From: mteconst@hotmail.com
To: jim@jimirving.com; ktopping@calpoly.edu; 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; lreynolds@gmail.com; debs.gone.coastal@gmail.com; rachelletoti@gmail.com; p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca; mwilson@co.slo.ca
Subject: Railspur Proposal
Date: Fri, 31 Oct 2014 09:53:39 -0700

Dear Mr. Wilson:

My initial reaction to the proposed Phillips Rail Spur project was to take a wait-and-see approach. Well, I have waited, and have seen that the pros to the project woefully lack as much substance as the cons! Simply put, the project is really about appeasing the corporate office of Phillips 66 in Houston, Texas as they attempt to "soil" our pristine California Central Coast region so that they may benefit financially at the risk of the health of the people of San Luis Obispo County. Hence, let's examine the aforementioned pros and cons.

PROS-
*Temporary jobs for a few people as the rail spur is constructed, temporary being the key word here.
*Very few (MAYBE 10-20) additional full-time jobs created at the refinery. (Not substantial by any means!)
*Additional money into the county coffers, as Phillips substantially lines their Houston-based pockets. (Let's feed Texas!)

CONS-
*Dust and noise pollution from the construction process.
*Noise pollution into our area from five trains PER WEEK pulling EIGHTY CARS of crude oil into our PRISTINE AREA.
*Air pollution into our area from five trains PER WEEK pulling EIGHTY CARS of crude oil into our PRISTINE AREA.
*Additional air pollution from the refinery as they ratchet up their production.
*Permanent lighting pollution being installed for the new rail spur at the refinery.
*Permanent disturbance of the dunes area west/northwest of the proposed sight if coastal access is required.
*Additional traffic on Highway 1 due to the construction process and, I'm sure, additional tanker trucks into and out of refinery.
*The pervasive threat of an unmitigated disaster if there is a derailment and oil spill.
*The cumulative negative, PERMANENT effect that the project would have on those living on the mesa and at Trilogy.
*The discord that the county and Phillips 66 would have with the majority of the people in SLO County if this project goes forth.

From my perspective it boils down to this: Are the governing factions of San Luis Obispo County going to allow a project from an OUT-OF-STATE oil magnate to adversely impact OUR environment and OUR lives, full-well knowing that the negative impacts overwhelmingly trump the minuscule positives? Our officials

ELM-01

that make the decision on this project need to rationalize as to whether or not it is worth a few dollars into our county coffers to bring all of the pollution and fear into our county. You know, Mr. Wilson, the pollution and fear will never go away if this project is allowed to happen!

Lastly, the human element must be considered as one peruses the viability of this project. People live and breathe in the area of the proposed project and their lives will be forever negatively impacted. If this project were pushed through and a derailment disaster occurred killing scores of San Luis Obispo County residents, could those making the crucial decision on this project live with their consciences? ELM-01 cont

Respectfully,

Michael Elliott
620 Monadella Street
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420

*The pervasive threat of an unmitigated disaster occurring if the if a derailment occurs.

ELM-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 air quality, noise, traffic, hazards, cumulative environmental impacts, project objectives and economics are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.