

From: "Garry Gillette" <gcgillette@ix.netcom.com>
To: <p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: <jim@jimirving.com>, <bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, <ktopping@calpoly.edu>, <ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, <frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, <darnold@co.slo.ca.us>, <elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us>, <fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, <rhedges@co.slo.ca.us>, <boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>, <cray@co.slo.ca.us>, <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/24/2014 03:01 PM
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Railspur in Nipomo

My residence is on Vaquero Way, just off Mesa, in the Trilogy development. I can hear the trains and see the lights from the Santa Maria Refinery. When I purchased my home I was required to sign my awareness of the refinery and its possible problems, but at no time did I agree to an increase in rail activity of gigantic proportions, to which I am totally opposed,

GIG-01

I have read the Rail Project Proposal, the Mesa Refinery Watch Group REIR summary, and the Phillips 66 Manager's Column propaganda by Jerry Stumbo on Community Relations. I note that the Rail Project Proposal "does not allow for an increase in the processing capacity or throughput". However, the critical problem regarding the safety of 1.5 mi. trains carrying toxic oil through populated areas is a prohibitive and widely distributed risk that was not addressed in the Phillips proposal, probably because it cannot be mitigated. The probability of a derailment anywhere along the path of such trains is likely, and the resultant damage unacceptable to those who would have to bear the consequences.

GIG-02

I believe it might be possible to move the location of the rail spur to a remote location, but long trains will still be winding through densely populated areas. And once in a while one of these trains is going to become a bomb; there is no amount of fire engines that will be able to stop the conflagration.

GIG-03

So, even with the political and financial resources (\$51B) of Phillips 66 and participation from Berkshire Hathaway (Warren E. Buffett, \$1.4B)) I cannot support the Proposal and am totally against allowing it to be approved.

GIG-04

Garry Gillette
1147 Vaquero Way
Nipomo. 93444
gcgillette@ix.netcom.com

From: "Garry Gillette" <gcgillette@ix.netcom.com>

To: <p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>

~š° | « !±@@µ +¥'~ «a ' ž#' . «±a° µ' S' šaa¥a£' ~ | -š® © a°

My residence is on Vaquero Way, just off Mesa, in the Trilogy development. I can hear the trains and see the lights from the Santa Maria Refinery. When I purchased my home I was required to sign my awareness of the refinery and its possible problems, but at no time did I agree to an increase in rail activity of gigantic proportions, to which I am totally opposed,

GIG-05

I have read the Rail Project Proposal, the Mesa Refinery Watch Group REIR summary, and the Phillips 66 Manager's Column propaganda by Jerry Stumbo on Community Relations. I note that the Rail Project Proposal "does not allow for an increase in the processing capacity or throughput". However, the critical problem regarding the safety of 1.5 mi. trains carrying toxic oil through populated areas is a prohibitive and widely distributed risk that was not addressed in the Phillips proposal, probably because it cannot be mitigated. The probability of a derailment anywhere along the path of such trains is likely, and the resultant damage unacceptable to those who would have to bear the consequences.

GIG-06

I believe it might be possible to move the location of the rail spur to a remote location, but long trains will still be winding through densely populated areas. And once in a while one of these trains is going become a bomb; there is no amount of fire engines that will be able to stop the conflagration.

GIG-07

So, even with the political and financial resources (\$51B) of Phillips 66 and participation from Berkshire Hathaway (Warren E. Buffett, \$1.4B)) I cannot support the Proposal and am totally against allowing it to be approved.

GIG-08

Garry Gillette
1147 Vaquero Way
Nipomo. 93444
gcgillette@ix.netcom.com

Responses to Garry Gillette Comments

GIG-01	<p>This comment is a general statement about the commenter’s opinion (or preference about) the proposed project and expresses an opinion about the proposed project. The comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter’s opinion is included in the FEIR for the decision-makers’ consideration as part of the County’s deliberations on the proposed project.</p> <p>The EIR provides a discussion of the various visual (see Section 4.1) and noise (see Section 4.9) impacts of the Proposed Project, and provided recommend mitigation measures to reduce the severity of these impacts.</p>
GIG-02	<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 safety and environmental 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.</p> <p>Please note that the RDEIR provided a comprehensive analysis of the risk associated with the Phillips 66 project. The Quantitative Risk Analysis (QRA) that was prepared for the proposed rail spur project found that the risk was Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) despite the identification of numerous mitigation risk reduction measures.</p>
GIG-03	Please see Response to GIG-02.
GIG-04	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.
GIG-05	This comment is identical to GIG-01. See Response to GIG-01.
GIG-05	Noise levels along the mainline and at the SMR would increase with the additional trains. Noise levels along the mainline are addressed in section 4.9 under impact N.3. Noise levels at the SMR are discussed in section 4.9 under impacts N.1 for construction and N.2 for operations. The RDEIR addresses the potential impacts and recommends mitigation measures for the proposed Project consistent with the requirements of CEQA. The commenter’s statement about air issues are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers’ consideration as part of the County’s deliberations on the proposed project.
GIG-06	Please see Response to GIG-02.
GIG-07	Please see Response to GIG-02.
GIG-08	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.