



**Nancy  
Kitz**

1046 55th Street  
Sacramento, CA 95819

916 440 6450

[nancy.kitz@comcast.net](mailto:nancy.kitz@comcast.net)

**November 24, 2014**

Murry Wilson  
Environmental Specialist  
Department of Planning and Building  
976 Osos Street, Room 300  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408-2040

**Re: Public comment on Phillips 66 Rail Project**

I live north of the proposed Phillips rail project and the 80-car trains that will come right through The City of Sacramento, our downtown, close to schools, residences, and businesses on a daily basis. This would be in addition to the hundreds of other rail cars currently using the area's rail lines on a daily basis.

The EIR states: "Trains could arrive at the Phillips 66 site from the north or the south. The feedstock would be sourced from oilfields throughout North America based on market economics and other factors. The most likely sources would be the Bakken field in North Dakota or Canada."

I do not believe that the EIR has properly reviewed the potential impacts on up-rail communities and am very concerned about the impact of an increased number of trains rumbling and screeching through my community every day, especially train cars carrying crude oil.

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines require that the environmental analysis for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must evaluate impacts associated with a project and identify mitigation measures for any potentially significant impacts. This includes regional plans such as, applicable air quality attainment or maintenance plan or State Implementation Plan, area-wide waste treatment and water quality control plans, regional transportation plans, regional housing allocation plans, regional blueprint plans, plans for the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, habitat conservation plans, natural community conservation plans and regional land use plans for the protection of the Coastal Zone, Lake Tahoe Basin, San

KIN-01

Francisco Bay, and Santa Monica Mountains (CEQA Guidelines Section 15125[d]).

According to the California Energy Commission, we can expect CA to import as much as 25% of its crude oil by rail within the next few years, translating into five or six trains per day passing through my community. Bencia, Bakersfield and Kern County have recently approved, or are considering the approval, of similar projects. This may mean dozens of trains moving oil through Sacramento in the near future. Given the cumulative impact of such increased crude-by-rail traffic, up-rail communities have much at risk and deserve a voice in the environmental review process.

KIN-01  
cont

Here are my concerns.

**THE EIR FAILS TO DISCUSS, MUCH LESS MITIGATE, THE FOLLOWING:**

1. Potential regional impacts on public safety, noise, air quality, energy conservation, transportation and greenhouse gas emissions, to name a few.

KIN-02

2. There are no Federal Safety Regulations governing Phillips 66 crude by-rail scheme.

KIN-03

3. Tar sands will be more energy intensive to refine and, moreover, due to the chemicals added to get the tar sands to flow into a rail car, the resultant thick bitumen has a high sulfur content and will be more dangerous to workers and, if transported, pose a higher danger to the environment.

KIN-04

4. The impact on climate change. The EIR has avoided discussing the ultimate danger caused by extracting crude from the ground and, with the assistance of chemicals, transporting it through communities and sensitive habitats all across the country.

KIN-05

Please forward my comments to the Commissioners and incorporate them as part of review of its DEIR.

Thank you,

Nancy Kitz