning communities along rail routes. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution, including toxic sulfur dioxide and cancer-causing chemicals. The report cites increased health risks -- particularly for children and the elderly -- of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease, and premature death.

Third, the EIR must fully analyze the potential worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed rail route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's treasured central coast. Each oil train carries more than three million gallons of explosive, toxic crude oil. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or above a groundwater aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians. During a time of extreme drought, SLO must not approve this project and create contamination risk for the rest of our state.

Fourth, the planning department must examine the Santa Maria and Rodeo

proposals as a single project. it is clear that Phillips 66 wants to bring toxic Canadian tar sands to California. The proposed oil train terminal in Santa Maria is linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo, CA. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify these facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands. Transporting and refining tar sands will create more toxic air and water pollution for families along the rail line and near the Santa Maria refinery. San Luis Obispo cannot approve this project in isolation.

Fifth, Phillips 66 must disclose crude quality information in order for decision makers to fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. Tar sands means more carbon pollution: At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption.

For all the aforementioned reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate.

Sincerely,



To the Attention of Mr. Murry Wilson

SLO County Planning Department

I'm emailing you to express my strong opposition to the Phillips 66 rail terminal expansion project. I am a resident of San Leandro and live on the periphery of the identified blast zone. I am Board Vice-President of the San Leandro Unified School District, and several of our school campuses are within the blast zone through which the oil trains would travel. Therefore, I'm deeply concerned about the potential dangers associated with this entire project. Additionally, bringing tar sands oil to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

Specifically, our emergency responders are not prepared to deal with potential accidents with these heavy, dangerous trains, and the current safety standards won't protect our people and property along the blast zones. My understanding is that the draft EIR doesn't fully inform our first responders because it inadequately assesses the risks of an oil train disaster in San Leandro. The EIR only evaluates rail-accident rates between 2003 and 2012 and the spill rates between 2005 and 2009, while omitting important data about accident frequency and magnitude in more recent years. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

In my role as a Board Trustee in San Leandro Unified School District, I am not prepared, nor is our District Emergency Operations Procedure plan prepared, to address this threat to our school communities. School teachers, as public employees, become state mandated emergency workers when disaster strikes. This proposed project threatens school communities along the entire north to south California rail route planned for these oil shipments.

The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Depending upon where an accident occurred, such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, schools, homes, transit facilities and rail lines, businesses, and our local economy. In Alameda County, this rail route parallels major highways and urban areas in several cities, including (but not limited to) Berkeley, Oakland,

San Lorenzo, and Hayward. In San Leandro, these trains would pass within less than a mile from our City Hall, Police Department, two BART Stations, and the tracks pass through the heart of our downtown.

Also, the toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk anytime, made more severe in this time of extreme drought.

The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

We don't live in a bubble, this proposed project that you are considering in Santa Maria will affect the health and well-being of millions of people along the train routes, as well as the dangers to our school communities, environment, water resources, local economies, and private property.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

With Respect,

Ron Carey

Board Vice-President, Trustee Area 6

San Leandro Unified School District

14735 Juniper St.

San Leandro, CA 94579



Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Expansion Project

Sarah Del Grande to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

To the Attention of Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department

I'm emailing you to express my strong opposition to the Phillips 66 rail terminal expansion project. I am a teacher in San Leandro, and several of our school campuses are within the blast zone through which the oil trains would travel. Therefore, I'm deeply concerned about the potential dangers associated with this entire project. Additionally, bringing tar sands oil to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

Specifically, our emergency responders are not prepared to deal with potential accidents with these heavy, dangerous trains, and the current safety standards won't protect our people and property along the blast zones. My understanding is that the draft EIR doesn't fully inform our first responders because it inadequately assesses the risks of an oil train disaster in San Leandro. The EIR only evaluates rail-accident rates between 2003 and 2012 and the spill rates between 2005 and 2009, while omitting important data about accident frequency and magnitude in more recent years. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

In my role as a public school teacher on a school campus in San Leandro Unified School District, I am not prepared, nor is our District Emergency Operations Procedure plan prepared, to address this threat to our school communities. School teachers, as public employees, become state mandated emergency workers when disaster strikes. This proposed project threatens school communities along the entire north to south California rail route planned for these oil shipments.

The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Depending upon where an accident occurred, such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, schools, homes, transit facilities and rail lines, businesses, and our local economy. In Alameda County, this rail route parallels major highways and urban areas in several cities, including (but not limited to) Berkeley, Oakland, San Lorenzo, and Hayward. In San Leandro, these trains would pass within less than a mile from our City Hall, Police Department, two BART Stations, and the tracks pass through the heart of our downtown.

Also, the toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk anytime, made more severe in this

time of extreme drought.

The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

We don't live in a bubble, this proposed project that you are considering in Santa Maria will affect the health and well-being of millions of people along the train routes, as well as the dangers to our school communities, environment, water resources, local economies, and private property.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

With Respect,
Sarah Del Grande

Sent from my iPad



No on Philips 66

Laura Dyess to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Please respond to Laura Dyess

History: This message has been forwarded.

To whom it may concern,

I am deeply opposed to the Philips 66 proposal to begin receiving trains of extreme oil to their refinery in San Luis Obispo.

Our railway system was not designed to transport dangerous, and highly explosive oil through cities. This move would put many communities in jeopardy, such as Antioch, Pittsburg, Bay Point, Martinez, Crockett, Rodeo, San Pablo, Richmond, El Cerrito, Albany, Berkeley, Emeryville, Oakland, San Leandro, Hayward, Union City, Fremont, and thousands more at risk for accidents and spills, threatening our air, water, and health, and contributing to climate disruption.

All that one needs to do is to look at Lac Mégantic, in Quebec, to see the devastating effects that only one accident along this proposed system could cause. Far too many people live in California to take these types of risks with the stability of their environment, their businesses, their lives, and their homes.

The acknowledged "significant air pollution" of this proposed Oil Railway will increase the levels of toxic chemicals in the air, causing respiratory illnesses, heart disease, cancer, and premature death. Not only would this be a crime against the citizens of California, but it would deal a harsh blow to the economic stability of our entire region. A population of sick people cannot function effectively, and our healthy, beautiful coast would run the risk of becoming a diseased population.

I implore you to reject this dangerous and reckless proposal,

As our representatives, you have a duty to protect the health of our communities and our coastline.

Any move towards such a refinery would be endangering the health and safety of our citizens.

Sincerely,

Laura Dyess



The Santa Maria project

Soeun to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

History:

This message has been forwarded.

I'm emailing you to express my strong opposition to the Phillips 66 rail terminal expansion project. I am a resident of San Leandro and live on the periphery of the identified blast zone. I am a teacher in San Leandro, and several of our school campuses are within the blast zone through which the oil trains would travel. Therefore, I'm deeply concerned about the potential dangers associated with this entire project. Additionally, bringing tar sands oil to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

Specifically, our emergency responders are not prepared to deal with potential accidents with these heavy, dangerous trains, and the current safety standards won't protect our people and property along the blast zones. My understanding is that the draft EIR doesn't fully inform our first responders because it inadequately assesses the risks of an oil train disaster in San Leandro. The EIR only evaluates rail-accident rates between 2003 and 2012 and the spill rates between 2005 and 2009, while omitting important data about accident frequency and magnitude in more recent years. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

In my role as a public school teacher and Teacher In Charge on a school campus in San Leandro Unified School District, I am not prepared, nor is our District Emergency Operations Procedure plan prepared, to address this threat to our school communities. School teachers, as public employees, become state mandated emergency workers when disaster strikes. This proposed project threatens school communities along the entire north to south California rail route planned for these oil shipments.

The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Depending upon where an accident occurred, such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, schools, homes, transit facilities and rail lines, businesses, and our local economy. In Alameda County, this rail route parallels major highways and urban areas in several cities, including (but not limited to) Berkeley, Oakland, San Lorenzo, and Hayward. In San Leandro, these trains would pass within less than a mile from our City Hall, Police Department, two BART Stations, and the tracks pass through the heart of our downtown.

Also, the toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk anytime, made more severe in this time of extreme drought.

The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa

Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

We don't live in a bubble, this proposed project that you are considering in Santa Maria will affect the health and well-being of millions of people along the train routes, as well as the dangers to our school communities, environment, water resources, local economies, and private property.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

With Respect,

Soeun Peterson
San Leandro Teacher

Sent from my iPhone



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jessica Friedman to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Sent by: **Jessica Friedman**
<dlofriedman@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to dlofriedman

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jessica
Friedman
12 baggins end
davis, California
95616



Environmental Impact Report -Phillipa 66 Rail Spur Expansion Project

Jan Owens-Martinez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Please respond to owens -martinez

History: This message has been forwarded.

To: Murray Wilson, County Environmental Coordinator
San Luis Obispo County Dept. of Planning & Building

RE: Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report

**Phillips 66 Company Rail Spur Extension Project
(DRC-2012-00095)**

Dear Mr. Wilson,

As a resident at Cypress Ridge, I have concerns regarding the proposed project because:

- 1) It imposes new sources of potential hazards and hazardous materials to a primarily residential area.
- 2) It will contribute significant new sources of air pollution to an area that is already in non-compliance with Federal and State Air Quality standards.
- 3) It will bring a new use to the Santa Maria Refinery which is inconsistent with residential land uses in adjacent areas.
- 4) Our local first responders are not equipped to respond to a spill/fire/explosion at the refinery. It is my understanding that we have no certified haz mat responders in the area.
- 5) The project will bring new sources of noise to a quiet, rural area that are inconsistent with residential land uses in adjacent areas.

In addition,

-- I have heard that the Cuesta Grade rail system puts San Luis Obispo at high risk as it is not up to handling the increased rail traffic.

--Realtors will be required to disclose the potential drawbacks to having this "in our backyards" which will detract from our property values.

I know we are all busy and I would not take my time to ask you to do this if I did not understand how important it is for everyone to let our county representatives know how we feel. I do not think that this project is what we need in this area.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

--

Jan Owens-Martinez
Cypress Ridge resident
owens-martinez@att.net



Please reject the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Expansion Project

Vince Rosato to: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Cc: Maureen Forney, "hderespini@sanleandro.org"

Please respond to Vince Rosato

From: Vince4schools@yahoo.com
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Subject: Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Expansion Project
Date: Sat, 22 Nov 2014 07:36:08 -0800
To the Attention of Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department

Honorable, Mr. Wilson:

I'm emailing you to express my strong opposition to the Phillips 66 rail terminal expansion project. I am a resident and school board Trustee of San Leandro Unified School District, writing as an individual. I live on the periphery of the identified blast zone. Several of our school campuses are within the blast zone through which the oil trains would travel. As the District's liaison to the City of San Leandro's Disaster Preparedness Council, I am deeply concerned about the potential dangers associated with this entire project. Additionally, bringing tar sands oil through California undermines our State's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

Our emergency responders have only recently been alerted to the potential accidents for these heavy, very long oil trains, and the current safety standards do not yet protect our people and property along the blast zones. My understanding is that the draft EIR doesn't fully inform our first responders because it inadequately assesses the risks of an oil train disaster in San Leandro. The EIR only evaluates rail-accident rates between 2003 and 2012 and the spill rates between 2005 and 2009, while omitting important data about accident frequency and magnitude in more recent years. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in older, and subsequently, not as safe, as newer tanker cars.

In my role as a San Leandro Unified School District Governing Board Trustee, our District Emergency Operations Procedure plan is not yet prepared to address the additional threats to our school communities approval of the Phillips 66 Expansion Project would bring. I hope it never has to because the dirtier tar sands oil ought not be railed through our City. As you may already know, school employees, as public employees, become state mandated emergency workers when disaster strikes. This proposed project threatens school communities along the entire north to south California rail route planned for these oil shipments.

The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Depending upon where an accident occurred, such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, schools, homes, transit facilities and rail lines, businesses, and our local economy. In Alameda County, this rail route parallels major highways and urban areas in several cities, including (but not limited to) Berkeley, Oakland, San Lorenzo, and Hayward. In San Leandro, these trains would pass within less than a mile from our City Hall, Police Department, two BART Stations, and the tracks pass through the heart of our downtown.

Also, air quality reductions occasioned in tandem with transport and possible accidental spills pose another unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir, or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk anytime, made more severe in this time of extended drought.

I urge the planning department to examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

All of us are certainly connected, and this proposed project you are considering in Santa Maria will affect the health and well-being of millions of people along the train routes. It poses the dangers to our school communities, environment, water resources, local economies, and private property.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Expansion Project.

Respectfully yours,

Honorable Vince J. Rosato
Trustee, Clerk, San Leandro Unified School District Governing Board
1542 141st Avenue
San Leandro, CA 94578
510-357-1755



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jeff Mailes to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Jeff Mailes <jeff.mailes@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to jeff .mailes

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeff Mailes
23408 Victory
Blvd.
Woodland Hills,
California 91367



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Daniel Martinez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Sent by: **Daniel Martinez** <mrtallmart@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to mrtallmart

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Daniel Martinez
2527 Ridge Rd
Berkeley, CA,
California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Sofia Airaghi to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Sofia Airaghi** <sairaghi@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to sairaghi

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards

won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa

Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sofia Airaghi
25 Kingston St
San Francisco ,
California 94110



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Andrew Van Meter to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Sent by: **Andrew Van Meter**
<andrewinafunk@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to andrewinafunk

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrew Van Meter
572 E Foothill Blvd. apt. 5
San Luis

Obispo,
California 93405



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Ben Rushakoff to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Sent by: **Ben Rushakoff**
<ben.rushakoff@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to ben.rushakoff

SLO County Planning
Department Murry Wilson,

Hello there,

I am a student at UC Berkeley and I am writing you to express my demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal.

I am sure you've received countless letters about why this is an issue, but I want to say that this puts more than just SLO and community members at risk- it puts all of California and the United States at risk. If we don't stand up against these big and dirty oil industries, we aren't forced to look for alternative solutions to our energy demands. I hope you are familiar with the climate change that we are currently experiencing and the disastrous future that is highly probable. If we continue to dig deep into our planet for these dirty energy sources, our climatic situation will only worsen and become more dangerous than the possibility of an oil by rail accident.

It is time that California, the United States, and the world take a proactive and preventative approach to our

climate situation and this starts at a local level. Stand up for SLO and California when you vote on Monday, and help defeat this proposal. Not only will you be saving your local community from hazardous air quality, and protecting communities across the coast from accidents, but you will be forcing industries to come up with innovative energy solutions.

This starts here, and now. Think of your community, and of future communities that will be affected by this decision and reject this oil by rail.

Your community is under attack from an industry that seeks profit instead of progress. Represent your constituents and your fellow Californians when you reject this proposal, and be proud of that decision.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and I urge you as a member of the County Planning Department to represent your community and be proud of your decision.

Sincerely,

Ben Rushakoff
ben.rushakoff@berkeley.edu
UC Berkeley Class of 2016
B.S. Environmental
Economics and Policy
B.S. Forestry and Natural
Resources

Ben Rushakoff
2527 Ridge Road
Berkeley, California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Harrison Hucks to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Sent by: **Harrison Hucks**
<harrisonhucks@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to harrisonhucks

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current

safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

2. Air quality impacts: The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route

to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

4. Climate impacts: Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Harrison Hucks
2330 Blake
Street
Berkeley,
California 94704



Phillips 66 Environmental Impact Report Concern

Raleigh McLemore to: p66-railsur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Please respond to Raleigh McLemore

History: This message has been forwarded.

11-22-14

To: Mr. Wilson, San Luis Obispo Planning Department

I understand that you have to make a difficult decision on the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Expansion Project. My wife and I are writing this letter as your decision will impact the security and safety of our home and family in Oakland, California.

Should you approve the expansion project our community will see a massive increase in weekly transportation of dangerously explosive materials through Oakland. I am a retired teacher and the tracks that will be used to move the hundreds of tank cars of oil adjacent to many schools Oakland. Our community has struggled to become more prepared for earthquakes, but it is not prepared for the kind of fires and explosions created by massive oil spills. Your decision will make you responsible for this increase in danger to our home and the many schools and families that will be within the blast zone of the tanker car traffic Phillips wants you to approve.

Over the past year, with a huge increase in the volume of oil being transported by rail, we have seen many folks die from tanker car accidents. You are probably well aware of these accidents and I have no doubt that you don't wish these outcomes. Unfortunately you are being asked to take responsibility for approving a rolling "blast zone" that will imperil many far beyond your own boundaries and your responsibilities must include folks beyond your county alone.

I understand the importance of jobs and not over-regulating some industries, but the oil industry and the transportation of their products have given us great reason to pause. Their safety record is intolerable as there is never a reason to take human life for the sole purpose of getting cheap and dirty resources to a refinery. This is exactly what they are asking you to agree to; they want your approval to jeopardize many to make more money. The oil companies are flush with profits and the restriction of their business due to their lack of safety in transportation of their product is not a danger to the jobs I'm sure you want to protect.

There are other things to reflect on before deciding:

The refining of products from Canadian Tar Sands are not only dangerous explosion and fire hazards to the safety of our communities but vastly increase the production of greenhouse gases. This is a real issue to all California communities presently struggling during our drought.

The EIR information given by Phillips 66 is "cooked" designed to minimize the appearance of safety issues in the transportation of the crude product. The most recent year shows a clear and dangerous trend of larger and more life-threatening spills.

The EIR information given by Phillips suggests an example of a six car spill when the most recent experience we have is that many more cars have spilled in derailments. The potential fire and explosion from these tank car trains is far greater than presented in the Phillips EIR.

Phillips is putting your planning commission in a position where you can do great harm or great good to areas that extend throughout California and beyond. By refusing this permit you will substantially have created a safer community for your own citizens and for those, like my wife and I, who live beyond your immediate area of concern.

I walked the main tracks that the Phillips oil would transit yesterday and as I traveled I saw all the schools, homes and businesses that would face the horrifying risk associated with the oil trains Phillips would need if you approve their permit. The potential blast created by these trains is not worth the incremental increase in immense profits gathered by the oil companies, Phillips included. This permit creates a very real risk and I'm sure you would not want the responsibility of trying to explain to folks in Oakland why you allowed this transport should a catastrophe occur.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Raleigh McLemore and Beth Kean, 4436 Fleming Ave, Oakland, CA 94619
raleighmclemore@yahoo.com



Oil EIR Comment.docx



Davis residents comment letter for P 66 Rail Spur Extension Project

Lynne Nittler to: P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

11/25/2014 10:07 AM

Please respond to Lynne Nittler

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I am resubmitting the the letter I sent early November 24th signed by 68 Davis residents. When I returned to my computer later in the day but before the 4:00 deadline, I discovered another ten residents wishing to add their names to the letter. I have added that additional sheet of signatures, making the total 78 signatures.

If appropriate, I request that you use this updated file. Thank you for all your efforts to make this process of gathering comments effective.

Sincerely,

Lynne Nittler

Inittler@sbcglobal.net



530-756-8110

final Davis comment ltr for P66 11.24.14.docx



Cool Davis comment ltr . resubmitted on letterhead
Lynne Nittler to: P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Please respond to Lynne Nittler

11/25/2014 09:55 AM

History: This message has been forwarded.

Dear Mr. Wilson,
Yesterday I submitted the Cool Davis comment letter for the P66 Rail Spur Extension Project by email. This is the same letter but on our letterhead. I would appreciate it if you could substitute this file. If not, no harm done.

Thank you for your effort to keep track of the comments .

Respectfully,
Lynne Nittler
Secretary of Cool Davis



Inittler@sbcglobal.net

Cool Davis SLO REIR letter 11.24.14 letterhead.docx