From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:51 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #8

REIR section 9.0 identifies three options for satisfying the county's requirement for vertical access to the coast. Phillips 66 has agreed to immediately provide public access to the beach if any projects are complete (they are currently on a ten-year window to complete the access as part of the Throughput project approval in 2013). The three options are:

1. Motor vehicle access – Bridge over RR to allow vehicular access to the State Offroad Vehicle Park (dune buggy and camper access).
2. Bicycly and foot traffic access – pedestrian bridge over RR
3. Docent-led access to the dunes.

Option 1 will allow State Parks to close the Arroyo Grande Creek to vehicle crossings, thus forcing all camper and dune buggy traffic to use a new entrance at Phillips 66 (and use Willow Rd from Hwy-101). The construction would include a paved road past the refinery, up to a 25,000 square foot parking lot. This would give vehicles capable of driving on the dunes access to the beach. New issues related to option 1 – HEB-01

Air quality impact – the REIR claims there is no dust impact because vehicle trips shift from Oceano and Pismo beach entrances, to the refinery entrance. However, the impact is major for the Nipomo Mesa Emissions impact – again the REIR claims no impact from emissions because they are only shifted from another location, to the Nipomo Mesa.

Condor Study estimated that a peak of 3,579 vehicles per day would use the new refinery access point

Significant impacts along the Willow route to Hwy 101 exist. As previously pointed out, Willow is more similar to a Collector roadway than an Arterial roadway (9,400 versus 16,000 ADT).

Art Herbon
805-294-3012 (cell)

From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:52 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #7

REIR section 4.12-25 presumes that peak train travel associated with the Rail Spur would be one round trip per day. However, the Rail Spur will generate a peak of three round trips per day. For example, in UPRR's capabilities:

1. A full unit train arrives at SMR at 8AM, leaves with an empty tankers at 9AM.
2. A second full unit train arrives during the day and delivers a full unit train on the overflow tracks at SMR (because the 8AM load is still being processed);
3. A third full unit train arrives at 8PM, and leaves with empty tankers (the ones that arrived at 8AM) at 9PM.

Therefore, since the REIR is required to evaluate the impact of peak train travel associated with the Rail Spur, the REIR must consider the possibility of six trains passing any point within a one-day period. HEB-02

REIR section 4.12 -26 identifies delays on at-grade crossings. Trains in SLO county will be traveling between 10 and 30 MPH. Crossing delays will range between 2.2 and 6.5 minutes per train. The REIR claims this as a class-III impact. However, with peak activity of six trains crossing roads per day, the activity represents a Class-II impact, mitigated with separated crossings being necessary throughout the system to mitigate. HEB-03

REIR section 4.12 – pages 26 through 45, make various references to the impact of one-round trip train peak. However, as pointed out in 4.12 page 25 comments, the Rail Spur will generate a peak of three round-trip trains per day. HEB-04

Art Herbon
805-294-3012 (cell)

From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:55 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #6

The REIR, section 4.12-2 identifies Willow Road as an Arterial Roadway (16,000 daily vehicle capacity DVC). However, we believe Willow Road should be considered a Collector Road (9,400 DVC) because:

Roadway design is consistent with Pomeroy Rd (Collector Rd).
Four-way stop sign at intersection of Pomeroy and Willow consistent with two collector roads.
Short roadway line-of sight (due to rolling hills) on Willow, in the immediate vicinity of large residential entrances.
Recent history of user complaints regarding speed limit on Willow set too high

HEB-05

REIR section 4.12-23 evaluates construction traffic on Willow Road according to Arterial Roadway conditions. However, as pointed out previously, Willow Road has Collector Roadway conditions (9,400 versus 16,000 DVC). This criteria creates a Class-II impact to roadways during construction.

HEB-06

Art Herbon

805-294-3012 (cell)

From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:56 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #5

REIR, section 4.12-10 points out that much of the coastal rail route has hand operated switches that require train crews to operate tracks before and after trains enter sidings. This antiquated systemshould be considered Class II, and should be corrected on the entire coastal route before creating a new destination for oil-by-rail. HEB-07

Art Herbon
805-294-3012 (cell)

From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:57 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #4

REIR, section 4.12-10 identifies passenger train on-time-performance according to actual departure times versus actual arrival times.
Performance metrics should also include the impact of passenger trains departing later than scheduled due to rail congestion, including freight train congestion. HEB-08

The REIR claims passenger train on-time performance is 80% between April 2011 and March 2014. By including delays to scheduled departures, OTP would drop well below 80% if delays to departures are included in the metric. HEB-09

REIR, section 4.12-10 claims freight trains contribute to only 2% of passenger train delays along the coastal route. That figure will be much higher if departure delays are included in the metric. HEB-10

REIR section 4.12-11 points out that the Federal Railroad Administration has established a target goal of 80% performance for the coastal passenger trains. Therefore, performance is already below acceptable limits, and additional freight train traffic will further reduce performance. This creates a class-2 impact, with the improvements to the coastal rail system required to mitigate. HEB-11

Art Herbon
805-294-3012 (cell)

From: Art Herbon <afherbon@gmail.com>
To: Murry Wilson <mwilson@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: Linda Reynolds <lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/21/2014 03:58 PM
Subject: Phillips REIR - Rail Spur Comment #1

The REIR “alternatives” section does not consider another obvious alternative. Price Canyou Oil Fields have proposed expanding production capacity. Phillips 66 proposes running a new 10” underground pipeline to connect Price Canyon oil fields to SMR (an active EIR). The added capacity of Price Canyon crude furthers SMR's ability to optain adequate supplies to satisfy operation of the SMR. HEB-12

Art Herbon
805-294-3012 (cell)

HEB-01	The statement that the RDEIR claims there will be no dust impact is inaccurate. Section 9.4.9.2 (see Chapter 9.0, Vertical Coastal Access Assessment) states the existing emissions would just be shifted south from the Pier Avenue entrance to the new SMR coastal access road. This shift in vehicles to the south could increase the level of off-road vehicle (ORV) activity in the southern part of the ODSVRA thereby increasing PM_{10} emissions in this part of the ODSVRA. PM_{10} emissions could also be increased from travel on the new coastal access road. While the road would be paved, sand tracked onto the road could increase the level of PM_{10} emissions in the area around the refinery. While the overall level of PM_{10} emissions from the area around the ODSVRA would not be expected to increase over the current levels, there is the potential for an increase in localized impacts in the area of the SMR. The trips identified in the Condor study are currently using the Pier Avenue entrance, so the emissions are already occurring. However, as discussed above, the emissions would be shifted south by about six miles, which would shift some of the air impacts to the area around the SMR. The County Public Works classifies Willow Road as an arterial roadway. The Circulation Element of the South County Area Plan lists Willow Road as an arterial road. It is also shown as an arterial road in the Circulation Element of the South County Villages Plan. Therefore, the classification of Willow Road has not been changed in the EIR.
HEB-02 through HEB-04	The time for a unit train to make a full round trip between Canada and the SMR including loading and unloading time is estimated to be about four days. This means that three unit trains would need to be dedicated to the SMR rail service in order to allow for five train deliveries per week. In discussions with Phillips 66 and UPRR the delivery of unit trains would be spaced out over the week, and under normal operations two trains would not be expected to be at the SMR at one time. It is possible that due to bad weather or other mainline rail issues, that a train could be delayed, which could result in a second train arriving at the SMR while another one is at the site unloading. However, this would not occur on a regular basis, and would be an infrequent event. The example in the comment would have four trains, which is more than is needed for the project. Given that three trains would need to be dedicated to the project, it is highly unlikely that all three trains would arrive at the SMR on the same day. The analysis in Section 4.12, Traffic and Transportation, was based upon two at grade crossings per peak hour (one in the AM and one in the PM), which is a reasonable worst case assuming 250 trains per year under normal operations. The intersection discussion focuses on the long-term impacts to at grade intersections and therefore, was based upon the normal operations of the unit trains. For these reasons, no change has been made to the at grade crossing intersection impact classification.
HEB-05	The Circulation Element of the South County Area Plan lists Willow Road as

and HEB-06	an arterial road. It is also shown as an arterial road in the Circulation Element of the South County Villages Plan. Therefore, the classification of Willow Road has not been changed in the EIR.
HEB-07	The use of hand thrown switches by itself is not a significant impact. The issue would be how the use of these switches affects on time performance of passenger trains. The RDEIR found that the addition of one crude oil unit train per day would not result in a significant impact to passenger train on-time performance. Therefore, mitigation is not required.
HEB-08 through HEB-11	The metrics used for the on-time performance of passenger trains is directly from the Federal Railroad Administration. The actual departure time is only for the origin station, which is the station where the rail route begins. This data was used to be consistent with the requirement of the Federal Railroad Administration for determining on-time performance of passenger trains. The Federal Railroad Administration's 80% goal for on-time arrival is calculated based upon the actual departure time from the originating station. This approach was used to allow for comparison to the Federal Railroad Administration's on-time goal. As shown in Table 4.12.5 (see Section 4.12, Transportation and Circulation) the baseline on-time performance of the Coast Starlight and Pacific Surfliner at the end point has been 80 percent or greater between April 2011 and March 2014. For the Pacific Surfliner the on-time performance at all stations has been greater than 85 percent over the same period. The all station on-time performance of the Coast Starlight has been only 61.2 percent over the same period. The significance criteria used in the analysis was "decrease the performance of public rail transit facilities to less than an 80% on-time performance at the end station, which is the acceptable level of service established by the Federal Railroad Administration for Amtrak trains." (see Section 4.12.3). As discuss in the RDEIR, the FRA quarterly reports show that for the period between April 2011 and March 2014 that about 20% of the delay minutes for the Pacific Surliner were on UPRR track. The remaining 80% occurred on BNSF, SCRRA, and SDNRR track (21% was on SCRRA track in Los Angeles, 29% was on BNSF track in Los Angeles/Orange Counties, and 30% was on SDNRR track in San Diego). As can be seen in Figure 4.12-4 50% of the track miles for the Pacific Surfliner are on UPRR track, 27% are on SCRRA track, 6% is on BNSF track, and 17% is on SDNRR track. This data would tend to indicate that travel on the UPRR mainline track is not the major cause of delay for the Pacific Surfliner, which is the track that would be used to deliver crude to the SMR. A conservative assumption would be to assume that the addition of the crude oil unit train to this portion of the Coast Line would double the delay times associated with FTI, RTE, and DSR for the Coast Starlight on this section of the route. Based upon this assumption, the delay minutes would increase from

	about 0.5% to 1% for the entire Coast Starlight route between San Diego and San Luis Obispo based upon the delay minutes provided by the FRA in the quarterly Amtrak performance reports. An analysis of the FRA quarterly Amtrak performance reports from April 2011 through March 2014 for the Pacific Surfliner shows that increasing delay minutes typically results in a decrease in the OTP at the train endpoint. While the data is not linear, in the vicinity of the average for the period stated above, an increase of 102 delay minutes per 10,000 train miles would decrease the OTP at the end station by about 1%. A 0.5% increase in delay minutes due to the crude oil trains would increase the average delay minutes per 10,000 train miles by about 26 minutes, which is small enough that it would not be expected to affect the end point OTP of the Pacific Surfliner.
HEB-12	The proposed expansion of the Price Canyon Oil Field might be able to deliver a maximum of 10,000 barrels per day to the SMR via pipeline. This would represent a 8,000 barrel increase over the historical deliveries from the Price Canyon Oil Field to the SMR. Delivery of an additional 8,000 barrels per day of oil to the SMR would not meet the basic objectives of the project. Therefore, it is not a viable alternative. The Price Canyon Oil Field Project is considered as part of the cumulative analysis (see Chapter 3.0). The issue of long-term crude supply to the SMR from local sources is very speculative. It is unknown what local crude oil development projects could occur in the future. Data provided in Comment CBE-78 estimates that in 2050 the upper end of locally produced crude that could be shipped to the SMR would be about 30,000 barrels per day. With the addition of 26,000 barrels per day that can be delivered by truck to the Santa Maria Refinery the upper end of the available crude supply would be 56,000 barrels per day, which is greater than the currently permitted capacity of the SMR, and the capacity under the Increased Throughput Project. While the estimated future oil production from local sources is not relevant to the assessment of impact of the Rail Spur Project, the forecast range presented in Comment CBE-78 does not take into account proposed new oil development project. For example, the Arroyo Grande Oil Field (AGOF) in San Luis Obispo has applied to the County to increase production to 10,000 barrels per day. If this project is approved it would increase the production from the AGOF by about 8,000 barrels, which would all go to the SMR. There are a number of other oil development projects currently proposed in northern Santa Barbara County that could add an additional 23,000 barrels per day of oil production that could be transported to the SMR. These include projects such as Santa Maria Energy, which would move 3,000 barrels per day via pipeline to the SMR, Pacific Coast Energy, which would move 3,600 barrels per day to the SMR via pipeline, and ERG Cat Canyon, which would move 5,000 barrels per day via pipeline to the SMR. A listing from Santa Barbara County shows a total of 943 oil production wells in various phases of development, all of which

	could provide oil to the SMR. A May 2014 report by the United States Energy Information Administration (EIA) estimated that as much as 13.7 billion barrels of oil may be recoverable from the Monterey Shale, of which some of this shale formation is in northern Santa Barbara County and Southern San Luis Obispo County. While it is unknown, when and if any of these reserves would be developed (and in what quantity), they could, in the future, provide local crude supply to the SMR. It is also possible in the future that the portions of the All American Pipeline between the Sisquoc Pump Station and Kern County could be reversed to allow crude oil to move to the Sisquoc pipeline. This portion of the All American Pipeline that connects to the Sisquoc Pipeline is currently used to move only OCS crude from Southern Santa Barbara County to Kern County and then on to refinery destination in the Bay Area and Los Angeles. When OCS production reaches a level where it does not make economic sense to operate this portion of the All American Pipeline, it could be reversed to move crude oil from the Kern County to the SMR. This would provide the SMR with access to other sources of crude. If and when this would happen is unknown and speculative, but it is a potential future option for obtaining crude for the SMR. The point of this discussion is to show that there are potential options in the future for the SMR to obtain crude oil without the rail project, however, they are unknown, and as with all crude supply issues, would be determined based upon market forces, including the future price of crude oil. This point can be illustrated by the past history of the crude supply at the SMR. In the 1970's the SMR did not receive any crude from offshore Santa Barbara County since none of this crude had been developed. With the development of the offshore crude, pipelines were built that allowed the SMR to receive this crude source. Now offshore crude from Santa Barbara is the major source of crude for the SMR. As this source of crude declines, it is likely that other sources of crude will become available to the SMR as discussed above. This would occur with or without the Rail Spur Project. What future crude is processed at the SMR will depend upon economic and market factors. Therefore, it would be speculative at best to estimate when the local crude supply would not be sufficient to support further operation of the SMR without the proposed Rail Spur Project.