From: "Cynthia M. Kennedy" <ckennedy@clarion.edu>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "jim@jimirving.com" <jim@jimirving.com>, "ktopping@calpoly.edu"
<ktopping@calpoly.edu>, "frenchbicycles@gmail.com"
<frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, "elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us"
<elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us>, "rhedges@co.slo.ca.us"
<rhedges@co.slo.ca.us>, "cray@co.slo.ca.us"
<cray@co.slo.ca.us>, "bgibson@co.slo.ca.us"
<bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, "ahill@co.slo.ca.us"
<ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, "darnold@co.slo.ca.us"
<darnold@co.slo.ca.us>, "fmecham@co.slo.ca.us"
<fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, "boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us"
<boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>, "lreynolds151@gmail.com"
<lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/23/2014 06:17 PM
Subject: Opposition to P66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr.Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Murry:
My husband and I are relatively new residents of SLO County and, frankly, are now questioning our decision to retire here. Indeed, the proposed Phillips 66 Rail Terminal project seems like a betrayal of the SLO County "vision" that factored strongly into our relocation. It is, simply put, corporate greed masquerading as a benevolent effort at "job creation." The reality is that Phillips 66 plans to maximize profits by capitalizing on the availability of lower-cost crude while assuring us that our objections are over-blown and unfounded.

Their profits will come at an unacceptable cost to all of us in SLO County and those costs and myriad risks are serious and frightening: air pollution that further increases an already unlawful situation on the Nipomo Mesa + the documented high risk for oil spills and fires + the well-documented potential for horrific explosions to enumerate just three.

KEC-01

Frankly, if you focus on the Phillips 66 war cry of "job creation" and their disingenuous assurances that they can and will "mitigate" all the potential dangers, you risk--at best--nothing less than irreversibly damaging the reputation of SLO County as a highly desirable place to live and work and visit. We've all seen the worst-case scenarios of exploding rail cars with human, environmental, and economic costs.

Phillips 66 also persists in perpetrating the lie that they "must" initiate this new method of operation in SLO County or their employees will suffer; more corporate blackmail of sorts. The facts are: 1) P66 plans to knowingly subject SLO County and the Nipomo Mesa to NEW HAZARDS AND DANGERS, and 2) If a genuine and comprehensive risk/benefit analysis was done, it would reveal the truth: these myriad risks to businesses and to we the citizens of SLO County eclipse the benefits that will accrue to Phillips 66.

For these reasons and more, our Planning Commissioners must vote "NO PROJECT."

Sincerely,
Cynthia M. Kennedy, Ph.D.

From: "Cynthia M. Kennedy" <ckennedy@clarion.edu>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "jim@jimirving.com" <jim@jimirving.com>, "ktopping@calpoly.edu"
<ktopping@calpoly.edu>, "frenchbicycles@gmail.com"
<frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, "elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us"
<elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us>, "rhedges@co.slo.ca.us"
<rhedges@co.slo.ca.us>, "cray@co.slo.ca.us"
<cray@co.slo.ca.us>, "bgibson@co.slo.ca.us"
<bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, "ahill@co.slo.ca.us"
<ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, "darnold@co.slo.ca.us"
<darnold@co.slo.ca.us>, "fmecham@co.slo.ca.us"
<fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, "boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us"
<boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>, "lreynolds151@gmail.com"
<lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/23/2014 06:37 PM
Subject: P66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr. Murry Wilson, SLO County Planning Department.

Dear Mr. Wilson:
The number of current and proposed oil-related projects in our area has escalated at a frightening and frenetic pace and includes not merely traditional drilling but also fracking, other unconventional oil extraction, and the importation of tar sands oil.

You know more than most the full scope of these projects in SLO County and northern Santa Barbara County: expansion of the Price Canyon oilfield; development of the Huasna Valley oilfield; exploration for oil on Porter Ranch; an industry initiative to probe for oil at over 7,700 regional drilling sites; and construction of a Rail Terminal at the Phillips 66 refinery for delivery of crude-by-rail. No doubt such proposals and projects will continue.

Like many others in SLO County, I strongly believe that the County must perform a "cumulative impact analysis" rather than looking at each one--including the Phillips 66 Terminal Project--on its own. I am puzzled that this has not been done; “cumulative impacts” have been a consideration for County projects, yet the Planning Commission has been addressing OIL-related proposals individually. Perhaps blinded by dollar signs, you have not initiated an across-the-board cumulative analysis reflecting the extreme upsurge in oil-related initiatives. Taken as a whole, this collection of projects will undoubtedly have serious, cumulative impacts for the entire region. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), cumulative impacts include “past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects”, which "when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.” KEC-02

Therefore, I strongly recommend a moratorium on individual oil project decisions until an in-depth, thoughtful, all-encompassing analysis is conducted and a vision established.

Sincerely,
Cynthia M. Kennedy

From: "Cynthia M. Kennedy" <ckennedy@clarion.edu>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "jim@jimirving.com" <jim@jimirving.com>, "ktopping@calpoly.edu"
<ktopping@calpoly.edu>, "frenchbicycles@gmail.com"
<frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, "elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us"
<elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us>, "rhedges@co.slo.ca.us"
<rhedges@co.slo.ca.us>, "cray@co.slo.ca.us"
<cray@co.slo.ca.us>, "bgibson@co.slo.ca.us"
<bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, "ahill@co.slo.ca.us"
<ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, "darnold@co.slo.ca.us"
<darnold@co.slo.ca.us>, "fmecham@co.slo.ca.us"
<fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, "boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us"
<boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>, "lreynolds151@gmail.com"
<lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/23/2014 06:56 PM
Subject: Opposition to P66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr. MurryWilson, SLO County Planning Department:

Dear Mr. Wilson:
My husband and I were well aware of SLO County's 2103 Annual Report when we chose this area to make our home. It boasted that "San Luis Obispo County is a safe, healthy, livable, prosperous, and well-governed community," and also indicated that those entrusted with SLO County governance and planning "assume responsibility for our actions and follow through on our commitments."

If the proposed Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project is approved--thus welcoming the delivery of a half-billion gallons of crude BY RAIL each year, those pledges will have been violated and renounced. It will be a betrayal of monstrous proportions and will belie the boasts quoted above.
My husband and I, like every citizen of SLO County, will be subjected to the quintessential opposite of this "safety", "health" and "caring." A veritable host of potential disasters and pollution will be loosed upon us.
This is not hyperbole, it is a fact.

Do not be duped by Phillips 66 and their alleged promises of "mitigating" outcomes because those outcomes should never have been introduced into SLO County in the first place. I and all citizens are depending on County leaders to live up to their pledges.

KEC-03

Sincerely,
Cynthia M. Kennedy

From: "Cynthia M. Kennedy" <ckennedy@clarion.edu>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Cc: "jim@jimirving.com" <jim@jimirving.com>, "ktopping@calpoly.edu"
<ktopping@calpoly.edu>, "frenchbicycles@gmail.com"
<frenchbicycles@gmail.com>, "elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us"
<elcarroll@co.slo.ca.us>, "rhedges@co.slo.ca.us"
<rhedges@co.slo.ca.us>, "cray@co.slo.ca.us"
<cray@co.slo.ca.us>, "bgibson@co.slo.ca.us"
<bgibson@co.slo.ca.us>, "ahill@co.slo.ca.us"
<ahill@co.slo.ca.us>, "darnold@co.slo.ca.us"
<darnold@co.slo.ca.us>, "fmecham@co.slo.ca.us"
<fmecham@co.slo.ca.us>, "boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us"
<boardofsups@co.slo.ca.us>, "lreynolds151@gmail.com"
<lreynolds151@gmail.com>
Date: 11/23/2014 07:11 PM
Subject: Opposition to P66 Rail Terminal Project

Mr. Murry Wilson
SLO County Planning Department

Dear Mr. Wilson:
Contrary to what Phillips 66 would have us believe, the economic life and reputation of our county is not dependent on their Rail Project being approved, nor is our economic well being dependent on 1.5 mile-long trains laden with dangerous crude oil crossing our entire county 260 times each year.

Our economic lives are dependent more on the leisure & hospitality, agriculture, retail and real estate industries. Our economic well being is dependent on the contributions of local businesses, NOT on satisfying the corporate objectives set by a cabal of Phillips' executives in Houston, Texas, who plan to expand their profits with their "crude-by-rail" strategy. KEC-04

Moreover, I and many others in the county know that SLO county's economy, our continued growth, high quality of life, desirability, and natural beauty--which, quite literally brought my husband and I here--will be seriously jeopardized by bringing in 20,800 tank cars of crude oil by rail, year after year. At the very least, our economic health will be in peril, let alone our lives. I ask you to REJECT the Phillips Rail Terminal project.

Cynthia M. Kennedy, Ph.D.

KEC-01	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 air pollution, aesthetics and visual resources, hazards and economics are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
KEC-02	The EIR addresses cumulative impacts in each issue area. The Price Canyon expansion is included in the cumulative project list (see Table 3.1 in Chapter 3.0, Cumulative Projects Description). The Huasna Oil Project has been denied by the SLOC Supervisors and was therefore not included. The Porter Ranch Project is for drilling and testing of one exploratory oil/gas well on one existing pad. The project would be completed within 3 months of initial drilling, where at such time the well would be closed. No further oil related activities would be allowed on the site without subsequent discretionary permit approval. This project was not a known project at the time the NOP was issued, and based upon its current status, would likely be complete prior to any construction activities at the SMR for the Rail Spur Project. Therefore, it has not been included in the cumulative project list. However, projects that are speculative or have not been discussed with the Planning Department are generally not included in the cumulative analysis. Development of area oil company prospectuses would not be included in an EIR cumulative analysis. CEQA requires that project be included that are in "projections contained in an adopted local, regional or statewide plan, or related planning document" or that are "past, present, and probable future projects". Future projects that are not in the planning stages are considered speculative.
KEC-03	The comment does not request changes in the RDEIR's analysis of the Project's potential impacts, including potential land use conflicts, increased hazards, or consistency with applicable plans and policies. Therefore, no revisions or additional information is required. While the RDEIR discusses potential inconsistencies with applicable planning documents, the decision of whether a proposed project is consistent with a particular plan or policy must ultimately be made by the local decision-making body. The comment has been included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
KEC-04	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 quality of life vs. Phillip 66 profits and economics are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.