From: k anderson <karenanderson33@hotmail.com>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/18/2014 07:43 AM
Subject: Opposition to P66 Rail Terminal Project

Dear Mr. Wilson
Under Section 5.0, Alternatives, of the REIR, it discusses a No Project Alternative wherein:

> The Santa Maria Refinery would continue to receive crude oil from the existing pipeline network from the Santa Maria Pump Station located in Santa Maria, Santa Barbara County. This additional oil would most probably arrive from Bakersfield as is already occurring. Additional deliveries are already approved by Santa Barbara County.
> The REIR states that all potential impacts using this alternative would be lower due to less train traffic. There would be no additional impacts at the SMR.

ANK-01

> The R E I R states if the County is preempted from requiring mitigation of the impacts on the UPRR mainline track and locomotives (and safer rail cars) (a definite probability), then "the No Project Alternative would be environmentally superior since it would eliminate a Class I air impact… and reduce the severity of five other Class I impacts. (Page 5-49, paragraph 3 of the R E I R).
> It further states that The No Project Alternative would meet most of the basic objectives of the Rail Spur Project. (Page 5-49, paragraphs 3 and 6 of the R E I R).
> That's what the Environmental Impact Statement says!

"The No Project Alternative would meet most of the basic objectives of the Rail Spur Project."

Karen Anderson
Nipomo, CA

From: Karen Anderson <karenanderson33@me.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/19/2014 07:34 AM
Subject: Opposition to the P66 Rail Terminal Project

Dear Mr. Wilson,

With respect to Section A-7a. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, of the REIR, the following comments are provided:

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 And they're attempting to calm citizens' fears about rail accidents by citing outdated, historical statistics.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.

ANK-02

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.

Therefore, I am opposed to the P66 Rail Terminal Project as the risk of a detrimental impact to SLO County, and other counties along the rail, will be significantly increased.

Sincerely,
K. N. Anderson
Nipomo, CA