From: Stephanie Hinson <wamukid@hotmail.com>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/12/2014 08:07 PM
Subject: Phillips 66 rail terminal project

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department:

I am writing to convey my dismay at the very thought of SLO County approving the Phillips 66 rail terminal project.

Phillips 66 is currently using the pipeline method to transport their crude. This has worked and worked well over the years with minimal problematic impact to SLO county.

We live in a wonderful, picturesque county where we pride ourselves with the beauty and scenic coastal views of our area.

With that said, why, would we want to see our beautiful landscape dotted with 520 (to start) one and a half mile oil tanker cars traveling through our pristine environment annually that present potential chemical hazards, increased noise, traffic and blight to our serene existence.

You have the power to say no. Please support the "NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE".

HIS-01

Sincerely,

Stephanie Hinson

Sent from my iPad

NOV 18
SLO CO PLANNING & BLDG

November 14, 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 am vehemently opposed to the Phillips 66 Rail Project. I have read the REIR and am concerned about the potential for derailments that could harm our peaceful community.

HIS-02

Why would we want to risk a hazardous spill which would potentially destroy our environment for years to come?

I support the No Project Alternative.

Sincerely,

Stephanie Hinson

912 Albert Way

Nipomo, CA 93444

From: Stephanie Hinson <wamukid@hotmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/18/2014 06:23 PM
Subject: The Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department:

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

The fact that we are even considering this rail project to go through our environmentally sensitive cities is a surprise to me.

Why would we want these potentially hazardous group of 80+ oil tankers, five days a week traveling through our communities? The inevitable spills, the noise, the smell, all don't belong here. HIS-03

Please protect our environment and say no to this project.

Sincerely,

Stephanie hinson
SLO County Resident

Sent from my iPad

From: Stephanie Hinson <wamukid@hotmail.com>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/23/2014 03:51 PM
Subject: Phillips 66 rail terminal project

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department:

I am writing to convey my dismay at the very thought of SLO County approving the Phillips 66 rail terminal project.

Phillips 66 is currently using the pipeline method to transport their crude. This has worked and worked well over the years with minimal problematic impact to SLO county.

We live in a wonderful, picturesque county where we pride ourselves with the beauty and scenic coastal views of our area.

With that said, why, would we want to see our beautiful landscape dotted with 520 (to start) one and a half mile oil tanker cars traveling through our pristine environment annually that present potential chemical hazards, increased noise, traffic and blight to our serene existence.

You have the power to say no. Please support the "NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE".

HIS-04

Sincerely,

Stephanie Hinson

Sent from my iPad

HIS-01 through HIS-04	These comments do not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's concerns about hazards, safety, noise, traffic, aesthetics and visual resources and odor are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project. 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 (82*60+90*3=5,190), not 1.5 miles long as stated in the comment.