

From: Paul Hinson <[pismoragman@hotmail.com](mailto:pismoragman@hotmail.com)>  
To: "[p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[jim@jimirling.com](mailto:jim@jimirling.com)"  
<[jim@jimirling.com](mailto:jim@jimirling.com)>, "[ktopping@calpoly.edu](mailto:ktopping@calpoly.edu)"  
<[ktopping@calpoly.edu](mailto:ktopping@calpoly.edu)>, "[frenchbicycles@gmail.com](mailto:frenchbicycles@gmail.com)"  
<[frenchbicycles@gmail.com](mailto:frenchbicycles@gmail.com)>, "[elcarrol@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:elcarrol@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[elcarrol@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:elcarrol@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[rhedges@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:rhedges@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[rhedges@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:rhedges@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[cray@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:cray@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[cray@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:cray@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[bgibson@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:bgibson@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[bgibson@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:bgibson@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[ahill@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:ahill@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[ahill@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:ahill@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[darnold@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:darnold@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[darnold@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:darnold@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[fmecham@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:fmecham@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[fmecham@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:fmecham@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us)>, "[lreynolds151@gmail.com](mailto:lreynolds151@gmail.com)"  
<[lreynolds151@gmail.com](mailto:lreynolds151@gmail.com)>  
Date: 11/12/2014 08:07 PM  
Subject: Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project

11/11/14

Mr. Murry Wilson, San Luis Obispo County planning department

I am writing in regard to the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project.  
As a citizen of Slo County I am opposed to this project being allowed in our communities.  
The mere concept of 260 trains times two annually that are over a mile long intruding into our communities with increased noise, lights and high potential for a rail car accident/ spill is unfathomable.  
Slo county does not need this project.

HIP-01

"Please support the No Project alternative"

Respectfully

Paul Hinson  
912 Albert Way  
Nipomo CA  
93444

805 286 7365

November 13, 2014

Murry Wilson

SLO County Department of Planning and Building

976 Osos St., Room #200

San Luis Obispo, CA 93408

Mr. Murry:

I am writing in regard to the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project.

I live in San Luis Obispo County and don't feel the Phillips 66 Rail Project is a right fit for our county. I have read the REIR and am concerned about the noise levels of hundreds of trains traveling through our quiet cities.

Our county is home to students, working class and entrepreneurs who work hard to create and sustain our quality of life.

I support the No Project Alternative.

Sincerely,

Pail Hinson



912 Albert Way

Nipomo, CA 93444

HIP-02

From: Paul Hinson <[pismoragman@hotmail.com](mailto:pismoragman@hotmail.com)>  
To: "[p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)"  
<[p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us](mailto:p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us)>  
Date: 11/18/2014 06:27 PM  
Subject: Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr. Murry Wilson, Slo County Planning Department

I am writing in regard to the Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project.

As a concerned citizen of San Luis Obispo County I am opposed to this project being allowed in our communities.

The mere concept of 260 trains annually that ARE over a mile and a half long intruding into our communities with increased noise,

lights and High potential for a rail accident Spill is unfathomable.

SLO COUNTY DOES NOT NEED THIS PROJECT!!

Thank you for your consideration

Respectfully

Paul Hinson  
912 Albert Way  
Nipomo 93444

HIP-03

## Responses to Paul Hinson Comments

---

HIP-01 and HIP-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 noise, aesthetics and visual resources and hazards are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.</p> <p>As shown in Appendix A of the RDEIR each of the 80 tank cars and two buffer cars would be 60 feet long, and the three locomotives would be 90 feet long. This would make the total train length 5,190 feet (<math>82*60+90*3=5,190</math>), not over one mile long as stated in the comment.</p>
HIP-02	<p>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 (Noise and Vibration) 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. Based on in-field monitoring and modeling, noise impacts would be less than significant with mitigation (Class II).</p>