

From: Lynne Nittler <lnittler@sbcglobal.net>
To: "P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/24/2014 11:12 AM
Subject: comment letter for Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project

Dear Mr. Wilson,
Please add the attached letter to the comments for the Phillips 66 Rail Spur
Extension Project in San Luis Obispo.
Thank you,

Lynne Nittler
lnittler@sbcglobal.net
530-756-8110(See attached file: Lynne's letter.docx)

November 24, 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

Dear Mr. Murry Wilson,

Please add my comments to the public record on the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

I am a 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. After reading the summary and a number of sections of the RDEIR, I am concerned with the project for a number of reasons.

NIL-01

High Hazard Rails

All three routes into CA from the north end of the state have sections marked “High Hazard” for rail on the map provided by the Office of Spill Prevention and Response, under the governor’s Office of Emergency Services. The map can be found here: <http://bit.ly/OBR-page>

NIL-02

It particularly concerns me to have oil trains carrying tars sands, which can be explosive depending on the diluents added to make it liquid enough to transport, speeding along on rails already designated as high risk. A major derailment accident on the route south from Oregon near Dunsmuir in 1991 killed 37 miles of the Sacramento River in one spot marked as high hazard rail, and recovery took many years. The Sacramento is a major source of water for agriculture and municipal use, and we simply cannot afford to put it at risk. If any tar sands spills happen over water, the diluents separate out and the heavy bitumen sinks to the bottom within hours if not minutes where it is nearly impossible to remove. We know this from the recent studies on the Kalamazoo River which after 4 years of remediation from a tar sands spill and nearly a billion dollars is still lined with tar sands bitumen and lifeless.

NIL-03

The Downside of Tar Sands

Increasing the shipments of Canadian tar sands into our state also concerns me. I understand your refinery has always refined the heavy crude from southern California, and tar sands is similar and inexpensive right now. But it is the dirtiest crude on the planet, and from every angle I look, the extreme crude is unwelcome in California.

First, its extraction requires huge amount of energy, making its extraction questionable to begin with. There are serious and proven claims of infringement on indigenous people’s rights and more importantly on their health as unusual cancer rates upstream (that’s how the rivers flow there) are rising where people must eat the fish as their only source of food.

NIL-04

Second, transporting the crude to refineries comes at a huge price to the safety and health of all the communities the trains pass through all over Canada and the U.S. Your refinery is by no

NIL-05

means the only one clamoring for access to deliveries of the cheap, extreme, land-locked crude. In California we have embarked on a path toward renewable energy which is clean energy. With conservation alone Californians have dropped our consumption in the last year from 700 million barrels of oil to 600 million barrels of oil, according to California Energy Commission figures. We are on a different path than one that expands the refining of the highest carbon crude oil

NIL-05
cont

Third, the refining of tar sands causes more problems. I understand that at the Santa Maria refinery, only certain products will be produced, and sulfur dioxide and some of the other toxic chemicals typically resulting during the processing will not be released as a result. How fortunate for the community! Still, I am concerned that some of the tar sands brought in by rail might be sent to the Phillips 66 refinery in the Bay Area and refined for other products there, where the worse air pollutants could be released. I have not been able to find out the truth of this.

NIL-06

However, the EIR does admit the byproduct “petcoke” will be produced. It is already causing problems as it is stored in open piles (I read if covered it can catch fire), and now there will be more of it piling up before it can be sent off to Asia. In the U.S. this by-product is considered too dirty to burn; it’s more polluting than coal. However, in Asia, they are allowed to burn it and all those greenhouse gases go up into the atmosphere we share. I have read that they have even tracked some of the smog in Los Angeles to burning petcoke in China.

NIL-07

So from extraction to transportation to refining to burning, tar sands is bad news. Does California want tar sands in its energy portfolio? Does the Board of Supervisors for San Luis Obispo want to be responsible to its community, to the people of California and to the people of the planet for helping promote this carbon-intensive cycle that causes harm to us and our planet at every step, especially when there is a clean energy option?

NIL-08

Disruption of Public Transportation and Freight

On another topic, I notice the EIR took care to analyze the impact of the Phillips 66 trains on the Capitol Corridor traffic flow, and they concluded that it would be minimal. That analysis may be accurate from Benicia south, but there is a cumulative impact from multiple trains to be considered from Roseville to Benicia.

NIL-09

From Davis to Benicia, we are looking at potentially three trains a day loaded with crude oil. The Valero project wants two 50-car trains per day with Bakken Crude and Phillips 66 wants one 80-car train five days/week with tar sands crude. Each of these three trains will make a return trip, so six trains per day. Six additional long trains on the tracks are enough to affect the scheduling of other trains.

NIL-10

From Roseville to Sacramento, the number escalates. Bakersfield has just approved two daily 100-car trains that will travel from Roseville to Sacramento to Stockton and down the valley beginning in 2015. Already Roseville-Sacramento-Stockton has two trains per week going to

NIL-11

Kinder-Morgan terminal in Richmond for transfer to trucks that take the Bakken crude to the refinery in Martinez. If the projects in Benicia and San Luis Obispo are approved, Roseville and Sacramento will have six daily 100-car trains loaded with crude oil, and six returning empty trains. Twelve trains per day can certainly affect their public transit and freight. While there may be extra tracks in the Bay Area, the EIR does not analyze whether there are extra sets of track between Roseville and Benicia and between Roseville and Stockton to ease the congestion of the extra trains. We have worked hard to build public transportation and need to be sure it is not disrupted as has happened all across the country as oil trains take precedence.

NIL-12

Air Quality – Class I Air Pollution

Our region is working hard to bring its air quality into compliance, and the introduction of more pollutants from possibly six new daily trains is not good news. Even just the two new trains from Phillips 66 create Class I Air Pollution for us, so the cumulative impact of six trains will be greater. I am encouraged to learn that new standards for train engines will be in our favor in the coming years. I want to commend your EIR team for being honest and thorough in examining this issue which is of such concern to all the uprail and downrail communities, and offering a mitigation that would help if federal preemption is not in the way!

NIL-13

Please consider your other options carefully in terms of uprail impacts as well as your own region. Every action has ramifications for our whole state and all the many communities and sensitive areas within it. Air quality is one of those overriding issues.

Liability Coverage

I'm sure you are aware that our state legislature enacted SB861 in June which requires railroads and refineries to produce proof of sufficient liability for accidents and spills, which sounds reasonable. Any other business must provide liability coverage for their business. The minute Governor signed the bill into law, UPRR and BNSF sued the state of California and the attorney general and the Office of Spill Prevention and Response. I urge you to be cautious in this arena, taking what happened in the aftermath of Lac Megantic to heart. After the accident there, the railroad went bankrupt, and the government is left to reimburse those affected, which is still not complete. That means the public had to pay for the accident! How would you feel if there were a spill into one of our rivers or an accident in one of our towns or cities, and aside from the damage and injuries, the railroad walked away from covering the costs?

NIL-14

Thank you for reading my comments. I appreciate the opportunity to voice my concerns.

Lynne Nittler

Resident of Davis, CA

lnittler@sbcglobal.net

530-756-8110

From: Lynne Nittler <lnittler@sbcglobal.net>
To: "P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>, "mwilson@co.slo.ca.us"
<mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/24/2014 01:28 AM
Subject: comment letter for P66 Rail Spur Extension Project

Dear Mr. Wilson,
Please open the attachment to find a comment letter from 68 residents of Davis addressing seven concerns. Thank you for allowing us to comment on the RDEIR for the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project for the Santa Maria Refinery.

Sincerely,
Lynne Nittler
lnittler@sbcglobal.net(See attached file: final Davis comment ltr for P66 11.24.14.docx)

November 24, 2014

Murry Wilson
SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building
San Luis Obispo, 93408
P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

Note letter contains 68
signatures attached.

Dear Mr. Murry Wilson,

Thank you for adding our comments to the public record on the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

We are uprail residents 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. We are concerned for a number of reasons.

First is the cumulative impact of more trains. For Davis, the SLO rail spur means a second daily train moving through our community if both this and the Valero Crude-by-rail project are approved. For Sacramento, it's the 5th train! This shift to crude-by-rail transport has to be taken into account from the borders of CA all the way to the refineries. We all live with the threat of more trains as California expects 25% of its crude to arrive by rail according to the CA Energy Commission projection. As the number and frequency of trains increases, the significant impacts multiply. No individual project stands alone.

NIL-15

Second, the map prepared by the Office of Spill Prevention and Response reveals serious dangers for our state. All three northern routes bring the oil trains over identified "**High Hazard Rail**" sections of track. These include coming south through Dunsmuir (the site of a terrible spill in 1991 that killed life in the Sacramento River for 35 miles), through the Feather River Canyon with long stretches of rail on high wooden trestles, and over the treacherous Donner Pass and just above Colfax. In addition, California has many **untrustworthy and old bridges** such as the Carquinas Bridge at Benicia, not built to carry 100 heavy tank cars regularly or ever. While the bridges were just recently scheduled to receive minimal safety inspections for the first time, there are no funds to repair or rebuild them. The map can be found at <http://bit.ly/OBR-page> .

NIL-16

Third, the same OSPR map reveals **Earthquake faults** that run just south of Davis along the rail stretch to Benicia, and along capitol corridor all the way to San Luis Obispo. Seismic instability is a reason to avoid oil train deliveries entirely in the region.

NIL-17

Fourth, tar sands is the dirtiest of crude oils, and the decision to import it for refining should be made at the state level, not by any single industry or refinery. Spills threaten to pollute our waterways and often cannot be cleaned up as the heavy bitumen sinks rapidly to the bottom. The refining process emits sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals which can cause serious health problems. The refining process also produces the by-product petcoke which is too toxic to be burned in the U.S., but it can be sold for burning in Asia. Tar sands produces more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional crude which exacerbates climate change.

NIL-18

Fifth, oil trains themselves **create Class I toxic air pollution** every mile they travel in California, including criteria pollutant emissions (**AQ.3**), toxic emissions (**AQ.5**) and GHG emissions (**AQ.6**) that exceed thresholds in many air quality management districts. This increase in air pollution is unacceptable, especially when it is likely the railroads will claim federal preemption to negate the possibility of any mitigations such as requiring more efficient train engines.

NIL-19

Sixth, Phillips 66, and UP and BNSF railroads have not offered proof of **sufficient liability** to cover a worst case scenario of accident or spill, or indeed, any scenario despite California's SB 861 enacted in June calling for safety measures and assurance of such liability. It should not rest on the communities, individuals, or government to bear the burden of paying for catastrophic accidents or spills.

NIL-20

Seventh, states across the country are experiencing **major disruptions to Amtrak and freight movement** as railroads are favoring crude oil transport over apples in Washington, grain in the Midwest, and people on Amtrak. We can't afford the disruption of services in California. That's food wasted when in Yolo County one in six people is experiencing food insecurity, and the livelihood of farmers is sacrificed for the profit of oil companies, railroads and refineries. The SLO supervisors have the power to keep Capitol Corridor running smoothly and on time.

NIL-21

Based on these seven serious concerns among others, we recommend that the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

Thank you for allowing us to make comments.

Sincerely,

The various residents of Davis whose names and emails are attached (Scroll down 7 pages for 68 signatures.)

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Dorothy Callison	dorothyandpaulca@gmail.com	yes
Sonya Grodt	brodtub@ web yahoo.com	yes
Donald Schug	donschug@hotmail.com	yes
Milton Kalish	milton@miltonkalish.com	yes
Alvin Remmers	westof113@me.com	yes
Diane Remmers	westof113@me.com	yes
Diane Simon	simonsez@sbcglobal.net	yes
Barry Bolden	olliebee57@gmail.com	yes
Margaret Algazi	malgazi@comcast.net	yes
Jean Miller	jm-miller@sbcglobal.net	yes

1

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Bill WAGMAN	billwagman@dcn.org	✓
Eric Miller	jm-miller@sbcglobal.net	yes
Nancy T Price	nancytprice@39@gmail.com	yes
Don C Price	nancytprice31@gmail.com	yes
Yvonne Adcock	auntevon@hotmail.com	yes
Barbara R Burr	BRBIQ@aol.com	yes
Susan Vogt	tsvogt@att.net	yes
Jewel Payne	jewel@dcn.org	yes
Carol B. Gass	cbgass@gmail.com	yes
Michael Gass	cbgass@gmail.com	yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Judith Moores	je moores @ aol.com	yes
Robb Davis	robbathome @ gmail.com	yes
Dale Haack	avro @ att.net	yes
Lynn Narlesky	omalsky @ yahoo.com	yes
Lucille Hammes	snazzi:jazzi@att.net	yes
Jack Berger	dmbj8@sbcglobal.net	yes
Julie Sly	cyclinggirl6@gmail.com	yes
Ann Hubes	AnnH@dcn.org	yes
Russell Reagan	rsslr @ yahoo.com	yes
Mark Attention		yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Sherri Venezia	sher@omsoft.com	Yes
Judy Reynolds	jeffjudyn@gmail.com	Yes
Ellen Pontae	ep@dcn.org	Yes
Saskia Mills	Saskia@dcn.org	Yes
Pamela S. Nieberg	pnieberg@dcn.davis.ca.us	Yes
Leslie Crenna	lesliecrenna@gmail.com	Yes
Lew Fulton	lew.fulton@gmail.com	Yes
John Chendo	jac@dcn.org 530-758-3331	Yes
Hannah Stein	hannadstein@yahoo.com	Yes
Stephen Fass	stephenfass@yahoo.com	Yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Betty Fass	stephenfass@yahoo.com	yes
Richard Livingston	rpianoman@gmail.com	yes
Rachel Livingston	rpianoman@gmail.com	yes
Nick Buxton	nicholasbuxton@gmail.com	yes
Juliette Beck	stpsiennaclearcutting@gmail.com	yes
Blayne Breckenridge	blaynebreckenridge@gmail.com	yes
Deanna Haack	avro@att.net 758-8122	yes
Elizabeth Fulton	lili.fulton@gmail.com	yes
Maureen Driscoll	markpun@mindspring.com	yes
Dona Stokes	des835@sbcglobal.net	yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Tom Phillips	des835@slcglobal.net	yes
Joycelyn Hart	jharte@dcn.org	yes
Dave Hart	davehart@dch.davis.ca.us	yes
Ian Hart	ian@ianhartart.com	yes
Tamsin Nutter	tamsinmeranda@yahoo.com	yes
Michael Harrington	michael@mikeharringtonlaw.com	yes
Sherri Sandberg	ssandberg@djust.net	yes
Christine Granger	cgranger@dcn.org	yes
Nancy Leroy	neleroy@saclink.csus.edu	yes
Sherman Stein	stein@math.ucdavis.edu	yes

5/12/04 9:50

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Joseph K. Schreibauer	srijozus@san.rr.com	yes
Marla Fee	marla.fee@hotmail.com	yes
Frances Burke	frances_brk@yahoo.com	yes
Lynne Nitter	lnitter@sbcglobal.net	yes
Richard McAdam	richardcm@sbcglobal.net	yes
Cindy Anders	Cindy.h.anders@gmail.com	yes
Ray Valentine	ray@courtyards.com	yes
Richard Schultz	rschultz@sas.upenn.edu	yes

From: Lynne Nittler <lnittler@sbcglobal.net>
To: "P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>, "mwilson@co.slo.ca.us"
<mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/24/2014 02:04 AM
Subject: Comment letter on the P66 Rail Spur Extension Project

Dear Mr. Wilson,
Please add the attached letter to the comments for the San Luis Obispo Phillips
66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

Thank you,
Lynne Nittler
Secretary for Cool Davis Foundation
lnittler@sbcglobal.net
530-756-8110

(See attached file: Cool Davis SLO REIR letter.docx)

Re: Comments on the SLO Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project

November 23, 2014

***See Cool Davis Comment Letter
Under Organizations and Schools**

Murry Wilson
SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408
P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

Dear Mr. Murry Wilson,

Please add our comments to the public record on the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project which proposes the shipment of crude oil by trains. We understand that proposed route for the trains would pass through the center of Davis.

Cool Davis is a non-profit organization whose mission is to inspire our community to reduce greenhouse gas (ghg) emissions, to adapt to a changing climate, and to improve the quality of life for all! We are concerned that not only do the trains present the danger of spillage and explosions in our area, but also, that our own efforts to mitigate the climate crisis will be compromised or negated by the potential pollution and increased GHG emissions from the proposed trains carrying crude oil through Davis and other cities along the rail route.

The impacts of the trains are cumulative as more trains travel on the tracks. Cool Davis has already commented on the Valero Crude-by-Rail Project in Benicia which proposes two trains of 50 cars each per day, seven days a week, traveling to Benicia and back through Davis. The additional trains to Santa Maria refinery and back five days a week means the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions will be even higher, exacerbating the pollution problems already increased by the Valero trains. The mitigation for the Phillips 66 train emissions must take into account the round trip of the Phillips 66 trains in the larger context of the existing air quality and the compromised air quality in the near future should the Valero project be approved.

The climate impacts of Canadian tar sands crude must also be taken into account. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, 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 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and climate disruption. Spills threaten to pollute our waterways and often cannot be cleaned up as the heavy bitumen sinks rapidly to the bottom. The refining process emits sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals which can cause serious health problems. The refining process also produces the by-product "petcoke" which is too polluting to be burned in the U.S., though it can be sold for burning in Asia.

CEQA addresses impacts for all of California. The REIR for the Phillips 66 project has focused on air quality and GHG emissions from Roseville to San Luis Obispo, saying the routes above Roseville are uncertain. Nonetheless, the REIR provides data on the three northern entry routes, and their GHG emissions are calculated and considered. Similar data is included for the two southern entry routes to Colton. Therefore, total GHG emissions in the state introduced by the Phillips 66 trains can be considered for possible mitigations from each possible entry point where the trains cross the California border.

To be truly complete, **the REIR should consider the full life-cycle impact of the fossil fuel footprint** from the extraction process to the transportation to the final consumption which all contributes to local pollution and to global climate change. Singling out only the greenhouse gas emissions as the train passes through town is a thin slice of the total lifecycle and its impact. CEQA requires a more cumulative and holistic approach.

Under AB32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act, California has chosen a set of goals for greenhouse gas reduction. According to the California Energy Commission, in the last year California significantly reduced its consumption of oil through conservation measures such as more efficient vehicles and more trips by transit, biking and walking. We have proven we can reduce our footprint! Bringing in more crude by any means runs counter to our path to renewable energy and conservation.

If mitigations are called for, generally, they are direct offsets related to local pollution. However, since GHG emissions contribute to global climate changes that affect California communities as well as others around world, the mitigation should also provide global benefits. Cool Davis proposes creative mitigations such as funding to support the transition to electric and hybrid vehicles, including incentives to encourage households to purchase electric vehicles and to encourage multi-family residences to install electric vehicle charging devices for their residents. Another example would be funding to support local government efforts to convert to “complete streets” to encourage more biking and walking. Cool Davis would be happy to work with the project proponents on a list of possible mitigations to effectively reduce GHG emissions to best fit our community, the region, and the world. The mitigations must reduce GHG emissions sufficiently to counterbalance the emissions added to the community by the added daily trains.

As already stated, the sudden and substantial increase in crude-by-rail into our state takes us backwards, increasing our ghg emissions into the atmosphere and slowing our necessary conversion to renewable energy and low-carbon fuels as we confront climate change. **This REIR must examine how the increase in oil trains will affect our state and local climate goals and propose appropriate mitigations if it finds that the incoming crude-by-rail makes it harder to reach those goals.** At stake is a livable climate for all living beings, including our children and their children. The best mitigation may be to stop importing crude by rail, particularly high carbon-intense and explosive crude, and instead put our efforts into supporting passenger rail and other measures more consistent with a safe climate.

Thank you for taking into account the above concerns regarding greenhouse gas emissions for the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project. We urge you to reject the REIR and the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project until the above concerns are addressed in full.

Sincerely,



Bill Heinicke, President of Cool Davis Foundation Board of Directors
Davis, CA

| info@cooldavis.org

From: Lynne Nittler <lnittler@sbcglobal.net>
To: "P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/25/2014 10:07 AM
Subject: Davis residents comment letter for P66 Rail Spur Extension
Project

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
lnittler@sbcglobal.net
530-756-8110 (See attached file: final Davis comment ltr for P66
11.24.14.docx)

November 24, 2014

*Duplicate Letter with 10 additional signatures.
See 11/24/2014 Submission.

Murry Wilson
SLO County Dept. of Planning and Building
San Luis Obispo, 93408
P66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us

Dear Mr. Murry Wilson,

Thank you for adding our comments to the public record on the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

We are uprailand residents 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. We are concerned for a number of reasons.

First is the cumulative impact of more trains. For Davis, the SLO rail spur means a second daily train moving through our community if both this and the Valero Crude-by-rail project are approved. For Sacramento, it's the 5th train! This shift to crude-by-rail transport has to be taken into account from the borders of CA all the way to the refineries. We all live with the threat of more trains as California expects 25% of its crude to arrive by rail according to the CA Energy Commission projection. As the number and frequency of trains increases, the significant impacts multiply. No individual project stands alone.

Second, the map prepared by the Office of Spill Prevention and Response reveals serious dangers for our state. All three northern routes bring the oil trains over identified "**High Hazard Rail**" sections of track. These include coming south through Dunsmuir (the site of a terrible spill in 1991 that killed life in the Sacramento River for 35 miles), through the Feather River Canyon with long stretches of rail on high wooden trestles, and over the treacherous Donner Pass and just above Colfax. In addition, California has many **untrustworthy and old bridges** such as the Carquinas Bridge at Benicia, not built to carry 100 heavy tank cars regularly or ever. While the bridges were just recently scheduled to receive minimal safety inspections for the first time, there are no funds to repair or rebuild them. The map can be found at <http://bit.ly/OBR-page> .

Third, the same OSPR map reveals **Earthquake faults** that run just south of Davis along the rail stretch to Benicia, and along capitol corridor all the way to San Luis Obispo. Seismic instability is a reason to avoid oil train deliveries entirely in the region.

Fourth, tar sands is the dirtiest of crude oils, and the decision to import it for refining should be made at the state level, not by any single industry or refinery. Spills threaten to pollute our waterways and often cannot be cleaned up as the heavy bitumen sinks rapidly to the bottom. The refining process emits sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals which can cause serious health problems. The refining process also produces the by-product petcoke which is too toxic to be burned in the U.S., but it can be sold for burning in Asia. Tar sands produces more greenhouse gas emissions than conventional crude which exacerbates climate change.

Fifth, oil trains themselves **create Class I toxic air pollution** every mile they travel in California, including criteria pollutant emissions (**AQ.3**), toxic emissions (**AQ.5**) and GHG emissions (**AQ.6**) that exceed thresholds in many air quality management districts. This increase in air pollution is unacceptable, especially when it is likely the railroads will claim federal preemption to negate the possibility of any mitigations such as requiring more efficient train engines.

Sixth, Phillips 66, and UP and BNSF railroads have not offered proof of **sufficient liability** to cover a worst case scenario of accident or spill, or indeed, any scenario despite California's SB 861 enacted in June calling for safety measures and assurance of such liability. It should not rest on the communities, individuals, or government to bear the burden of paying for catastrophic accidents or spills.

Seventh, states across the country are experiencing **major disruptions to Amtrak and freight movement** as railroads are favoring crude oil transport over apples in Washington, grain in the Midwest, and people on Amtrak. We can't afford the disruption of services in California. That's food wasted when in Yolo County one in six people is experiencing food insecurity, and the livelihood of farmers is sacrificed for the profit of oil companies, railroads and refineries. The SLO supervisors have the power to keep Capitol Corridor running smoothly and on time.

Based on these seven serious concerns among others, we recommend that the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Extension Project.

Thank you for allowing us to make comments.

Sincerely,

The various residents of Davis whose names and emails are attached (Scroll down 7 pages for 68 signatures.)

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Dorothy Callison	dorothyandpaulca@gmail.com	yes
Sonya Grodt	brodtub@ web yahoo.com	yes
Donald Schug	donschug@hotmail.com	yes
Milton Kalish	milton@miltonkalish.com	yes
Alvin Remmers	westof113@me.com	yes
Diane Remmers	westof113@me.com	yes
Diane Simon	simonsez@sbcglobal.net	yes
Barry Bolden	olliebee57@gmail.com	yes
Margaret Algazi	malgazi@comcast.net	yes
Jean Miller	jm-miller@sbcglobal.net	yes

1

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Bill WAGMAN	billwagman@dcn.org	✓
Eric Miller	jm-miller@sbcglobal.net	yes
Nancy T Price	nancytprice@39@gmail.com	yes
Don C Price	nancytprice31@gmail.com	yes
Yvonne Adcock	auntevon@hotmail.com	yes
Barbara R Burr	BRBIQ@aol.com	yes
Susan Vogt	tsvogt@att.net	yes
Jewel Payne	jewel@dcn.org	yes
Carol B. Gass	cbgass@gmail.com	yes
Michael Gass	cbgass@gmail.com	yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Judith Moores	je moores @ aol.com	yes
Robb Davis	robbathome @ gmail.com	yes
Dale Haack	avro @ att.net	yes
Lynn Narlesky	omalsky @ yahoo.com	yes
Lucille Hammes	snazzi:jazzi@att.net	yes
Jack Berger	dmbj8@sbcglobal.net	yes
Julie Sly	cyclinggirl6@gmail.com	yes
Ann Hubes	AnnH@dcn.org	yes
Russell Reagan	rsslr @ yahoo.com	yes
Mark Attention		yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Sherri Venezia	sher@omsoft.com	Yes
Judy Reynolds	jeffjudyn@gmail.com	Yes
Ellen Pontae	ep@dcn.org	Yes
Saskia Mills	Saskia@dcn.org	Yes
Pamela S. Nieberg	pnieberg@dcn.davis.ca.us	Yes
Leslie Crenna	lesliecrenna@gmail.com	Yes
Lew Fulton	lew.fulton@gmail.com	Yes
John Chendo	jac@dcn.org 530-758-3331	Yes
Hannah Stein	hannadstein@yahoo.com	Yes
Stephen Fass	stephenfass@yahoo.com	Yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Betty Fass	stephenfass@yahoo.com	yes
Richard Livingston	rpianoman@gmail.com	yes
Rachel Livingston	rpianoman@gmail.com	yes
Nick Buxton	nicholasbuxton@gmail.com	yes
Juliette Beck	stpsiennaclearcutting@gmail.com	yes
Blayne Breckenridge	blaynebreckenridge@gmail.com	yes
Deanna Haack	avro@att.net 758-8122	yes
Elizabeth Fulton	lili.fulton@gmail.com	yes
Maureen Driscoll	markpun@mindspring.com	yes
Dana Stokes	des835@sbcglobal.net	yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Tom Phillips	des835@slcglobal.net	yes
Joycelyn Hart	jharte@dcn.org	yes
Dave Hart	davehart@dch.davis.ca.us	yes
Ian Hart	ian@ianhartart.com	yes
Tamsin Nutter	tamsinmeranda@yahoo.com	yes
Michael Harrington	michael@mikeharringtonlaw.com	yes
Sherri Sandberg	ssandberg@djust.net	yes
Christine Granger	cgranger@dcn.org	yes
Nancy Leroy	neleroy@saclink.csus.edu	yes
Sherman Stein	stein@math.ucdavis.edu	yes

5/12/04 9:50

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Joseph K. Schreibauer	srijozus@san.rr.com	yes
Marla Fee	marlafee@hotmail.com	yes
Frances Burke	frances_brk@yahoo.com	yes
Lynne Nitter	lnitter@sbcglobal.net	yes
Richard McAdam	richardcm@sbcglobal.net	yes
Cindy Anders	Cindy.h.anders@gmail.com	yes
Ray Valentine	ray@courtyards.com	yes
Richard Schultz	rschultz@sas.upenn.edu	yes

First and Last Name	Email/address	Resident of Davis
Elsa Ruiz-Duran	erd09@hotmail.com	Yes
Bernadette Balics	bbalics@cal.net	Yes
Robert Bakke	bakkerobert@comcast.net	Yes
Lily Roberts	bakkerobert@comcast.net	Yes
Rodney Robinson	rodneyr88@outlook.com	Yes
Andrew Anker	neleray@saclink.csus.edu	Yes
Gloria St John	gloria339@volcano.net	Yes
Kelly Nelson	nelsons@gmail.com	Yes
Wendy Nelson	nelsons@gmail.com	Yes
Hailey Nelson	nelsons@gmail.com	Yes