From: Gail Ryan <2gsnana@gmail.com>
To: "p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us"
<p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us>
Date: 11/23/2014 09:26 AM
Subject: Opposition to Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project

Mr. Murray Wilson, SLO County Planning Department

This note is to urge the County Plan Board to recommend against the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project because the outcomes would be contrary to land use plans, RYA-01
health, safety and environmental impacts. It would not provide significant benefits to residents, visitors and commerce in San Luis Obispo County. RYA-02

I live in Nipomo. At the time I bought my house, I was not aware of the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project. I have lived in many parts of this country and none compare to the beauty of the central coast. This is why my husband and I choose to retire here. The Phillips 66 rail spur would be visible from our area. The the excessive light and noise at the site will have a very negative effect on our way of life that we worked so hard to obtain. RYA-03

I urge you to preserve the quality of life that we and a large portion of San Luis Obispo County currently enjoy. RYA-04

Thank you,

Gail Ryan
1836 Nathan Way
Nipomo, CA. 93444
Sent from my iPad

From: Gail Ryan <2gsnana@gmail.com>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/23/2014 09:45 AM
Subject: Phillips 66 Rail Project

This note is to urge the County Plan Board to recommend against the Phillips 66 Rail Spur Project because the outcomes would be contrary to land use plans, health, safety and environmental impacts. It would not provide significant benefits to residents, visitors and commerce in San Luis Obispo County

The revised environmental impact report describes a number of Class I consequences of the Project. These include: a) exacerbating the current unhealthy amount of particulate and toxic air pollution; b) great danger from off-site accidents involving insufficiently safe tank cars, especially on the Cuesta Grade and through the cities; c) inadequate local capability to respond to likely emergency scenarios; and d) deleterious and agricultural effects from spills and accidents. Each of these effects alone might be sufficient to stop the Project, the combination of them makes it absolutely unacceptable.

I urge you to not allow this project to go forward.

Thank you for your time,

Gail Ryan
1836 Nathan Way
Nipomo, Ca 93444

Sent from my iPad

Responses to Gail Ryan Comments

RYA-01 And RYA-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 land use, health, safety, environmental impacts, and lack of benefits to the community are included in the FEIR for the decision-makers' consideration as part of the County's deliberations on the proposed project.
RYA-03	The RDEIR acknowledges that the rail spur tracks and associated trail cars would encroach into views of the open space southeast of the Santa Maria Refinery. Although those existing open space views already include railroad tracks and trains, the RDEIR 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 result in any blockage of views of the Pacific Ocean, sweeping coastline, dunes, riparian corridors, or agricultural field patterns. The existing visual setting as seen from the surrounding areas including the residential developments east of Highway 1 include the Santa Maria Refinery, coke processing plant, railroad tracks and other industrial support facilities. The proposed unloading facility, which would be more than 1.5 miles away from Highway 1 and points east, would be constructed on an already highly disturbed work-zone. With applied mitigation the project would appear as a logical extension of the existing industrial facility, with a similar level of visual compatibility as what currently exists. 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 be sufficient to reduce visibility of the project to a less than significant level for viewpoints from the east, including elevated viewpoints on Via Concha, Louise Lane, Eucalyptus Road, Thomas Court, and other viewing areas. 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 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 project would introduce light into a new area, the required berm in combination with the natural ridge to the north will help reduce visibility of night lighting for viewpoints from the east, including elevated viewpoints in the Trilogy development and other public viewpoints. With applied mitigation measures new lighting would not appear out of place given the relatively close proximity to the existing Santa Maria Refinery and coke processing facility, which emits high levels of industrial lighting 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 through expertise and photometric-based design and technology, based on established dark-sky principles. 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.
RYA-04	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.