

From: "Peggy" <mmidling@pacbell.net>
To: <p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 10/11/2014 01:52 PM
Subject: Phillips 66 rail extension

Dear Mr. Wilson:

After reading about all of the rail accidents involving crude and refined oil, I believe our county is asking for trouble (and possible liability) for letting the extension go forward. Even though if the zoning at Phillips might be sufficient for a rail hookup, chances are it was zoned years ago, when there were very few residences or small businesses in that particular area. Now it has become more developed.

In addition, if I'm any judge of topography, I don't see how any route from Phillips to the existing tracks could be effected without having a fairly steep downhill slope before connecting to the existing rail. This slope, coupled with the volatility of the oil tanks, would seem to me to be a further hazard.

Hopefully, this extension will not b permitted.

Sincerely,

Peggy Midling

MIP-01

Responses to Peggy Midling Comments

MIP-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 land use and hazards are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
--------	---