

From: "nbeety@netzero.net" <nbeety@netzero.net>  
To: [p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)  
Cc: [nbeety@netzero.net](mailto:nbeety@netzero.net)  
Date: 11/24/2014 03:37 PM  
Subject: Comments, Draft EIR Phillips 66 Company Rail Spur Extension Project

November 24, 2014

Murry Wilson  
San Luis Obispo County Planning Department  
976 Osos St., Room 200  
San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Comments on Draft EIR Phillips 66 Company Rail Spur Extension Project

I am completely opposed to the Phillips 66 expansion project.

BEN-01

Unless this EIR takes into account the widespread impacts to communities across California, then it has failed in its stated goals.

Because of those impacts and the lack of notice that other impacted areas have had to this proceeding, I request that the comment deadline be extended to allow impacted communities, including in Monterey and Santa Cruz County, to learn about this project, to read the full EIR, and to submit comments.

BEN-02

Tar sands extraction has destroyed and polluted the land, the water, the air, and all life where it is taken. Approving this project puts a stamp of approval on the extensive harm done to other communities and other areas.

BEN-03

Furthermore, bringing this highly toxic and flammable oil to San Luis Obispo County will harm communities along the length of its journey, resulting in multiple, ongoing impacts. That is a very bad idea indeed.

BEN-04

The only benefit is increased profit for the oil company. Everyone else pays.

BEN-05

I ask the County of San Luis Obispo to extend this comment period. I further ask the county to deny this project when it comes up for a vote.

BEN-06

Very sincerely,

Nina Beety  
[nbeety@netzero.net](mailto:nbeety@netzero.net)  
Monterey County

cc  
Monterey County Board of Supervisors  
Santa Cruz Board of Supervisors  
Salinas City Council  
Watsonville City Council  
King City City Council  
Soledad City Council  
Gonzales City Council  
Assemblyman Mark Stone  
Senator Bill Monning  
Assemblyman Luis Alejo

## Responses to Nina Beety Comments

BEN-01	<p>The RDEIR addressed the impacts associated with moving crude oil along the mainline UPRR tracks throughout the State of California and beyond. A detailed analysis of the impacts along the mainline was completed for the routes from the SMR to the UPRR rail yards in Roseville and Colton California. A less detailed analysis was completed from these two rail yards to the California border and beyond. As stated in Chapter 4.0, Environmental Analysis, trains could enter California at five different locations (one at the north end of the state from Oregon, two at the northeast from Nevada, one at the southeast from Nevada, and one at the south from Arizona). Depending upon the route taken by the train they could arrive at the Phillips 66 site from the north or the south. It is unknown what route UPRR would use to deliver the trains to the SMR.</p> <p>Coming from the north the routes merge at the UPRR Roseville Rail Yard. From the south the routes merge at the Colton Rail Yard. Given that the route the trains would travel to get to these two UPRR yards is speculative, the EIR has evaluated in more detail the impacts of trains traveling from these two UPRR yards to the SMR.</p> <p>Beyond the two UPRR Yards, trains could travel any number of routes. Also, crude oil delivered to California by UPRR would generally pass through either of these two rail yards in route to the SMR. Depending upon the source of the crude oil, crude oil trains could use any portion of the UPRR network from the source location for the crude oil to Roseville/Colton. The exact route that would be taken would depend upon a number of factors, that could include the source of the crude oil, weather conditions, train traffic conditions, etc. Since the routes past Roseville and Colton are more speculative, the EIR has discussed in a more qualitative nature the potential impacts of train traffic beyond these two rail yards.</p>
BEN-02	<p>When the lead agency sends the Notice of Completion to the State Clearinghouse, it must also provide public notice of the availability of the draft EIR. The notice and opportunity for public review must not be less than 30 days nor should it normally be longer than 60 days (CEQA Guidelines §15105). The County provided notice of the release of the DEIR to all cities and counties along the mainline routes that were evaluated in the RDEIR.</p>
BEN-03	<p>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 impacts of tar sand extraction are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.</p>
BEN-04	<p>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</p>

## Responses to Nina Beety Comments

---

	deliberations on the proposed project.
BEN-05	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's comment about Phillips 66 profits are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
BEN-06	The County determined that a 45-day comment period was adequate for the RDEIR. The public review period for a draft EIR shall not be less than 30 days nor should it be longer than 60 days except under unusual circumstances. When a draft EIR is submitted to the State Clearinghouse for review by state agencies, the public review period shall not be less than 45 days, unless a shorter period, not less than 30 days, is approved by the State Clearinghouse (CEQA Guidelines Section 15105(a)).