

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/03/2014 08:02 AM
Subject: PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL PROJECT

Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Wilson,

No intelligent person could expect us to take, at face value, the results of the noise testing (see Noise Modeling Appendix at D.1-2 through D.1.5) that Phillips hired its consultants to perform as being representative of the extent of the NOISE that we will be subjected to if this project goes forward.

The train noise measurement test was a single test, carried out during the day, lasting less than 30 minutes, and with significantly fewer rail cars than would be moving about the spur if this project came to fruition. I respectfully suggest that this test be given little, if any weight, in trying to determine the real world noise levels we would actually be subjected to. At the very least, much more extensive noise testing should be mandated in order to determine the true noise and vibrational impact of this project.

Furthermore, according to the REIR, section 4.9 Noise and Vibration (particularly 4.9-24), Phillips 66 admits "UNCERTAINTIES" in its noise test...

"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 CONDITIONS ARE RIGHT. In addition, characterizing noise sources is challenging, as there are a number of 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 OCTAVE BAND ANALYSIS OF DIFFERENT LOCOMOTIVE ARRANGEMENTS, for example, that bring in a range of POTENTIAL ERRORS into the analysis" (all emphases mine).

The REIR leaves many details of the "Rail Unloading and Management Plan (see "Mitigation Measures" N-2a at page 4.9-26) to be developed in the future...therefore, we have no reasonable way of knowing or assessing what mitigation measures Phillips 66 would actually take to alleviate exceedances of noise thresholds at noise-sensitive receptors which exceedances are recognized as a "POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT" (see 4.9-25 of REIR).

This project should be DISAPPROVED.

Sincerely,

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, Ca 93444

MCG-01

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/12/2014 10:54 AM
Subject: Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Wilson,

The REIR at page C.4-10 acknowledges that the Monarch Butterfly is considered a "sensitive species" in the CNDDDB.

However, the REIR is silent as to what impact this project would have on the wintering butterfly roost sites that are acknowledged to be less than 1 mile from the Site.

It is unreasonable to assume that these roost sites would not be negatively impacted by the project without having first done a proper study.

This Project should be disapproved.

Sincerely,

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, CA 93444

MCG-02

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us, "bcc: Jim Irving"
<jim@jimirving.com>, ktopping@calpoly.edu, Eric Meyer
<frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us,
rhedges@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us, bgibson@co.slo.ca.us,
ahill@co.slo.ca.us, darnold@co.slo.ca.us, fmecham@co.slo.ca.us,
boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us, Linda Reynolds
<lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/12/2014 11:32 AM
Subject: PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL PROJECT

Dear Mr. Wilson,

Considering the poor air quality in general on the Nipomo Mesa, it stretches credulity to believe, as Phillips 66 would have us do, that this project would not make the Mesa air even worse, (see generally section 4.3 of the REIR).

Vote NO on this project.

Sincerely,

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, Ca 93444

MCG-03

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/12/2014 01:23 PM
Subject: PHILLIPS 66 RAIL SPUR PROJECT- CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Dear Mr. Murry,

No where under the section titled "3.2 Cumulative Projects List" is there mentioned the Phillips 66 Rodeo facility and for that reason this REIR could be considered incomplete. Failing to even consider what impact, if any, changes in the way Rodeo operates now or in the future is troublesome.

Phillips' Santa Maria Refinery and its Rodeo Refinery are inextricably connected and the fact that the Rodeo Facility is not mentioned in this section could be viewed as an attempt to "piecemeal" this project. The cumulative impacts from these two projects should have, at the very least, been addressed.

This project should be DISAPPROVED.

Sincerely,

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, Ca 93444

MCG-04

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us, "bcc: Jim Irving" <jim@jimirving.com>, ktopping@calpoly.edu, Eric Meyer <frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us, rhedges@co.slo.ca.us, cray@co.slo.ca.us, bgibson@co.slo.ca.us, ahill@co.slo.ca.us, darnold@co.slo.ca.us, fmecham@co.slo.ca.us, boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us, Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/13/2014 8:15 AM
Subject: PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL PROJECT

(NOTE: This email was previously sent without the proper subject line)

Dear Mr. Wilson,

The REIR at page C.4-10 acknowledges that the Monarch Butterfly is considered a "sensitive species" in the CNDDDB.

However, the REIR is silent as to what impact this project would have on the wintering butterfly roost sites that are acknowledged to be less than 1 mile from the Site.

It is unreasonable to assume that these roost sites would not be negatively impacted by the project without having first done a proper study.

This Project should be disapproved.

Sincerely,

Gary McKible
1007 Maggie Lane
Nipomo, CA 93444

MCG-05

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>, Murry Wilson
<mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/23/2014 02:15 PM
Subject: Mr. Wilson - Official Responses From The Mesa Refinery Watch
Group- VERSION #2

Dear Mr. Wilson:

As you know, the Mesa Refinery Watch Group represents more than 500 SLO County citizens.

On November 20, 2014, we emailed our "Official Response From The Mesa Refinery Watch Group" to your office and you have acknowledged the receipt of same. We have also hand-delivered our Response document to your office.

The attached PDF contains our official responses to the Phillips 66 Rail Spur REIR that was issued in October, 2014, with a revision to page 70, only.

I will hand-deliver the revised page 70 to your office on Monday, November 24, 2014.

KINDLY REPLY TO THIS EMAIL ACKNOWLEDGING RECEIPT OF OUR REVISED DOCUMENT.

Respectfully,
For The Mesa Refinery Watch Group
Gary McKible

• Linda Reynolds (Chairperson): lreynolds151@gmail.com • Martin Akel: akelassoc@earthlink.net • John Anderson: johnanderson33@hotmail.com • Kevin Beauchamp: Kevin.Beauchamp@kw.co • Lee Edmonson: edmondson60@gmail.com • Gary McKible: gary@mckible.com • Mike Nelson: miken0105@gmail.com • Tom Ryan: whitneyhiker888@yahoo.com • Sam Saltoun: ssaltoun@verizon.net • Laurance Shinderman: lshinderman@sbcglobal.net (See attached file: _Response_ Submitted To Murry Wilson v2.pdf)

See Mesa Refinery Watch Group Comment Letter under Organizations and Schools

MCG-06

From: Gary McKible <gary@mckible.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/25/2014 11:08 AM
Subject: LETTER IN OPPOSITION TO THE PHILLIPS 66 RAIL TERMINAL PROJECT

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

MCG-07