

From: Richard Mathes <richardmathes4@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/13/2014 07:54 AM
Subject: Phillips Refinery Proposed expansion

Dear Sirs:,

It is with great concern that I have watched the debate unfold about Phillip's Refinery's proposed expansion on Nipomo Mesa.

I have several reasons for concern and will address two in this letter. First, I have no confidence in the railroad companies being able to guarantee public safety in the transport of crude oil in any form into this county. I have personal knowledge of what excessively long trains and a poorly maintained infrastructure can do because I was living in Siskiyou County when at least two such trains derailed in the canyon running from Mt. Shasta to Redding. One of these killed all the fish in that part of the Sacramento River for at least two years. The proposal to bring in crude by rail necessitates its being transferred from the north or the south into our area. In each case, it is necessary to travel those trains through highly populated areas. A near train accident involving a propane truck threatened the entire town of Mt. Shasta. Fortunately, the train was stopped with little time to spare before it would have collided with that stalled truck. Yet, this was potentially of much smaller consequence than that posed by the trains that are wanted to be brought into this county. We, all the citizens potentially involved, cannot afford the risk to our safety, health and livelihoods, yet powerful interests with seeming distain to these potential dangers want to go "full speed ahead".

MAR-01

Secondly, I worked in the oilfields in the Taft area. I witnessed an oil corporation's cavalier attitude about risking my life and that of the other crew members in the interest of saving money. Then too, we all remember the Gulf oil spill. This was 100% avoidable as was the incident I was personally involved in. Sadly, there have been too many train derailments and too many incidents of oil companies betting that their cost cutting methods would not result in dangerous consequences. I survived my close encounters. The men on that platform in the Gulf did not. Again, the citizens facing potential harm from such practices cannot afford the risk.

It concerns me greatly that our leaders are not responding more assertively to these threats. Gentlemen, is "the fix in?"

From: Richard Mathes <richardmathes4@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/12/2014 01:06 PM
Subject: P66 proposed rail spur

Dear Mr. Wilson:

It is with great concern that I have watched the debate unfold about Phillip's Refinery's proposed expansion on Nipomo Mesa.

I have several reasons for concern and will address two in this letter. First, I have no confidence in the railroad companies being able to guarantee public safety in the transport of crude oil in any form into this county. I have personal knowledge of what excessively long trains and a poorly maintained infrastructure can do because I was living in Siskiyou County when at least two such trains derailed in the canyon running from Mt. Shasta to Redding. One of these killed all the fish in that part of the Sacramento River for at least two years. The proposal to bring in crude by rail necessitates its being transferred from the north or the south into our area. In each case, it is necessary to travel those trains through highly populated areas. This poses an extreme risk to all the citizens in the path of those trains. Given the poor safety record of the rail industry, it would to be a matter of "when" and not "if" a large spill or derailment would occur in this County. The likelihood of such an accident is exacerbated by the dangers posed by Cuesta Grade. Secondly, the air quality on the Nipomo Mesa is already poor due to sand off the Dunes and particulate matter from the Phillips Refinery. Their proposal, to transport crude into our area will greatly add to the already existing problem. This increased health risk will be evidenced all along the train routes because of the use of diesel engines. Finally, Phillips will have no incentive to deal with these increases because they can utilize energy credits to absolve themselves of this responsibility.

MAR-02

It seems that Phillips has no real concern for the safety and life style of all those who are potentially effected by their proposal. In the pursuit of cheaper crude, all else is seconded. Solutions such as utilizing existing pipelines and local supplies exist for them that would not pose the hazards that are rife in their Proposal. I am hopeful of a resounding "No" vote by all of San Luis Obispo County's officials that are involved in this matter. The health, safety and lifestyle of all of us are being threatened by this Proposal.

Sincerely,
Richard A. Mathes

From: Richard Mathes <richardmathes4@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/14/2014 08:35 AM
Subject: Phillips 66 rail spur proposal

Dear Mr. Wilson:

I continue to have many concerns about the proposed rail spur expansion of Phillips 66.

In this letter I would like to address two of these. First, Phillips 66 is proposing an entirely new business plan. In the past and currently, they receive no oil by rail. All of it is received by pipeline, and this can be increased with little or no risk. Although this alternative is more costly in terms of the purchase price for the oil, it is much cheaper when compared to the many environmental and health risks that the rail Spur proposal threatens to visit upon us. This is compounded by the increased threat to citizens living on any of the five possible railroad entry points into California. All this suggests a business plan that is rife with consequences for all except Phillips 66.

MAR-03

My second point seems like it should be a huge red flag to this proposal going forward. Not only are there many threats to all those impacted by this proposal, but this refinery is entirely located within the Coastal Protection Zone that is west of Highway 1. The only reason that I can figure that this happened is that they've been here long enough to have been grandfathered in when the Coastal Commission first came into being. Now, today, I think it highly unlikely that that refinery could even be built on its present location. Why then, with all the attention given to environmental issues in this zone, is it that the Phillips 66 Rail Spur proposal is even being considered?

MAR-04

Phillips 66 has admitted that pollution - chemical, light, and noise will be greatly increased. They seem to have a corporation's interest in their own profits and nothing else. A "No" vote is badly needed and is hoped for by all concerned citizens that are relying on this County's officials to protect us, our safety, our health, and our life style.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Mathes

From: Richard Mathes <richardmathes4@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/17/2014 04:39 PM
Subject: Phillips 66 rail spur proposal

Dear Mr. Wilson:

In this letter, I want to discuss the threat to all residents in San Luis Obispo County, our life style, our health, and our safety that is posed by the profit driven mind set of Phillips 66. I have, in previous letters discussed my concerns about the rail industry's poor safety record and the dangers of transporting oil into our area by rail.

Now, let's look at Phillips 66. They are a corporation. As such, they are dictated to by their stock holders. These stockholders, far removed from the realities that face us, tend to be concerned with the "bottom line" the profit that accrues to them by virtue of the number of stocks that they own. Typically, they don't know and don't care about the consequences of this motive.

This necessity to provide profit to the stockholders is a reality that corporations that are publically traded cannot ignore. It partially explains what even a cursory examination of corporate history shows to be a glaring lack of concern for anything but profits. Financial empires are being created that have the power to dictate terms to countries. British Petroleum, for example, was instrumental in a CIA coup that reinstalled the Shah in Iran and began the process of turning that country into the enemy that it is today. Then too, it is common knowledge that the oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico was 100% avoidable. However, the corporate mindset was to save money and play the odds that everything would be all right. In this case, it wasn't and eleven men died. This thinking also led to the first Space Shuttle's blowing up. A launch at such cold temperatures had never been attempted. Warning was given and ignored. People died. This pervasive corporate mindset is not limited to oil companies, but they have been perpetrators of it in many cases. My own life was risked in similar thinking when I worked in the oil fields in the Taft area. I survived, but as shown above, others have not been so fortunate.

Phillips 66 has shown itself to be interested in their own profit first. They seem to think that the cheaper oil that can be acquired via rail transport is the way to facilitate this. This new business plan, they've never brought in oil by rail to this area before, either second the concerns of all that are potentially effected or ignores them altogether.

We continue to rely on you, the decision makers, for protection from this corporation that is only concerned with its own profit and is more than willing to pursue this profit at our expense.

Sincerely,

Rich Mathes

MAR-05

From: Richard Mathes <richardmathes4@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/21/2014 04:53 PM
Subject: Poorly conceived Phillips 66 plan

Dear Mr. Wilson:

In this letter, I would like to say a word for two groups that so far have remained silent on the subject of Phillips 66's profit driven plan to use rail traffic to bring more crude into its refinery on Lompoc Mesa.

The first group are those who haven't yet heard of the potential dangers to our health, safety, and lifestyle that this plan poses. I have good reason to think that there are many. People I've spoken to and those spoken to by some of my friends and acquaintances have strongly reinforced my belief that, given more time, the floodgates of dissent would be opened even wider than they are now. Along with the near universal resistance to this project, two other ideas are frequently shared. How has this plan even gotten off the ground? Given all the dangers that it poses and will bring should it be adopted, the answer should be a resounding "No". Also questioned is the apparent lack of mention of zoning restrictions. After all, Viva Farms tried to exceed its zoning mandate and was stopped. The environmental dangers of the Phillips project greatly surpass those posed by Viva Farms, and they would take place in the Coastal Protection Zone.

MAR-06

MAR-07

The second group that are, at this point unable to express concerns about the proposed project, are those whose health will be adversely effected if this project gains approval. This group includes residents living near the rail lines or downwind from the Phillips 66 plant who would have to move because of compromised breathing caused or worsened by the pollutants that would be put into the air by this proposal. It includes grandchildren who could not visit these areas. It includes those who are more likely to develop asthma as is the case in areas such as Fresno, and it includes those who will suffer cancer or other illnesses because of the above mentioned pollutants. This group cannot yet speak because they have not yet materialized. But, if they do materialize, it will be too late.

MAR-08

Please, these two groups and all the rest of us need you, the decision makers, to protect us and give a resounding "No" to the Phillip66 proposal.

MAR-09

Thanks,

Richard Mathes

Responses to Richard A. Mathes Comments

MAR-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 the safety and environmental impacts of the project are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
MAR-02	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 the safety and environmental impacts of the project are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
MAR-03	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's statements about the increase risk of using rail instead of pipelines, and impacts of an accident are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
MAR-04	Most of the Project Site is located within the Coastal Zone and subject to the requirements of the California Coastal Act and San Luis Obispo County Coastal Zone Framework for Planning and Coastal Plan Policies (refer to Section 4.8). Industrial activities are not prohibited in the Coastal Zone. It is the County's responsibility as Lead Agency to analyze the proposed Project through its standard permit application process. The potential effects of the proposed Rail Spur Project (i.e., pollution, chemicals, light, and noise) have been addressed in Chapter 4 of the RDEIR. The Project's compatibility with surrounding land uses and applicable plans and policies is discussed in Section 4.8 and Appendix G of the RDEIR. 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.
MAR-05	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 Phillips 66 profits are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
MAR-06	This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. No further response is required.
MAR-07	Applicable zoning and land use standards associated with the Project Site, and the Rail Spur Project's potential consistency with applicable standards and policies, are addressed in Appendix G of the RDEIR. As discussed in those

Responses to Richard A. Mathes Comments

	<p>sections, the proposed use is generally consistent with the Industrial zoning designation and existing operations at SMR. Other potential inconsistencies with applicable policies are discussed in detail in Section 4.8 of the RDEIR (Land Use and Recreation).</p> <p>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.</p>
MAR-08	<p>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.</p>
MAR-09	<p>This comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. No further response is required.</p>