



MICHAEL JUVET

1343 Vicki Lane

Nipomo, CA 93444

November 19, 2014

**Mr. Murry Wilson
County Planning and Building
976 Osos Street room 300
San Louis Obispo, CA 93408**

Dear Mr. Wilson,

I'm writing to share my concerns and urge a "NO PROJECT" decision on the proposed rail spur and increased operation desired by the Phillip 66 refinery in Nipomo. The updated EIR under review has serious safety concerns. The reason for building the rail spur and increasing the operation at the refinery are stated by Phillips 66 to provided a way to obtain crude oil from sources but no goal statement of increased volume of oil production. If there is an economic gain to the community, it seems that could only be with increased production. My viewpoint is that the current proposal is a precursor to future refinery plans to increase the capacity to refine crude oil. Thus more trains.

JUM-01

The cost of the plan includes the unacceptable impact to the health andn safety to SLO county residents and visitors. The EIR lists many Class 1 violations including several that are air quality contributors. I do not want to breath the air particles every day and I think of my children and grandchild should not be subjected to all the toxic air that will increase with the Phillips 66 plan. The impact to the children needs to be the highest priority concern as the long term effects for the future is not as clear as the more studied and known impact to older adults with heart and breathing issues.

JUM-02

"NO PROJECT" is the only decision that recognizes that minimal economic impact in the near term cannot be at the cost of the health and safety of individuals. Class 1 issues must not be accepted.

JUM-03

I appreciate having a voice in this process.

Mike Juvet
Voter and resident

Responses to Michael Juvet Comments

| | |
|--------|---|
| JUM-01 | The comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's statements about future plans for the refinery are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project. |
| JUM-02 | The RDEIR addresses the potential impacts and recommends mitigation measures for the proposed Project consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Section 4.3 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases) addresses GHG emissions, criteria air emissions and health risks. 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. The EIR took special account of the impacts to children by assessing toxic pollutant emissions impacts using the revised OEHHA guidelines, which adds additional protections for children. |
| JUM-03 | The comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's statements about No Project Alternative are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project. |