

From: Dave Hart <[davehart@dcn.davis.ca.us](mailto:davehart@dcn.davis.ca.us)>  
To: Phillips 66 Oil By Rail Project  
<[P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)>  
Date: 11/23/2014 10:26 PM  
Subject: Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project

Please see my attached letter regarding the Phillips 66 project. Also, I understand there is another, separate project that would run oil via rail north because the Santa Maria facility is only providing part of the refining necessary. If that is the case, it is really a single, much larger, project under the guise of a separate one and that would betray a very underhanded and deceitful approach. That in itself should be a reason to reject this project. Thanks for taking my comments.

HAD-01

--

Dave Hart, Davis, CA 95618(See attached file: SLO Board of Supv. Letter on Oil Trains.docx)

November 23, 2014

Murry Wilson  
SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building  
976, Osos Street, Room 200  
San Luis Obispo, 93408  
[P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)

Dear Mr. Murry Wilson,

Thank you for adding my comments to the public record on the Phillips 66 Railspur Project.

My name is Dave Hart. I am a 37-year resident of Davis, California, and the proposed 80-car crude-oil train headed to the Santa Maria refinery 5 days a week will travel through Davis. I am concerned about this project for a number of reasons.

HAD-02

First, I am most immediately concerned with the very poor record of rail safety as outlined by the California Public Utilities Commission as reported for the latest year on their public website <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/PUC/safety/Rail/Railroad/railroadsafety.htm>. The record indicates that the rail industry is dangerous to begin with without the addition of dangerous oil payloads as measured by derailments large and small and as measured by injuries to rail workers and the public. Adding the element of 80 to 100-car trains carrying volatile and flammable materials seems like folly.

HAD-03

The CPUC as I am sure you are also aware has identified several particularly hazardous stretches of rail (Local Safety Hazards) in California as a result of the catastrophic derailment near Dunsmuir in 1993. One of these appears to be in the vicinity of the city of San Luis Obispo near or surround the campus there. This stretch of rail would be used for shipments coming from the north through my city of Davis. I don't want to think that either you or our area sat on our hands and didn't do everything we could do to stop this if an accident were ever to occur.

HAD-04

Beyond the basic issue of rail safety is the need for additional oil refinery capacity and facilities when balanced against the tangible negative impacts that include:

- The cumulative effects of the train itself. We here in Davis are looking at two 80 to 100-car trains a day if the Benicia Valero project moves forward. That is a lot of air pollution and railroad rights of way are notoriously polluted. The source of this oil is tar sands extraction and that is an entirely new and unacceptable technology that is damaging to the environment on a stand-alone basis regardless of climate change issues.
- At some point, someone somewhere will have to be the first to say "We are not going to be part of adding more carbon into the atmosphere. If that means more expensive fuel, then so be it. But, collectively, we cannot continue to act as if there is no cost to the climate. The time to say "NO" has arrived and I hope you can be clear about the wisdom of that.
- On top of that, this oil is destined for export and doesn't even meet the needs of California or U.S. residents. Why, I ask, would we subject ourselves to this level and type of risk when literally nobody in our localities benefits from this? The few refinery

HAD-05

jobs are not enough to justify the damage to the environment of the high sulfur tar sands oil or the impact of a large rail accident like that in Quebec last year.

HAD-05  
cont

I understand there will be some marginal increase in the number of well-paying jobs and those kinds of jobs often appear on the surface to be great for the economy. However, I am skeptical that the increased revenue to the local economy from those jobs is capable of offsetting the costs that could result from even relatively small accident or releases of toxic fumes (as happened in Richmond a couple years ago) let alone a large accident. Any such analysis is deceitful if it does not include a full assessment of liability and all the financial and social costs of all accidents, large and small that are part and parcel of running this type of industry.

HAD-06

**In summary:** I am looking to the county of San Luis Obispo and the various municipalities along the rail lines that lead to facilities owned by Phillips 66 and Valero to start drawing the line on moving away from an oil-based future. Stopping this specific project I believe will position your community and others that are the target of these projects in a way that draw the line on what is acceptable industrial activity not just for oil but possibly others as well. The natural beauty of your county will always make it a desirable place for businesses to operate. You already have the kind of leverage to create good jobs AND protect the citizens.

HAD-07

Thank you for your attention to this important matter,

Sincerely,

Dave Hart  
3010 Bryant Place  
Davis, CA 95618