From: Rose Ann Witt <rawitt@verizon.net>
To: p66-railspur-comments@co.slo.ca.us
Date: 11/21/2014 02:29 PM
Subject: Say NO to the Phillips 66 oil train proposal

As a concerned mother and Californian, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. This project creates significant, unavoidable, and unnecessary risks for our communities and our climate. WIR-01

Our rail system was designed to connect population centers, not move hazardous crude oil. Emergency responders are not prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards will not protect the public.
The San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors must reject the Phillips 66 Santa Maria oil train proposal. WIR-02

Crude oil trains threaten the safety of families along rail routes. Across the US and Canada oil train derailments, spills and fires are increasing as the oil industry moves more crude oil by rail. On July 6, 2013 an oil train derailed and exploded in Lac-Megantic, Quebec, leveling the downtown and killing 47 people. Anyone within a mile of a rail line is within the dangerous blast zone if there is a derailment, spill, and fire. WIR-03

Tar sands also mean more carbon pollution. At every stage of the mining, transportation, and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than other sources of oil. According to a 9/21/14 New York Times piece, “Global Rise Reported in 2013 Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” by Justin Gillis, new numbers reported by scientists at a tracking initiative called the Global Carbon Project and published in the journal Nature Geoscience, indicate that global emissions of greenhouse gases jumped 2.3% in 2013 to record levels. In the U.S., emissions rose 2.9%. China’s emissions (10 billion tons annually of atmospheric carbon dioxide, which is nearly twice what the U.S. produces … though emissions per person are still far higher in the U.S.) grew 4.2%, and India’s emissions rose by 5.1%. A separate report, released earlier in September by the World Meteorological Organization, said the 2013 level of atmospheric CO2 was 42% higher than the prevailing level prior to the Industrial Revolution. In addition, methane has increased 153% and nitrous oxide has risen 21% from their respective preindustrial levels. These figures clearly demonstrate that “vastly greater efforts are required to bring long-term global warming within tolerable limits.” As Glen P. Peters, a scientist at the Oslo Center for International Climate and Environmental Research who helped compile the data, put it, “There is no more time. It needs to be all hands on deck now.” If emissions continue to rise unabated at their current pace, scientists warn that, “the earth could warm by as much as 10 degrees Fahrenheit above preindustrial levels, which would likely be incompatible with human civilization in its current form.” WIR-04

Bringing tar sands to California will undermine the state’s efforts to be a global leader addressing climate disruption while simultaneously sabotaging global efforts to address an impending climate crisis.

Which side of history will the San Luis Obispo Board of Supervisors be on? ... the side that capitulates to the fossil fuels that are driving us headlong into this climate crisis? ... or the side that champions the clean renewable energy movement that is our only hope of extricating humanity from impending catastrophe?

Please say NO to the Phillips 66 oil train proposal ... and speed our state's and world's transition to an authentically clean energy future. WIR-05

Rose Ann Witt
1282 Oak Grove Place
Thousand, CA 91362

Responses to Rose Ann Witt Comments

WIR-01	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 EIR concludes that emissions of criteria, GHG and toxic pollutants would exceed the SLOCAPCD thresholds and would be a significant impact. 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.
WIR-02	The rail system in California was designed to move both passengers and freight including hazardous materials. The impact of crude oil trains on emergency services is discussed in Section 4.11, Public Services and Utilities. The impact to emergency services along the mainline rail routes was found to be significant and unavoidable (Class I). The RDEIR has mitigation measures to require the use of safer rail cars as discussed in Section 4.11.
WIR-03	A 1-mile zone is an overestimate of potential hazards for a crude oil train carrying heavy tar sands crude oil. The potential consequences of a potential accident also need to be taken into account; specifically the distance from the rail line where adverse impacts would be possible. The worst-case thermal hazard zone associated with the catastrophic tank car failure and fire was approximately 500 meters. Within this distance, there is the possibility that individuals could experience thermal injuries. Beyond 500 meters, potential injuries would not likely occur. Likewise, the potential for fatalities is limited to 300 meters from the rail line. However, the potential impacts of a train derailment, oil spill and potential fires and explosions would be substantial. Therefore, RDEIR found that the risk of a crude oil train accident and spill was considered a Significant and Unavoidable (Class I) impact.
WIR-04	The refining of the different crude slate associated with this project would not produce different GHG emissions at the SMR than the normal range of crude oils refined at the SMR. Note that some Canadian crude oils are currently being processed at the SMR, transported by rail to Bakersfield, then by truck to the SMPS. GHG emissions are attributable to removal of the heavier ends, such as at the SMR, and associated with the cracking and formulation of lighter ends, such as gasoline, at the Rodeo Refinery. These activities would be within the range of normal activities at each refinery. The main difference in GHG emissions occurs at the extraction point, where extracting the tar sands generally produces substantially higher GHG per bbl of crude oil than convention methods, depending on the level of associated gas and the use of that gas. Some fields in California for example, extract the crude oil and just burn the associated gas in flares, which actually can produce a higher GHG intensity than even Canadian Tar Sands crude oils. The additional GHG emissions associated with mining the tar sands would occur no matter the

	destination of the crude oil, whether the crude oil is destined for the SMR, or other locations within the U.S. The main difference in GHG emissions occurs at the extraction point, where extracting the tar sands generally produces higher GHG per bbl of crude oil than convention methods, depending on the level of associated gas and the use of that gas. Some fields in California for example, extract the crude oil and just burn the associated gas in flares, which actually can produce a higher GHG intensity than even Canadian Tar Sands crude oils. Current CARB requirements (LCFS) already require refineries to disclose the carbon intensities of the crude oil they refine.
WIR-05	This comment expresses support for the scope of analysis provided for in the EIR. 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.