From: Wanda Bailey <wandaleebailey@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 10/31/2014 11:15 AM
Subject: Phillips 66 Railspur EIR Comment

TO: Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Wilson,

As a resident of San Luis Obispo County and a resident of the Nipomo Mesa, I am greatly concerned about the proposed Phillips 66 rail spur and urge you to reject the Phillips Rail Terminal project.

I believe that our county's economy, continued growth, high quality of life, desirability, and natural beauty, will be seriously jeopardized by bringing in the tens of thousands of tank cars of crude oil by rail, year after year. Most importantly our very lives are jeopardized.

BAW-01

There are many reasons to be concerned. One reason is that it has been well documented that the rail cars have shown to be unsafe and inadequate to carry this type of cargo.

This is not only a concern for our County but for our entire State.
Please demonstrate San Luis Obispo County's thoughtful leadership and reject this project.

Thank you,
Wanda Bailey

--
Wanda Lee Bailey, M.S.

1152 Spring Azure Way
Nipomo, CA 93444
805 219-0356
858 243-3768 cell

From: Wanda Bailey <wandaleebailey@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/23/2014 05:27 PM
Subject: Phillips 66 Railspur EIR Comment

TO: Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Wilson,

As a resident of San Luis Obispo County and a resident of the Nipomo Mesa, I am greatly concerned about the proposed Phillips 66 rail spur and urge you to reject the Phillips Rail Terminal project.

I believe that our county's economy, continued growth, high quality of life, desirability, and natural beauty, will be seriously jeopardized by bringing in the tens of thousands of tank cars of crude oil by rail, year after year. Most importantly our very lives are jeopardized. BAW-02

There are many reasons to be concerned:

LAND USE - The increased intensity of industrial activity, both near the refinery and especially along the rail routes to be used, is completely inconsistent with the established county land use plan for agricultural, scenic, residential, and commercial development. BAW-03

POLLUTION - The revised environmental impact report describes a number of Class 1 consequences of the Project. These include: a) exacerbating the current unhealthy amount of particulate and toxic air pollution; b) danger from off-site accidents involving insufficiently safe crude oil tank cars, especially on the Cuesta Grade and through SLO county cities; c) inadequate local emergency response manpower (Hazmat teams, etc.); and d) harmful biological and agricultural effects from potential spills and accidents. BAW-04

IMPACTS NOT MITIGATED - The revised environmental impact report omits or downplays many negative effects such as increased air pollution, excessive noise, and extensive lighting at the site and along the rail routes, and any impacts on surface and ground water. BAW-05

This is not only a concern for our County but for our entire State.
Please demonstrate San Luis Obispo County's thoughtful leadership and reject this project. BAW-06

Thank you,

--
Wanda Lee Bailey, M.S.

1841 Nathan Way
Nipomo, CA 93444
805 219-0356
858 243-3768 cell

BAW-01	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's concerns about the potential hazards and impacts of the project are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
BAW-02	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's concerns about economics, population growth, aesthetics and visual resources, and safety are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
BAW-03	The Rail Spur Project's consistency with applicable plans and policies is discussed in Appendix G of the RDEIR, and any identified potential inconsistencies are further evaluated in Section 4.8, Land Use and Recreation, of the RDEIR. While the RDEIR discusses potential inconsistencies with applicable planning documents, the decision of whether a proposed project is consistent with a particular plan or policy must ultimately be made by the local decision-making body. The comment has been included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
BAW-04	The increase in risk from the proposed Project trains is analyzed in Section 4.7 of the RDEIR and the increase in air emissions from the proposed Project is analyzed in Section 4.3 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases).
BAW-05	This comment alleges that the RDEIR omits or downplays many negative effects of the project in areas such as air pollution, noise and light, but provides no specific comments about what areas are supposedly omitted or downplayed. Therefore, no further response can be provided.
BAW-06	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. No further response is required.