



Mr. Murry Wilson  
SLO County Planning Department;

Six years ago, my husband and I purchased a home in Trilogy where we have since retired. We lived in Orange County for over 30 years. When we first began visiting this area over 20 years ago we appreciated the tranquility, the lack of traffic and the rural beauty of this unique area. We felt it was a wonderful escape from the crowding and congestion of our home in Laguna Niguel. You see, when we first moved to Laguna Niguel it too was a type of paradise, there were open spaces, rural areas and minimal traffic. While it is naive to think property will not be developed, a clear and logical plan enhances the worth and preserves the dignity of area. South Orange County is an area where poor planning and greed for land development have ruined a once pristine area. The hills are no longer visible and are now covered with homes. Traffic is a nightmare. We are once again facing the same conundrum. The proposed rail terminal project will destroy for us our motivation for living here and for many of the Trilogy residents and in our opinion will greatly devalue our property value.

GAZ-01

Specifically:

The Aesthetic and visual impact-Instead of viewing the agricultural areas, the sand dunes and the ocean from top of our hill on Northwood Rd( we are also golfers)we will see a huge trainyard where unloading will be taking place 50-60 hours per week. In the past we have enjoyed bringing our grandchildren up to look at the evening sky - now we will be hindered by the bright lights needed to unload trains well into the evening hours. Pointing the lights in another direction is not a solution to diffusing the lights. This visual eyesore will completely alter our lifestyle and and the marketability of our homes.

GAZ-02

The noise - At this time one can hear, on occasion,in the distant background, the clickity- clack and the occasional whistles of the trains as they travel close by. I can only imagine the noise and vibration the will be created by the incessant moving of 260 fully-loaded, 1.5 mile-long trains as they move from north to south across the mesa.

GAZ-03

The pollution - The air quality near the dunes and the Nipomo Mesa is already seriously compromised by the off-road vehicles. Personally, I have developed asthma since moving to Nipomo. I can only imagine the damage that will be done to the air quality that would be generated by increased

GAZ-04

diesel emissions from the continuous operation of the trains.

GAZ-04  
cont

The danger of an oil spill - It is naive to think that any large petroleum business will put safety before profit. We have witnessed over and over the damage done to our environment, to our property, and the loss of human lives when we place our trust in the hands of large oil companies. The multitude of potential hazards have already been well-documented.

GAZ-05

In short, we have touted this area to friends and encouraged them to relocate to this beautiful area. The property values are returning to the pre-recession value. Why would you destroy that which makes this county so unique? Why would you risk yet another oil spill having finally recovered from the damage done to Avila Beach? We beseech you to think of the future and the generations to come who love living on the Central Coast.

GAZ-06

Sincerely,  
Linda and Michael Garza  
1777 Northwood RD.  
Nipomo, CA 93444

**Responses to Linda and Michael Garza Comments**

---

GAZ-01	<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 quality of life and property values are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.</p>
GAZ-02	<p>The project proposes to the construct the unloading facility and rail spur tracks adjacent to the southern slopes of a natural landform ridge. This adjacent landform rises to elevations ranging from approximately 120 to 145 feet above sea level. The proposed rail spur tracks are proposed at an elevation of approximately 94 feet above sea level, which would be as much as 55 feet lower than the landform to the north. As a result, views of the unloading facility and railroad spur from the north and the northeast would be substantially blocked. In addition, the eastern segment of the rail spur tracks, closest to Highway 1, are proposed to be constructed in an excavated area maintaining the approximately 94-foot elevation while the adjacent ground rises up eastward, resulting in the easternmost end of the tracks being approximately 20 feet below the surrounding natural terrain. This elevation difference, along with the required 10 to 20-foot tall mitigation berm, would combine for an approximately 30 to 40-foot tall earthen visual screen around the eastern end of the railroad spur. This berm height in combination with the natural ridge to the north will be sufficient to reduce visibility of the project to a less than significant level for viewpoints from the east, including elevated viewpoints on Northwood Road, Via Concha, Louise Lane, Eucalyptus Road, Thomas Court, and other viewing areas.</p> <p>The RDEIR also notes that the project would not result in any blockage of views of the Pacific Ocean, sweeping coastline, dunes, riparian corridors, or agricultural field patterns. The existing visual setting as seen from the surrounding areas including the residential developments east of Highway 1 include the Santa Maria Refinery, coke processing plant, railroad tracks and other industrial support facilities. The proposed unloading facility, which would be more than 1.5 miles away from Highway 1 and points east, would be constructed on an already highly disturbed work-zone. With applied mitigation the project would appear as a logical extension of the existing industrial facility, with a similar level of visual compatibility as what currently exists.</p> <p>The RDEIR acknowledges visibility of new night lights from the surrounding areas and identifies substantial mitigation measures to minimize any potentially adverse effects. At the unloading facility all lights would be mounted under the proposed canopy. Forty of these canopy lights would be placed 60-feet apart, and 30 of them would be 20-feet apart. Lighting for the rail spur would only be for perimeter fencing security purposes and would be placed on 15-foot tall poles, 500 feet apart. The lighting associated with the unloading facility would be viewed at a distance of approximately 1.5 miles or more from viewpoints east of Highway 1, and would be seen in the context of the Santa Maria Refinery immediately to the north. In addition the unloading facility proposes a</p>

**Responses to Linda and Michael Garza Comments**

---

	<p>covered canopy over the majority of the area, which would decrease light-trespass. Similar to the lack of visibility of the existing Santa Maria Refinery’s illuminated ground-plane, intervening topography would block views of the illuminated ground-plane of the unloading facility as seen from Highway 1 and the residential areas to the east. Although the project would introduce light into a new area, the required berm in combination with the natural ridge to the north will help reduce visibility of night lighting for viewpoints from the east, including elevated viewpoints in the Trilogy development and other public viewpoints. With applied mitigation measures new lighting would not appear out of place given the relatively close proximity to the existing Santa Maria Refinery and coke processing facility, which emits high levels of industrial lighting every night of the year.</p> <p>In addition to the applicant-proposed lighting features such as downward-directed lights with fully shielded lenses, the RDEIR requires substantial mitigation measures that will minimize lighting impacts through expertise and photometric-based design and technology, based on established dark-sky principles. Mitigation measures preclude illumination of adjacent slopes, prohibit placement of perimeter lights (which as previously described would be 15-foot tall) east of the screening berm (which as previously described would be 10 to 20- feet tall), and require the use of motion detectors rather than being continuously on.</p> <p>Importantly, following project completion the RDEIR requires the preparation of a Lighting Evaluation Report for review and approval by the County Department of Planning and Building prepared by a qualified lighting engineer not involved in the design of the original lighting plan. The Lighting Evaluation Report will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of in-place lighting, under all expected circumstances, and will require correction of any unexpected or residual lighting impacts based on direct observation of the completed project. The air quality mitigation that would limit rail car unloading from between 7 A.M. and 7 P.M. would also serve to reduce the nighttime lighting impacts to less than significant.</p>
GAZ-03	<p>As indicated in response to comment DUP-49, the EIR does not indicate that the noises would not be heard, only that they would be below the thresholds of either the code requirements or an increase. Noise attenuates over distances and with the inclusion of mitigation measures to reduce noise levels through the use of quieter pumps or barriers and limits on nighttime activities, noise levels would be reduced substantially.</p> <p>The conclusion that noise levels during operational activities, particularly rail movements at night, was based on a comprehensive noise assessment, including in-field monitoring of actual rail activities, and a detailed assessment of rail activities as proposed by the Applicant. Mitigation measure N-2c requires monitoring with the option for additional time limits on activities if noise levels</p>

**Responses to Linda and Michael Garza Comments**

	exceed the County Thresholds.
GAZ-04	<p>A study performed by the SLOCAPCD, the South County Phase 2 Particulate Study, evaluated whether impacts from off-road vehicle activities at the Oceano Dunes State Vehicle Recreational Area (SVRA), the Phillips Refinery coke piles, and adjacent agricultural fields were contributing to the particulate problems on the Nipomo Mesa (SLOC APCD 2010). The Phase 2 portion of the study concluded that off-road vehicle activity in the SVRA is a major contributing factor to the PM concentrations observed on the Nipomo Mesa and that neither the petroleum coke piles at the Phillips facility nor agricultural fields or activities in and around the area are a significant source of ambient PM on the Nipomo Mesa. The composition of the particulates is predominately natural crustal particles. The SLOCAPCD has determined that the dune complex along the coast of the Five Cities area is the source of the high particulate matter levels measured at the South Coast stations (SLOCAPCD Annual Emissions Report, 2013). The SMR has a coke dust plan to reduce coke dust and it does involve watering. However, the proposed Project is not anticipated to increase coke handling or contribute to dust particulate levels in the area. Air quality violations on the mesa a primarily associated with natural crustal particulates.</p> <p>As per the SLOCAPCD Annual Report in 2013, the days which cause impacts from the dunes are associated with strong winds out of the northwest, with the strong winds generating high levels of dune dust and causing PM impacts. These periods would produce substantial dispersion of the diesel PM emissions from the project site and would not correlate with the same meteorological conditions that would be associated with maximum impacts from the rail spur operations. Therefore, rail spur operations are not anticipated to contribute to additional exceedances of the PM standard.</p>
GAZ-05	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 risk of an oil spill are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
GAZ-06	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 risk of an oil spill are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.