From: Nancy Mauter <osomauter3@att.net>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/17/2014 08:23 AM
Subject: Rail Spur Extension

I am writing to oppose the plan for a Rail Spur Extension and Crude Oil Unloading Facility (Rail Spur Project) to be built at the Santa Maria Refinery (SMR) in Nipomo.
My fundamental objection is the Class I air quality issues which would exceed the thresholds for greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions within the State of California as well as the Energy-wise plan adopted by the County of San Luis Obispo. The County's goal is to reduce GHG emissions by 15% below baseline (2005) by the year 2020. The operational pollutant emissions associated with operation of the Rail Spur Project within the County would exceed the SLOCAPCD thresholds and doesn't work towards the State's goal as well.
I base this concern on the following points:

(AQ.3): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route outside of SLO County associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate criteria pollutant emissions that exceed thresholds. Given the speed limit restrictions (less than 30 mph)on trains along the route through cities with San Luis Obispo being one of them.

(AQ.5): Operational activities of trains along the mainline rail route associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate toxic emissions that exceed thresholds. The 30 year cancer risk would exceed the SLOCAPCD thresholds beyond the railroad right-of-way.

(AQ.6): Operational activities associated with the Rail Spur Project would generate GHG (greenhouse gas) emissions that exceed SLOCAPCD thresholds.
There is also the concern about the processing of Alberta bitumen: it has higher concentrations of toxic components like sulfur, copper, nickel, nitrogen, lead, and benzene than conventional crude.
Facilities that process Alberta bitumen release higher levels of sulfur dioxide which is associated with higher levels of asthma, respiratory weakness, cardiovascular problems, and higher cancer risk. Sulfur dioxide exposure is dangerous to people who have existing heart and lung conditions. The second draft states that North Dakota oil would not be processed. But there was no mention of Canadian tar sands oil being restricted so that opens the door for this substance to be processed. MAN-01

Of the 13 key impacts outlined in the EIR report 10 are Class 2 or Class 1.
That is a lot of mitigating to reduce the impact to not significant. How much mitigation does it take to make a very bad idea based on corporate profit a reasonable idea? MAN-02

Our county is a beautiful place to live and we want to keep it a safe, healthy, beautiful and economically vibrant. The negative impact of this project just doesn't affect the Nipomo Mesa but all of San Luis Obispo County. Many of the residents of San Luis Obispo County moved here specifically to have a quality of life free of heavy industrial development. SLO County planners have approved residential growth and master-planned communities as desirable land use on the western Nipomo Mesa. The natural beauty of this area is a draw for development. The County has also made a commitment to reduce GHG emissions and has programs that encourage it's residents to ride their bike, carpool, and build buildings energy efficiently. MAN-03

This Phillips 66 expansion doesn't support any of these ideals.

Nancy Mauter
1831 Doris
Los Osos, Calif.

MAN-01	The purpose of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is to inform governmental decision makers and the public about the significant environmental effects of a proposed project. The RDEIR addresses the potential impacts and recommends mitigation measures for the proposed Project consistent with the requirements of CEQA. Section 4.0 (Environmental Assessment) presents the environmental analysis for the CEQA mandated issue areas; air quality and GHG impacts are discussed in Section 4.3 (Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases). 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.
MAN-02	This comment refers to key impacts outlined in the report. Of the 13 issue areas, not key impacts, outlined in the EIR, 10 issue areas have been found to have impacts that are Class I or II. The reader may refer to the Impact Summary Tables and Section 4.0, Environmental Analysis, of the RDEIR for a more detailed discussion of the impacts and associated mitigation measures for the Rail Spur Project.
MAN-03	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 land use, aesthetics and visual resources, and greenhouse gases are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.