From: Rosemary Nelson <rosemarynelson@me.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/20/2014 01:07 PM
Subject: Opposition to Phillips 66 Rail Terminal Project

Dear Mr. Wilson,

As a new residents of the Trilogy community on the Nipomo Mesa my husband and I are so impressed with the natural beauty of this area. We have come to learn how unique the dunes are on this part of the coast. An "environmental treasure" as they have been described. The back of our home faces Highway 1 and we can see the dunes and the ocean. We also can see the Phillips 66 plant and it's lights at night. This is all part of our environment now and we feel fortunate to be here in San Luis Obispo county. NER-01

Phillips 66 Rail Spur project would change what we have come to know and love. Our scenic vista and that of our neighbors would be destroyed. We would now look upon an industrial complex with railroad tracks, trains and an uploading facility. Bright lights destroying the night sky would allow work to go on at all hours. Noise from the train yards would be ever present with trains coming and going and repairs ongoing. NER-02 Our air quality, which is already a concern as it violates state health standards more than
70 days per year, would become even more damaging to our health. The strong possibility of tar sands crude being refined would create enough pollution to make the environment unlivable especially for "vulnerable"
populations, i.e., people with preexisting medical condition, children and the elderly. NER-03

A broader and even more profound consequence of the Proposed Phillips 66 Rail Spur would be the permanent environmental, social and financial damage to San Luis Obispo county. We can only begin to estimate the effects of this damage. Some possibilities would be catastrophic such as a oil car train derailment. In that case the potential of lost lives and damage to the environment would be unthinkable. Imagine the effects of an oil fire on vineyards and agriculture with black smoke filling the air and settling on the soil. Recovery would be decades. NER-04

I have touched on what seems to me a few major points but there is so much more that can and will be said by others in opposition to the Phillips proposal. Everyone I speak to about the project agrees that if allowed to go forward the Phillips Rail Spur would ruin our SLO county. PLEASE VOTE NO PROJECT. We cannot let this happen. NER-05

Thank you.

Rosemary Nelson
1928 Eucalyptus Road
Nipomo, CA 93444

NER-01	This comment is a general statement about the commenter's opinion about the general project area. The comment does not identify a specific environmental analysis or CEQA issue relative to the EIR and compliance with CEQA. The commenter's opinion is included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
NER-02	The RDEIR acknowledges visibility of new night lights from the surrounding areas and identifies substantial mitigation measures to minimize any potentially adverse effects. At the unloading facility all lights would be mounted under the proposed canopy. Forty of these canopy lights would be placed 60-feet apart, and 30 of them would be 20-feet apart. Lighting for the rail spur would only be for perimeter fencing security purposes and would be placed on 15-foot tall poles, 500 feet apart. The project proposes to the construct the unloading facility and rail spur tracks adjacent to the southern slopes of a natural landform ridge. This adjacent landform rises to elevations ranging from approximately 120 to 145 feet above sea level. The proposed rail spur tracks are proposed at an elevation of approximately 94 feet above sea level, which would be as much as 55 feet lower than the landform to the north. As a result, views of the unloading facility and railroad spur from the north and the northeast would be substantially blocked. In addition, the eastern segment of the rail spur tracks, closest to Highway 1, are proposed to be constructed in an excavated area maintaining the approximately 94-foot elevation while the adjacent ground rises up eastward, resulting in the easternmost end of the tracks being approximately 20 feet below the surrounding natural terrain. This elevation difference, along with the required 10 to 20-foot tall mitigation berm, would combine for an approximately 30 to 40-foot tall earthen visual screen around the eastern end of the railroad spur. This berm height in combination with the natural ridge to the north will help reduce visibility of night lighting for viewpoints from the east, including elevated viewpoints associated with residential and recreational development. The lighting associated with the unloading facility would be viewed at a distance of approximately 1.5 miles or more from viewpoints east of Highway 1, and would be seen in the context of the Santa Maria Refinery immediately to the north. In addition the unloading facility proposes a covered canopy over the majority of the area, which would decrease light-trespass. Similar to the lack of visibility of the existing oil refinery's illuminated ground-plane, intervening topography would block views of the illuminated ground-plane of the unloading facility as seen from Highway 1 and the residential areas to the east. Although the unloading facility lights would introduce light into a new area, with applied mitigation measures they would not appear out of place given the relatively close proximity to the existing refinery and coke processing facility, which emits high levels of industrial lighting throughout the night, every night of the year.

	In addition to the applicant-proposed lighting features such as downward-directed lights with fully shielded lenses, the RDEIR requires substantial mitigation measures that will minimize lighting impacts. Mitigation measures include that the lighting plan be based on a photometric study prepared by a qualified engineer who is an active member of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA), using guidance and best practices endorsed by the International Dark Sky Association. Mitigation measures preclude illumination of adjacent slopes, prohibit placement of perimeter lights (which as previously described would be 15-feet tall) east of the screening berm (which as previously described would be 10 to 20- feet tall), and require the use of motion detectors rather than being continuously on. Importantly, following project completion the RDEIR requires the preparation of a Lighting Evaluation Report for review and approval by the County Department of Planning and Building prepared by a qualified lighting engineer not involved in the design of the original lighting plan. The Lighting Evaluation Report will conduct a comprehensive evaluation of in-place lighting, under all expected circumstances, and will require correction of any unexpected or residual lighting impacts based on direct observation of the completed project. The air quality mitigation that would limit rail car unloading from between 7 A.M. and 7 P.M. would also serve to reduce the nighttime lighting impacts to less than significant. The RDEIR Aesthetics section considers all public viewpoints surrounding the project, and specifically addresses viewpoints associated with the developments east of Highway 1. The project location was directly viewed and analyzed from each of these potential viewpoints. The analysis, potential impacts and mitigation measures identified in the RDEIR Aesthetic section include and specifically address views from the residential and recreational developments east of Highway 1. The RDEIR identifies and acknowledges potential impacts to the scenic vista and requires mitigation measures such as the screening berm which would reduce those impacts to a less than significant level. The RDEIR also notes that the project would not block views of the Pacific Ocean, sweeping coastline, dunes, riparian corridors, or agricultural field patterns.
NER-03	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.
NER-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 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.
NER-05	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.