Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kent Strother to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:02 PM
Please respond to Kent .strother

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kent Strother
7745 Vale
Whittier, CA 90602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rollin Odell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:02 PM
Please respond to rolodell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rollin Odell
2 Haciendas Road
Orinda, CA 94563
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rollin Odell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 05:02 PM
Please respond to rolodell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rollin Odell
2 Haciendas Road
Orinda, CA 94563
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rich Wills to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:59 PM
Please respond to richtenortone

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rich Wills
544 Douglas Ave.
Grass Valley, CA 95945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kevin Toney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:57 PM
Please respond to bodhran -man

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kevin Toney
4313 Nelson DR
Richmond, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bob Rosenberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:56 PM
Please respond to endobob

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bob Rosenberg
32 Toussin
kentfield, CA 94904
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Colin Macaulay to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:55 PM
Please respond to colinmacaulay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Colin Macaulay
410 W. 38th Ave.
San Mateo, CA 94403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Andrea Kean to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:55 PM
Please respond to davanmad

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrea Kean
1423 campus dr
Berkeley, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lynn Camhi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:55 PM
Please respond to camhi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynn Camhi
95 Marshall Ave.
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael B Wisper to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:54 PM
Please respond to mbwisper

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael B Wisper
172 Crown Crcle
South San Francisco, CA 94080
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Paul Belz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:54 PM

Please respond to pgb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paul Belz
PO Box 11507
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Virginia Krutilek to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:54 PM
Please respond to g .krutilek

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Virginia Krutilek
921 Broadway
Alameda, CA 94501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
W. Gish to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:53 PM
Please respond to seapink 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

W. Gish
PO Box 01
GLENDALE, CA 91201
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrizio Paratelli to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:53 PM
Please respond to pparatelli

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrizio Paratelli
3841 Mentone Ave,, pat. 34
Culver City, CA 90232
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jo Ann Kiva to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:52 PM
Please respond to jakiva

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jo Ann Kiva
1245 N. Michillinda Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91107
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robert Lord to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:52 PM
Please respond to rbtlord

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Lord
1 some street
San Jose, CA 95118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
margaret c. rowe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:50 PM
Please respond to peggyrowe 08

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

margaret c. rowe
7780 sonoma hwy
santa rosa, CA 95409
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan Orr to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to susanorr

11/17/2014 04:49 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Orr
2241 4th av
sacramento, CA 95818
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tanya Stum to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:49 PM
Please respond to tanya .stum7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tanya Stum
1075 Rose Avneue
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy R. Griffith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:48 PM
Please respond to rahijasaad

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy R. Griffith
1120 44th Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Hopkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:47 PM
Please respond to keileidh 88

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. No, no, no, no, no, no, no!

Kathleen Hopkins
671 Vernon St 101
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Debra Nichols to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:46 PM
Please respond to fender 0s

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debra Nichols
1122 Dianron Rd.
Palmdale, CA 93551
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Pete Cox to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:46 PM
Please respond to pete 73cox

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pete Cox
11350 Foothill Blvd Unit 18
Lake View Terrace, CA 91342
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Hanger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:45 PM
Please respond to stanifer 16

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Hanger
20940 Waveview
Topanga, CA 90290
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chris Petrakis to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to cpetrakis

11/17/2014 04:44 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chris Petrakis
1550 Amherst Ave. #102
Los Angeles, CA 90025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rita Fahrner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:44 PM
Please respond to ritakell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rita Fahrner
271 Gates Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elaine Erickson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:43 PM
Please respond to klagberry

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elaine Erickson
1426 Frontero Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tiffany-Marie Austin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:42 PM
Please respond to Tiff -Mariea

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tiffany-Marie Austin
19859 Kittridge St.
Winnetka, CA 91306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Boone to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:41 PM
Please respond to biologicaldiversity

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Boone
49 Hancock Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sheri Rollison to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sherirollison

11/17/2014 04:39 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheri Rollison
383 Grandview
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anje' Waters to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:34 PM
Please respond to anjewa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anje' Waters
14945 Christmas Tree ln.
Grass Valley, CA 95945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

sheila wyse to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:34 PM
Please respond to swyse

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sheila wyse
14925 jadestone drive
sherman oaks, CA 91403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kurt Olson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:34 PM
Please respond to kolson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kurt Olson
837 Turquoise
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Julian Orr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:32 PM
Please respond to orr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julian Orr
P. O. Box 577
Pescadero, CA 94060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Patricia Escalera to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:28 PM
Please respond to escalerainsb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Escalera
4132 Vista Clara Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Harless to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:25 PM
Please respond to Suegunhar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Harless
105 Hidden Dr.
Scotts Valley, CA 95066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jon Darke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:25 PM
Please respond to baseliner 2010

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jon Darke
111 cienga
LA, CA 90012
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Connie Devine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:24 PM
Please respond to squirelfox

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Connie Devine
5869 Southwind Drive
San Jose, CA 95138
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kimberly Notary to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:22 PM
Please respond to Gib 0324

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kimberly Notary
805 Tully Rd
modesto, CA 95350
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rich Moser to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:22 PM
Please respond to rich

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rich Moser
1103 W. Micheltorena
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Silverstein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:22 PM
Please respond to sylvenwilde

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Silverstein
Tujunga Ave
North Hollywood, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Arlyce Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:20 PM
Please respond to donald .smith4805

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arlyce Smith
110 Goya Drive
Fairfield, CA 94534
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dirk Reed to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:18 PM
Please respond to dirkdirkreedreed

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dirk Reed
4650 Cherryvale Avenue
Soquel, CA 95073
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah rebstock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:17 PM
Please respond to sarahrebstock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah rebstock
546 bellevue st
santa cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Thomas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:17 PM
Please respond to carol 8780

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Thomas
1613 Aromas Heights Lane
Aromas, CA 95004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jamie Green to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:16 PM
Please respond to springhead

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jamie Green
9727 Sweetwater Ln
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
AJ Canepa to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:16 PM
Please respond to aj

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

AJ Canepa
4637 Stillwater CT
Concord, CA 94521
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Helen Goldstein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:16 PM
Please respond to hlgoldstein

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Helen Goldstein
1026 Winding Ridge Ct
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Krasky to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:15 PM
Please respond to Booconcerns

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Krasky
5324 Manila Ave
Oakland, CA 94618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Brian Boortz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:14 PM
Please respond to brian

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Boortz
15750 Winchester Blvd., #201
Los Gatos, CA 95030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Mora to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:14 PM
Please respond to jbmconstruction 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Mora
700 Devils Drop Ct
El Sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Catherine Gould to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:13 PM
Please respond to Drcg _cnc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Catherine Gould
971Larmier Ave
Oak View, CA 93022
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristine Ashton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:12 PM
Please respond to Kristineashtonmagnuson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristine Ashton
7915 Amestoy Ave
Lake Balboa, CA 91406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Melissa Martinez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:10 PM
Please respond to melmel 68

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Melissa Martinez
12460 Gilmore Ave., #2
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Maris Bennett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:07 PM
Please respond to stuckinthe 60s

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Maris Bennett
3401 Dimaggio Way
Antioch, CA 94509
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M Guenza to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:06 PM
Please respond to guenzam

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M Guenza
2190 powell
SF, CA 94133
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
elaine edell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:05 PM
Please respond to elaine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

elaine edell
5244 Bridgetown Place
westlake village, CA 91362
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
annie belt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:02 PM
Please respond to annieb 58

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

annie belt
890 pacific ave
san jose, CA 95126
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ken Mundy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:01 PM
Please respond to kendrum

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ken Mundy
3650 Regal Place, # 37
Los Angeles, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Wendy Park to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:01 PM
Please respond to wpark

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Park
3730 24th St. #4
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gregg Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 04:00 PM
Please respond to gregg 8878

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gregg Johnson
790 Lenzen Ave Apt 344
San Jose, CA 95126
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brezy Wiker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:58 PM
Please respond to brezymay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brezy Wiker
231 Avenida Victoria
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William L Grgurich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:57 PM
Please respond to 1billgr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William L Grgurich
33 Encina Ave, Apt 519
Palo Alto, CA 94301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

heidi buech to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:56 PM
Please respond to buech .heidi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

heidi buech
12940 walsh ave
los angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rose An to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:55 PM
Please respond to dewsparkle .rose

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rose An
22 Fano St. #D
Arcadia, CA 91006
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Katrina Brewer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:55 PM
Please respond to knbrewer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katrina Brewer
windy road
hooseville, CA 04421
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

jude sky to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:55 PM
Please respond to j .sky

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jude sky
kensington
kensington, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Scott Coahran to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to scoahran

11/17/2014 03:55 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Scott Coahran
220 West K St. Apt. 1
Los Banos, CA 93635
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Leslie Paul Boston to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:55 PM
Please respond to BostonLesPaul

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leslie Paul Boston
PO Box 56419
Sherman Oaks, CA 91413
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Evette Garcia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:55 PM
Please respond to evettedgarcia 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Evette Garcia
12330 e 214st
Hawaiian Gardens, CA 90716
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amber Wheat to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:51 PM
Please respond to muzikfreek

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amber Wheat
1903 Carnegie Ln
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sean Corrigan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:51 PM
Please respond to quoll _fnq

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sean Corrigan
2/9 Lae Street
Trinity Beach, CA 90005
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
carol shinker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:51 PM
Please respond to carolpol

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

carol shinker
131 devonshire
san francisco, CA 94131
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Andrew Melnick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:50 PM
Please respond to andrew .melnick

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrew Melnick
102 Belridge Drive
Los Gatos, CA 95032
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brian Boortz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:50 PM
Please respond to brian

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Boortz
15750 Winchester Blvd., #201
Los Gatos, CA 95030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roberta Reed to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:50 PM
Please respond to rareed 657

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roberta Reed
208 Fifteenth Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tamadhur Al-Aqeel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:50 PM
Please respond to tamadhur

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tamadhur Al-Aqeel
1816 S Bedford St
Los Angeles, CA 90035
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jym Dyer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:49 PM
Please respond to jym +cbd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jym Dyer
132 Beulah Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Trisha Cooley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:49 PM
Please respond to peacebunnie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Trisha Cooley
3080 McKinley Dr.
Santa Clara, CA 95051
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dorothy Whitmore to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:49 PM
Please respond to gem 2464

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dorothy Whitmore
1860 Via Pacifica
Aptos, CA 95003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carla Aronsohn to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to cbaronsohn

11/17/2014 03:48 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carla Aronsohn
557 43rd St
Oakland, CA 94609
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sandra Holloway to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:48 PM
Please respond to oohsotweet

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Holloway
2160 107th. Ave.
Oakland, CA 94603
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Samuel Durkin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:47 PM
Please respond to samussr 337

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Samuel Durkin
5048 Lakeview Cir
Fairfield, CA 94534
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
GERHARD ECKARDT to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:47 PM
Please respond to g _eckardt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

GERHARD ECKARDT
1951 COTTAGE CT.
STOCKTON, CA 95207
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Annette Raible to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:46 PM
Please respond to amraible

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Annette Raible
6163 Bodega Ave
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Malley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:46 PM
Please respond to bonic

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Malley
1609 S. Gary St.
Anaheim, CA 92804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dennis Dougherty to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:46 PM
Please respond to dmdfct

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dennis Dougherty
1000 Bayhills Dr
San Rafael, CA 94903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Anne Gross to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to agross

11/17/2014 03:45 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anne Gross
1392 Mitchell Road
Modesto, CA 95351
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeanette Monroe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:45 PM
Please respond to knightpatriot

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeanette Monroe
26895 Aliso Creek Road
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amber Sims to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:43 PM
Please respond to amber

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amber Sims
803 Fawn Place
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mindi Shank to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:42 PM
Please respond to Mindishank

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mindi Shank
2525 29th street
Santa Monica, CA 90405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah Fernald Loft to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:42 PM
Please respond to sarahjane

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Fernald Loft
P.O. Box 6223
Napa, CA 94581
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Natalie McMahon to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to natalie .mcmahon
11/17/2014 03:38 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Natalie McMahon
130 Chapman Rd
Woodside, CA 94062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Schacher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:36 PM
Please respond to susan 4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Schacher
3500 35th Ave, Apt 27
Oakland, CA 94619
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
O Lewis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:36 PM
Please respond to ovl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

O Lewis
PO Box 881075
Los Angeles, CA 90009
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Miranda Leiva to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:34 PM
Please respond to MWolfL

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miranda Leiva
4950 Coldwater Cyn APT#23
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:34 PM
Please respond to 1980stingray

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Brown
3701 Glendon Ave Apt 3
Los Angeles, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ray Smith to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to realty

11/17/2014 03:33 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ray Smith
641 Highland dr
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Frank Seewester to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:32 PM
Please respond to seewester

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frank Seewester
1929 New Jersey St.
Fairfield, CA 94533
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gayle Cuddy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:32 PM
Please respond to nightengayles

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gayle Cuddy
853 Turquoise Dr
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michele Gloor to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:32 PM
Please respond to mgloor

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. Thank you for your help and good work.

Michele Gloor
1271 11th Ave. Apt. 1
San Francisco, CA 94122
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Judith Powell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:32 PM
Please respond to nedandjudy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Judith Powell
23561 Via agustini
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Seymour Singer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:29 PM
Please respond to quant

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Seymour Singer
414 N. Ogden Drive
Los Angeles, CA 90036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Louise Zimmer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:26 PM
Please respond to louise .rqtex

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Louise Zimmer
3975 Meadow Lark Lane
Paso Robles, CA 93446
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Berenice Cordova to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:26 PM
Please respond to Mercuryap 143

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Berenice Cordova
29058 Lillyglen Dr.
Canyon Country, CA 91387
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert Davenport to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:26 PM
Please respond to ridport

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Davenport
5128 Montair Ave.
Lakewood, CA 90712
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Guillermo Gonzalez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:25 PM
Please respond to oramfe

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Guillermo Gonzalez
4124 Ross Park Dr.
San Jose, CA 95118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roidina Salisbury to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:25 PM
Please respond to roi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roidina Salisbury
422 Avenida Castilla #E
Laguna Woods, CA 92637
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Taugher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:23 PM
Please respond to info

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Taugher
19201 Sonoma Hwy #268
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Hunter to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to barachy

11/17/2014 03:23 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Hunter
821 Brockhurst St
Oakland, CA 94608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sandra Peterson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:22 PM
Please respond to sandra .peterson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Peterson
67 Woodranch Circle
Danville, CA 94506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

S Hayano to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to suzannehayano

11/17/2014 03:22 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

S Hayano
91 Mission Plaza Drive
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Glenda Deaton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:21 PM
Please respond to glendadeaton 2771

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Glenda Deaton
2771 Fallon Cr
Simi Valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Renee Cossutta to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:20 PM
Please respond to renee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I oppose this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Renee Cossutta
297 West Carter Avenue
Sierra Madre, CA 91024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ron Hubert to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to rhubertaz

11/17/2014 03:20 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ron Hubert
6800 Virgil Way
Flagstaff, AZ 86001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Demetrios Panopoulos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:19 PM
Please respond to dmtrios

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Demetrios Panopoulos
1077 Craig Ave
sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Spease to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:18 PM
Please respond to karenskollars

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Spease
370 Acero Place
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Eleni Psyllos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:17 PM
Please respond to epsyllos

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eleni Psyllos
1888 Centuury Park East Suite 700
Los Angeles, CA 90067
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sondra G Adam to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:17 PM
Please respond to gail .adam950

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sondra G Adam
84 Cottage Ln
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jamie Zazow to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:16 PM
Please respond to jzazow

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jamie Zazow
733 Marine
Santa Monica, CA 90405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

gulshan oomerjee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:16 PM
Please respond to gulshan .Oomerjee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

gulshan oomerjee
1649 Casarin Ave
Simi valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Walt Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:15 PM
Please respond to waltgoldenbrown

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Walt Brown
Finch Drive
Roseville, CA 95661
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lorraine W. Norby to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:14 PM
Please respond to lnorby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lorraine W. Norby
12A Grove St.
Mill Valley, CA 94941
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Donald Webb to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:14 PM
Please respond to sdwebb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Donald Webb
621 Cowles Road
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Juliana Woodhead to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:14 PM
Please respond to anchorbaby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Juliana Woodhead
500 Prospect Blvd.
Pasadena, CA 91103
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Leo Lieber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:12 PM
Please respond to llieber

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leo Lieber
2385 Hemlock Ave
Concord, CA 94520
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Hildebrand to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to karenhildebrand
11/17/2014 03:12 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Hildebrand
1015 King St
santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Radha Vignola to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:11 PM
Please respond to radha

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Accidents will happen.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Radha Vignola
2913 Crocker Ct
Aptos, CA 95003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ronald Trainer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:10 PM
Please respond to ron .trainer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ronald Trainer
423 Garretson Ave
Rodeo, CA 94572
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Doug Tait to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:09 PM
Please respond to dougtait

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Doug Tait
645 Asilo
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
annika miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:09 PM
Please respond to mvswede

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

annika miller
190 Ethel avenue
mill valley, CA 94491
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cipra Nemeth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:08 PM
Please respond to cipran

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cipra Nemeth
6600 Lindenhurst Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90048
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Leslie Shapiro to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:06 PM
Please respond to artbylas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

Please just take a look from Google earth of the PETCOKE piled high currently

at this facility, and left in the enviroment where wind rain and erossion can effect it, this is the by product of refining and contains heavy metals that are known to cause cancer in citizens. If this is an example of their enviromental havic.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leslie Shapiro
765 Mesa View Dr
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rob Seltzer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:06 PM
Please respond to rsscpa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rob Seltzer
18408 Clifftop Way
Malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeannie Pollak to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:05 PM
Please respond to jeannie 22ster

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeannie Pollak
2672 Honeysuckle Drive
Oxnard, CA 93036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Franklin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:04 PM
Please respond to nancyfr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Franklin
Del Mar Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Paula Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:03 PM
Please respond to paula .lucia

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paula Adams
64 North Oak Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91107
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephanie Slaughter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:02 PM
Please respond to snslaughter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephanie Slaughter
3241 Sepulveda Blvd
Los Angeles, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
J.A. Zaitlin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:02 PM
Please respond to jaz 6443021

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

J.A. Zaitlin
297 Berkeley Park Blvd.
Kensington, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:01 PM
Please respond to electricista 545

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Johnson
5804 Alameda Ave
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Don McDermott to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 03:00 PM
Please respond to donmcdermott 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Don McDermott
484 Cole Pl.
Goleta, CA 93117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Veronica Jacobi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:59 PM
Please respond to VJacobi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Veronica Jacobi
408 Hickory Circle
Santa Rosa, CA 95407
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
erin garcia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:59 PM
Please respond to airingrc 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

erin garcia
14924 dickens
sherman oaks, CA 91403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mark Garfinkel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:58 PM
Please respond to gppixelworks

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Garfinkel
26895 Aliso Creek Rd
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cheryl Parkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:58 PM
Please respond to cparkins

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cheryl Parkins
4285 Gilbert St.
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Angie Bahris to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:56 PM
Please respond to ang _bahris

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Angie Bahris
1904 6th Street
Santa Monica, CA 90405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristen Renton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:56 PM
Please respond to Roxygirl 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristen Renton
26503 bighorn Way
Valencia, CA 91354
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jane Carleton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:56 PM
Please respond to janecm 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jane Carleton
1236 Walker Ave #307
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marilyn King to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:56 PM
Please respond to StardustMK

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marilyn King
1001 8th St. #18
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marilyn Fuller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:55 PM
Please respond to mdfuller 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marilyn Fuller
20202 Black Road
Los Gatos, CA 95033
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Starbuck to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:55 PM
Please respond to elizabeth .starbuck

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Starbuck
713 Cathedral Pointe Lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93111
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Norm Ellis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:55 PM
Please respond to nellis 2996

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Norm Ellis
22355 Caminito Tecate
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Aidan Humrich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:55 PM
Please respond to aidanclare 81

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Aidan Humrich
304 Burton Court
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Venus Lubui to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:55 PM
Please respond to vlubui

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Venus Lubui
109 Ofria Drive
Folsom, CA 95630
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lauren Lynley to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lmlynley

11/17/2014 02:54 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Lynley
1072 Via Palma
San Lorenzo, CA 94580
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ken Dawdy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:54 PM
Please respond to kendawdy 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ken Dawdy
3631 Crow Cyn.
San Ramon, CA 94582
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Kuelper to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:54 PM
Please respond to ckuelper

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Kuelper
3111 California St.
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
john endicott to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:53 PM
Please respond to johnalleycat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

john endicott
2043 19th av.
san francisco, CA 94115
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Beasley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:53 PM
Please respond to cb 1p

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Beasley
1075 Rose ave
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Douglas Dyakon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:53 PM
Please respond to douglasdyakon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Douglas Dyakon
2500 Zorada Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jan Burns to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:50 PM
Please respond to jbmail

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Burns
299 CAnnery Row
Montrey, CA 9.940
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Moss to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:49 PM
Please respond to jlmoss 40

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Moss
2223 24TH ST.
SANTA MONICA, CA 90405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laine Gates to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:49 PM
Please respond to lgates

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laine Gates
PO Box 516
Los Gatos, CA 95031
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Martin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:48 PM
Please respond to martin .nancy78

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Martin
16 East Padre
Santa Barbara, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

George D Barden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:48 PM
Please respond to therealminton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

George D Barden
1127 n 85th st.
Seattle, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Evelyn Myers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:47 PM
Please respond to evelyn .a.myers

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Evelyn Myers
17655 Greger Street
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Beverly Poncia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:47 PM
Please respond to bmp 1950

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Beverly Poncia
P.O. Box 971
Lower Lake, CA 95457
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Neil Lark to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:47 PM
Please respond to nlark

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Neil Lark
685 W. Euclid Ave
Stockton, CA 95204
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Martha Carrington to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:47 PM
Please respond to MyYogananda

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Martha Carrington
1555 Merrill Street
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Donna Meyers to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:44 PM
Please respond to donnameyers 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Donna Meyers
437 Obispo Ave
Long Beach, CA 90814
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
richard and chihoko Solomon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:44 PM
Please respond to risolom

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

In addition to these reasons there is one other aspect to why the SLO County

Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors should reject the Phillips rail spur: the city councils of Richmond and Berkeley have passed moratoriums against the transport of tar sands oil through their communities. Many of us who live here in Oakland are truing to get our city council to do likewise. Please join us in our efforts to protect our environment and our citizens against this ill conceived and dangerous plan.

richard and chihoko Solomon
2376 Thackeray Drive
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kandy Fabreo -Montelongo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:44 PM
Please respond to Zerowons

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kandy Fabreo-Montelongo
517 Walnut St
San Carlos, CA 94070
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mana-Jean Wagnon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:44 PM
Please respond to jwagnon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mana-Jean Wagnon
2834 Johnson Ave
Alameda, CA 94501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Irwin Friedman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:42 PM
Please respond to mysteryfan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Irwin Friedman
319 Commodore Drive
Richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lorraine Cook to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:42 PM
Please respond to lorraine .r.cook

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lorraine Cook
2928 Diane Street
Ashland, OR 97520
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
April Barcenas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:41 PM
Please respond to hays 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

April Barcenas
106 Northlite circle
Sacramento, CA 95831
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Paula Hartgraves to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:40 PM
Please respond to paulajeff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paula Hartgraves
5050 Hacienda Drive, #1937
Dublin, CA 94568
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mir Bahmanyar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:38 PM
Please respond to mbahmanyar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mir Bahmanyar
6708 Aldea Ave
Van Nuys, CA 91406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Scott Watanabe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:36 PM
Please respond to jedimasterryo 89

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Scott Watanabe
3649 Stoner Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Annecone to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:36 PM
Please respond to bettylea 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Annecone
551 Torrey Pine Lane
SANTA ROSA, CA 95407
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Gee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:35 PM
Please respond to inion

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Gee
PO Box 8674
La Crescenta, CA 91224
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tracey Kleber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:34 PM
Please respond to tracey .kleber

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tracey Kleber
345 S Anita Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90049
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alexander Scull to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:34 PM
Please respond to xhailed

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alexander Scull
150 arroyo rd
lagunitas, CA 94933
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Frey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:33 PM
Please respond to mjf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Frey
PO Box 30444
Santa Barbara, CA 93130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Andy Philpot to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to aphilpot

11/17/2014 02:32 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andy Philpot
1525 Acorn Way
Solvang, CA 93463
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
M.C. McFadden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:32 PM
Please respond to momcfadden

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M.C. McFadden
945 ward drive
santa Barbara, CA 93111
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

cheery miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:32 PM
Please respond to cheery .miller

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

cheery miller
maim
pomona, CA 91766
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
VIRGINIA VON HASSELN to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:31 PM
Please respond to GINNYVONH

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

VIRGINIA VON HASSELN
223 Hacienda Carmel
Carmel, CA 93923
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Brian Gray to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to bgraystar

11/17/2014 02:31 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Gray
7776 Palmyra Dr
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joy murley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:31 PM
Please respond to joymurley 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joy murley
405 south old ranch rd
arcadia, CA 91007
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lee Baldwin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:30 PM
Please respond to lbaldwin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lee Baldwin
11532 Liggett St
Norwalk, CA 90650
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeffrey Golden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:29 PM
Please respond to jgsf 1987

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeffrey Golden
30 Poncetta Drive, #320
Daly City, CA 94015
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chanel Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:29 PM
Please respond to brownesq

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chanel Brown
4006 Marconi Ave
Sacramento, CA 95821
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Signe Wetteland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:28 PM
Please respond to Snwetteland

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Signe Wetteland
1925 Donner Ave #3
Davis, CA 95618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joanne nagy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:28 PM
Please respond to jnn 1218

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joanne nagy
16500 simonds st
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John Lundquist to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:26 PM
Please respond to bablien

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Lundquist
1345 Carmel Ct.
Denver, CO 80020
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Edmund Jones to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:26 PM
Please respond to texicaliblues

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Edmund Jones
1083 Danbury Drive
San Jose, CA 95129
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sheryl Rose to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:25 PM
Please respond to sherylr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sheryl Rose
1407 Cornell Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

lynda leigh to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lynda .leigh1

11/17/2014 02:24 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lynda leigh
435 manzanita ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stanley Peterson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:24 PM
Please respond to stanart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stanley Peterson
427 N Santa Monica St
Los Banos, CA 93635
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alessandro Raganato to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to alessandroraganato

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alessandro Raganato
via Lucania, 7
Venezia, CA 90016
IT

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Albert Chiu to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to albert -chiu

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Albert Chiu
8222 Skyline Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Chris Messerschmitt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to cfm 4444

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chris Messerschmitt
Boyd
Carmichael, CA 95608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
janine bonk to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to janinebonk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

janine bonk
8644 sunset ave
fair oaks, CA 95628
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
claudia bordin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:23 PM
Please respond to cbdesign

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

claudia bordin
551 35th street
sacramento, CA 95816
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Wold to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:22 PM
Please respond to swold

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Wold
19134 Marilla St.
Northridge, CA 91324
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Dennis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:22 PM
Please respond to sedennis 63

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Dennis
1530 Hubbard Avenue
San Leandro, CA 94579
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chris Chouteau to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:22 PM
Please respond to chrischouteau

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chris Chouteau
PO Box 194
Healdsburg, CA 95448
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diane Bolman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:22 PM
Please respond to dbmar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diane Bolman
334 Ignacio Valley Cir.
Novato, CA 94949, CA 94949
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

yvonne hyatt to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to hyattisle

11/17/2014 02:21 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

yvonne hyatt
824 Cole St
san francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

judith sandodval to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:20 PM
Please respond to judithwsandoval

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

judith sandodval
838 Cabrillo St.
san fracisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
LyndaAnn Howerton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:20 PM
Please respond to pets 4me

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

LyndaAnn Howerton
1772 Lynn Dr
Penngrove, CA 94951
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Damian Anne James to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:20 PM
Please respond to damian .j

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Damian Anne James
432, 38 Street #D
Oakland, CA 94609
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
CHERYN ENGLISH to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:20 PM
Please respond to creativelife 317

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in santa Barbara (and other towns nearby) just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

CHERYN ENGLISH
1031 miramonte drive 4
santa barbara, CA 93109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joan Weir to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:19 PM
Please respond to Divinelygreen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Weir
2045 Orchard St.
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Mullins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:18 PM
Please respond to patricksmichaelsmullins

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Mullins
PO Box 262
South Strafford, VT 05070
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Watson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:18 PM
Please respond to bison

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Watson
701 Central Ave.
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gina Ness to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:17 PM
Please respond to ginavness

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gina Ness
1718 Capistrano Drive
Petaluma, CA 94954
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Garfield to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:16 PM
Please respond to lindag

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Garfield
1156 High St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95064
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

M Lee to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lee 9078

11/17/2014 02:16 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M Lee
3124 Harpers Ferry Ct
Stockton, CA 95219
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Vera Loewer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:15 PM
Please respond to veraloewer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vera Loewer
636 Montezuma Drive
Pacifica, CA 94044
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Gordon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:15 PM
Please respond to Thecarolanngordon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Gordon
2801 Glendower ave
Los angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Haskard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:15 PM
Please respond to houndsongs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Haskard
8393 Mipolomol Rd
Malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Harter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:14 PM
Please respond to John .N.Harter.civ

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Harter
1249 Bundage Court
Marina, CA 93933
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
MARC DE LEON to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:13 PM
Please respond to MDLATHLETE

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

MARC DE LEON
4965
WOODLAND HILLS, CA 91364
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Doreen Feingersch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:13 PM
Please respond to doreenf 0125

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Doreen Feingersch
257 nw 116 lane
coral springs, FL 33071
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karina Alvarez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:13 PM
Please respond to alvarezkarinar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karina Alvarez
1 LMU Drive MSB-4473
Los Angeles, CA 90241
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Izett to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mwizett

11/17/2014 02:11 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Izett
1571 Ptarmigan Drive #1A
WalnutCreek, CA 94595
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mal Gaffney to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:11 PM
Please respond to malgaff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mal Gaffney
801 W. Ocean Ave
Lompoc, CA 93436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sherri Andrade to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:10 PM
Please respond to sherrila

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sherri Andrade
25272 Rockridge Rd
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Yusem to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:10 PM
Please respond to dyusem

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Yusem
220 Drakes View Dr.
Inverness, CA 94937
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Stevens to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:10 PM
Please respond to cstevens 74

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Stevens
242 Senior Cir
Lompoc, CA 93436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lyn Ayal to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lynayal

11/17/2014 02:09 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lyn Ayal
6440 Via Escondido
Malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amber Fandel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:09 PM
Please respond to MartianLover 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amber Fandel
1027 N. Martel Ave.
West Hollywood, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amy Gable to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:07 PM
Please respond to amygable 11

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amy Gable
114 W Fedora Ave.
Fresno, CA 93705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marty Bostic to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:07 PM
Please respond to sbost 23

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marty Bostic
1540 Amherst Ave.
LA, CA 90025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Isaac Salazar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:04 PM
Please respond to izzycmt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Isaac Salazar
1815 S Ridgeley Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michelle Kory to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:04 PM
Please respond to Crunkchick 96

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michelle Kory
23323 Lynham Place
Valencia, CA 91354
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joanne Pennington to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:04 PM
Please respond to rp 92672

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joanne Pennington
2603 Calle Del Comercio D
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
susanne madden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:04 PM
Please respond to madrsrch

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

susanne madden
7319 trask avenue
playa del rey, CA 90293
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristy Howe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:04 PM
Please respond to howekri 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristy Howe
600 Radcliffe Dr.
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Fusco to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:03 PM
Please respond to earthdiamond 4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Fusco
50 Del Mar Ave
Berkeley, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Suzanne a'Becket to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:03 PM
Please respond to 8pawprints

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Suzanne a'Becket
21163 Patriot Way
Cupertino, CA 95014
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
kourtney ridenour to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:03 PM
Please respond to garmentfarmer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

kourtney ridenour
410 s. Padre Juan Ave.
ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Linda Waine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:02 PM
Please respond to lmwaine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Waine
80 School St.
Taunton, MA 02780
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Judith Collas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:01 PM
Please respond to jcollas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Judith Collas
760 Swarthmore Ave/
PAcific Palisades, CA 90272
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Anna Lind to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:01 PM
Please respond to carolanna

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Anna Lind
822 Clayton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Benzel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:01 PM
Please respond to Karenbenzelpr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Benzel
PO Box 5334, Carpenter 2 SW of 2nd
Carmel,, CA 93921
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Steve Iverson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:01 PM

Please respond to ryeman 4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Iverson
309 Fernleaf Ave Unit C
Corona Del Mar, CA 92625
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
earl lippold to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:00 PM
Please respond to earllippold

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

earl lippold
6322 seaborn st
lakewood, CA 90713
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erika Whitton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 02:00 PM
Please respond to efortuny 73

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erika Whitton
2235 Watermarke Place
Irvine, CA 92612
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Margaret Stapleton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:59 PM
Please respond to gramargo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margaret Stapleton
1263 Cypress Point Lane #101
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Debra Lewis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:59 PM
Please respond to buffymacleod

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debra Lewis
727 Medford Avenue
Hayward, CA 94541
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
billie talamantes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:59 PM
Please respond to B _TALAMANTES

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

billie talamantes
1841 s. olive av
stockton, CA 95215
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rosa Baeza to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:58 PM
Please respond to rosbaeza

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rosa Baeza
19556 Hart Street
Reseda, CA 91335
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Ruiz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:58 PM
Please respond to Lovnspidey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Ruiz
3365 Fernwood Ave.
Lynwood, CA 90262
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kevin Bundy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:58 PM
Please respond to kbundy 70

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I live less than one mile from the railroad tracks in West Berkeley, California, and I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death. According to data gathered by the California Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment, the West Berkeley community near the railroad tracks is already highly burdened with pollution, including diesel particulates, and residents suffer from high rates of asthma. See http://oehha.ca.gov/ej/ces2.html.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers

fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kevin Bundy
1611 Chestnut St
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Fletcher Chouinard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:58 PM
Please respond to fchouinard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Fletcher Chouinard
4274 Faria Rd.
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Philip Fraser to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:58 PM
Please respond to phlf 610

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Philip Fraser
454 34th st#26
Oakland, CA 94609
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gopal Shanker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:57 PM
Please respond to gopal

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gopal Shanker
1370 El Bonita Avenue
Saint Helena, CA 94574
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

MariaElena Yepes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:57 PM
Please respond to yepesme

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

MariaElena Yepes
527 Pomelo Av.
Monterey Park, CA 91755
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Waitz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:57 PM
Please respond to mwaitz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Waitz
21 Hillside Ct.
Berkeley, CA 94704
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Larry Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:56 PM
Please respond to lehrsmith

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Larry Smith
15 Coronado Ct
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Teri Forester to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:55 PM
Please respond to tricketts 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Teri Forester
7808 Auburn Woods Drive
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joanna Zadra to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:54 PM
Please respond to zadraj 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joanna Zadra
3859 Woodcrest Road
Sacramento, CA 95821
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Luben Stoilov to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:54 PM
Please respond to stoilov .l

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Luben Stoilov
23 Meadow Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sue marquez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:52 PM
Please respond to syamarts

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sue marquez
3764 watseka ave
LA, CA 90034
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Clara Beard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:52 PM
Please respond to clara -beard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Clara Beard
3580 Frances Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dudley and Candace Campbell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:52 PM
Please respond to cdcampbl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

We are writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

We are strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, we urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dudley and Candace Campbell
13167 Ortley Place
Valley Glen, CA 91401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

April Parkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:52 PM
Please respond to april

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

April Parkins
4285 Gilbert Street
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cherry Battaglia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:51 PM
Please respond to brewster .c

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cherry Battaglia
293 Eastside Drive
San Jose, CA 95127
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dan Goldberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:49 PM
Please respond to dano 41d

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dan Goldberg
2120 N Pacific Ave Spc 27
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joie winnick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:49 PM
Please respond to joiewinnick

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joie winnick
13911 Riverside Drive
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
USA

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
juliet goldstein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:48 PM
Please respond to shiningjoys

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

juliet goldstein
pob
aptos, CA 95001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Heather Kerr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:48 PM
Please respond to heatherlkerr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Kerr
21950 McKean Road
San Jose, CA 95120
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Derek Shuman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:48 PM
Please respond to dshuman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I live very close to the railway section through Berkeley and Oakland that would carry massive amounts of dangerous highly volatile oil on a very frequent basis. I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project

simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Derek Shuman
142A Walnut St. #240
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tygarjas Bigstyck to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:48 PM
Please respond to tygerjas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tygarjas Bigstyck
1137 Banyan Way
Pacifica, CA 94044
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Katherine Silvey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:47 PM
Please respond to kjsilvey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Silvey
1567 Ashwood Dr
Martinez, CA 94553
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cynthia Neber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:47 PM

Please respond to cece

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cynthia Neber
1979 Grace Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Misako Hill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:47 PM
Please respond to misakoelaine

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Misako Hill
1075 45th Street
Emeryville, CA 94608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
enrico verga to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:46 PM
Please respond to mrverga

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

enrico verga
352 12th street
seal beach, CA 90740
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Susan L Petrella to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:46 PM
Please respond to profpetrella

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan L Petrella
2455 Cambridge Avenue
Fullerton, CA 92835
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Denise Wittenberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:45 PM
Please respond to denisewittenberg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Denise Wittenberg
903 E. Rose Ave.
Orange, CA 92867
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Arlette Schlitt -Gerson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:45 PM
Please respond to asg 229

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arlette Schlitt-Gerson
39 norwood Ave.
Kensington, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Aylward to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:44 PM
Please respond to daylward

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Aylward
651 Sierra Vista Ave.
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jay Rice to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jaysrice

11/17/2014 01:44 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jay Rice
72 Holstrom Circle
Novato, CA 94947
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Levy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:43 PM
Please respond to david

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Levy
1255 Waller
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Shereen Hawkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:43 PM
Please respond to shercat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shereen Hawkins
18312 Manitoba Ln
Huntington Beach, CA 92648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
lonna richmond to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:43 PM
Please respond to lonnajean

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lonna richmond
45 sunset way
muir beach, CA 94965
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
catherine ridder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:43 PM
Please respond to caridder 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

catherine ridder
3091 lake
altadena, CA 91001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Portia Goltz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:42 PM
Please respond to pgoltz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Portia Goltz
898 Temple Terrace, #318
Los Angeles, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laurence George to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:42 PM
Please respond to larryg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurence George
confidential
Nicasio, CA 94946
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
lloyd reynolds to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:40 PM
Please respond to lareyn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lloyd reynolds
10943 obsidian ct
fountain valley, CA 92708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rob Firmin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:40 PM
Please respond to robfirmin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rob Firmin
642 Beloit Ave
Kensington, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

annie steele to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:39 PM
Please respond to annsteele 2233

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. In SLO the trains are within 500feet of
people's bedrooms and play-yards for children. Nobody has address the question of NORMS check the Journal of Petroleom engineers about them. Then look at the oil can themselves, rusting rolling cans that connect via a big pipe so if one catches an ignition they all go up in flames. Single hull and scale covered literal cans ! How about safety valves and fire surpression materials for the train station as"Chemtrec" is not close to us.

annie steele
santabarbar
SLO, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anna Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:39 PM
Please respond to edkiss 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anna Johnson
7316 amherst st
Sacramento, CA 95818
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Bettenhausen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to elizabethbettenhausen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Bettenhausen
345 Plymouth St.
Cambria, CA 93428
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wolf Bostedt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to sonicimpact

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons
1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wolf Bostedt
642 Poirier
Oakland, CA 94609
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carole Ehrhardt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to carole

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carole Ehrhardt
P.O Box 243
Pebble Beach, CA 93953
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Julia Sanford to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to jksanford

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julia Sanford
15418 Gault Street
Van Nuys, CA 91406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cecelia Mariscal to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to Cecelia .mariscal

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cecelia Mariscal
1052 45th St. #B
Emeryville, CA 94608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dorothy Wilkinson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:38 PM
Please respond to deegee 43

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dorothy Wilkinson
5118 De Longpre Avenue, #314
Hollywood, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Watson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:37 PM
Please respond to kwatson 1069

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to DENY the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Watson
8190 Grape Ave
Forestville, CA 95436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Binstock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:37 PM
Please respond to jamesbinstock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Binstock
308 East Anapamu Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Holly Burgin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:37 PM
Please respond to burgin .holly

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Holly Burgin
14220 Runnymede St
Van Nuys, CA 91405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephanie Miyashiro to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:37 PM
Please respond to luvbiz 67

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephanie Miyashiro
1135 Delaware St.
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

marcia m. smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:37 PM
Please respond to marciaotr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

marcia m. smith
722 seminole way
palo alto, CA 94303
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Josh Kaye-Carr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:36 PM
Please respond to biogems

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Josh Kaye-Carr
1365 Weymouth Ln
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
zelma fishman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:36 PM
Please respond to zelmafishman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

zelma fishman
1612 7th st
los osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jackie Marcus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:35 PM
Please respond to joiejmarcus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jackie Marcus
2780 Los Osos Valley Rd
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Betty Kowall to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:35 PM
Please respond to bakowall

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Betty Kowall
2295 Goodwin Ave
Penngrove, CA 94951
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Samara Hanson velloo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:35 PM
Please respond to Funkymonks 1100

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Samara Hanson velloo
720 glenice st
Petaluma, CA 94954
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

J. Barry Gurdin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:34 PM
Please respond to gurdin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

J. Barry Gurdin
247 Ortega Street
San Francisco, CA 94122
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Natalie Kovacs to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to natkovacs

11/17/2014 01:34 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Natalie Kovacs
716 Cantor
Irvine, CA 92673
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kerstin Mueller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:34 PM
Please respond to kemuelle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kerstin Mueller
479 Simas Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cathe Dietrich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:33 PM
Please respond to cathed

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cathe Dietrich
1200 Talbot St.
Berkeley, CA 94706
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gerald Orcholski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:33 PM
Please respond to gerryjim

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gerald Orcholski
2400 Brigden Rd
Pasadena, CA 91104
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
R L to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:33 PM
Please respond to rick .luttmann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

R L
*
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Leigh Clark to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to leighwyattclark

11/17/2014 01:32 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leigh Clark
16349 Los Alimos Street
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:32 PM
Please respond to perfect 4g

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Adams
11024 Balboa Blvd. #746
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Erikson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:31 PM
Please respond to sjerikson 46

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Erikson
8240 Stevenson Avenue
Sacramento, CA 95828
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ronit Corry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:31 PM
Please respond to ronit

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ronit Corry
3956 Calle Cita
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Niky Missagh to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:30 PM
Please respond to nikymissagh

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Niky Missagh
Winepol Loop
San Jose, CA 95125
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Paul Andrade to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:30 PM
Please respond to greenfire 999

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paul Andrade
119 Coral St
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Margaret Christine Robinett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:28 PM
Please respond to chrisdc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margaret Christine Robinett
3631 Cabernet Vineyards Circle
San Jose, CA 95117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ja Ko to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:28 PM
Please respond to starteamsystem 248

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ja Ko
v
v, CA 90018
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jane Bark to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:28 PM
Please respond to Janeba

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jane Bark
93 comanche ct
Fremont, CA 94539

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Monique Grajeda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:27 PM
Please respond to raggmusic

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Monique Grajeda
981 Madonna Rd.
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
dawn obrien to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:27 PM
Please respond to mercurydmo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

dawn obrien
1817 Mountain Ave
santa barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Shauna Haines to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:27 PM
Please respond to slhaines

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I OPPOSE this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur!

Shauna Haines
1732 McGee Ave
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael C . Ford and Richard B . Marks
11/17/2014 01:26 PM
To: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to samudra

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael C. Ford and Richard B. Marks
178 Manfre Rd.
Watsonville, CA 95076
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Blackwell -Marchant to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:25 PM
Please respond to patmarchant

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Blackwell-Marchant
5737 Medallion Court
Castro Valley, CA 94552
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jill Stassinos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:25 PM
Please respond to Jstassinos

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jill Stassinos
1760 Ocean Oaks Rd.
Carpinteria, CA 93013
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gloria Burd to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:25 PM
Please respond to burdlady

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

What we REALLY need are more passenger trains!

Gloria Burd
1078 Blazingwood Dr.
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lynne Olivier to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:24 PM
Please respond to lynneo 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynne Olivier
3700 Garvin Avenue
Richmond, CA 94805
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Rodriguez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:23 PM
Please respond to mrmichael 60

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Rodriguez
1128 N. Cahuenga Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90038
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Harrington to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mharrington 0606

11/17/2014 01:23 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Harrington
5420 Erickson Drive
Granite Bay, CA 95746
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Bryne to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:23 PM
Please respond to Scbryne

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Bryne
163 cedar st
Ventura, CA 93001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Erik Green to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:22 PM
Please respond to erikgreen 428

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Erik Green
415 N. 2nd St.
San Jose, CA 95112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jenna Friedenberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:22 PM
Please respond to friedenberg .jenna

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jenna Friedenberg
1540 N Benton Way
Los Angeles, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Irene Kraus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:22 PM
Please respond to Irenemhk

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Irene Kraus
26531 Baronet
Mission Viejo, CA 92692
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Richard Puaoi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to r .puaoi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Puaoi
9 Josefa Court
Novato, CA 94949
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Crystal Espinoza to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to crystal .espinoza92

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Crystal Espinoza
6218 Monterey Rd. #1
Los Angeles, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brendan Doyle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to bd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brendan Doyle
355 61st Street
Oakland, CA 94618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
La Vonne Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to lmiller 853

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

La Vonne Miller
4008 Pacific Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90807
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joanne Nelson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to Joanneinhachts

11/17/2014 01:21 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joanne Nelson
1245 . Ienega Avenue
San Dimas, CA 91773
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:21 PM
Please respond to adamsmaryc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Adams
Mormon
Folsom, CA 95630
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

val szymanski to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to valszy

11/17/2014 01:20 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

val szymanski
4 Mary Lane
El Sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Grindeland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:18 PM
Please respond to marykg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Grindeland
1085 Tasman Dr., Spc# 622
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
angie klein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:18 PM
Please respond to angieklein

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

angie klein
2622 Lincoln Ave
Alameda, CA 94501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Silvia Rocha to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:18 PM
Please respond to Tekanae

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Silvia Rocha
900 w Sierra Madre Ave #60
Azusa, CA 91702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stacey DeGooyer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:16 PM
Please respond to staceydegooyer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stacey DeGooyer
300 Galland St
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lori Newell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:16 PM
Please respond to lolee 210

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lori Newell
507 N. Scott Dr.
Santa Maria, CA 93454
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Mitsuda to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:16 PM
Please respond to mmitsuda

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Mitsuda
33210 Lake Oneida Street
Fremont, CA 94555
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rebecca Egger to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to egger

11/17/2014 01:15 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rebecca Egger
3126 College Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bonnie Pannell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:15 PM
Please respond to touchpeace

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bonnie Pannell
422 Jackson St
Crockett, CA 94525
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Albert Valencia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:15 PM
Please respond to afitguy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Albert Valencia
15542 Cabot Circle
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Huber to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:14 PM
Please respond to carolah 713

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Huber
1631 Interlachen Rd.
Seal Beach, CA 90740
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Josephine Laing to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:14 PM
Please respond to fzika

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Life is more important than economics.

Josephine Laing
141 Cuesta
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Ann Kelly & Family to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:14 PM
Please respond to besunflowersb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Ann Kelly & Family
1724 Olive Avenue
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dan Gotch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:14 PM
Please respond to dgotch

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dan Gotch
1114 Kenet Pl
PG, CA 93950
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marianna Mejia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:13 PM
Please respond to lamarianna

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marianna Mejia
1009 Hidden Valley Road
SOQUEL, CA 95073
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Max Kaehn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:12 PM
Please respond to citizenkaehn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Max Kaehn
234 N Murphy Ave.
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barb Skoog to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:12 PM
Please respond to cheers

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barb Skoog
1884 Peterson Avenue
South Pasadena, CA 91030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Frankenfield to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:12 PM
Please respond to pvfrankenfield

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Frankenfield
325 Channing Avenue #116
Palo Alto, CA 94301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Polly Dallas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:11 PM
Please respond to pollydallas

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Polly Dallas
1622 Center St.
Oakland, CA 94607
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patrick Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:11 PM
Please respond to patrickrpn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patrick Williams
1156 W. Iowa
Sunnyvale, CA 94086
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sarah Spengeman to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sspengem

11/17/2014 01:11 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sarah Spengeman
1330 Southwood Drive
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Melissa Peabody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to mpeabody

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Melissa Peabody
89 Manchester St
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dehra Iverson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to dehra

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in towns along the train route aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dehra Iverson
2237 Raleigh Ave
Costa Mesa, CA 92627
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Austin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to Mike

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Austin
5737 Kanan Rd. #271
Agoura Hills, CA 91301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Chelsea Eng to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to tangochelsea

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chelsea Eng
390 Valdez Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94127
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jean Reinys to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:10 PM
Please respond to jean .reinys

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jean Reinys
Francisco St
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jan Cox Golovich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:09 PM
Please respond to janlcg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:
1. My newly-wed daughter lives with a quarter mile of the proposed bomb train tracks. To aprove this project with total disregard for the thousands of lives at stakes is unthinkable.

2. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

3. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

4. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

5. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

6. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

7. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project

simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Cox Golovich
179 Harbor Vista Ct.
Benicia, CA 94510
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

MARK MCCORMICK to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:09 PM
Please respond to mark .mccormick4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

MARK MCCORMICK
556 HACIENDA DR
SCOTTS VALLEY, CA 95066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Amit Shoham to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:09 PM
Please respond to amit

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amit Shoham
2106 7th Ave.
Oakland, CA 94606
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bruce Higgins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:09 PM
Please respond to bhiggins 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Higgins
4148 Bristlecone Way
Livermore, CA 94551
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Fran Salisbury to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:08 PM
Please respond to fran .salisbury

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing you today in the hope that many other citizens of the Central Coast are writing you, too, to I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery.
You know the reasons. And I know the pressure you are under to cave on this issue. Therefore, I am appealing to you on behalf of public and environmental health to block this project now. Please let me know your final decision.

Fran Salisbury
2207 Ashwood Lane
San Jose, CA 95132
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christina Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:08 PM
Please respond to cmwfey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christina Williams
8600 International Ave Apt 239
Canoga Park, CA 91304
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cindy Ast to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:08 PM
Please respond to Cindy _ast

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cindy Ast
Roble Ave
Menlo Park, CA 94305
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Allen Swift to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to swifteye

11/17/2014 01:08 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Allen Swift
Bridgehead Road
Martinez, CA 94553
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Debbie Verdugo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:08 PM
Please respond to web 4deb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debbie Verdugo
210 Avenida Montalvo
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Taylor Solorzano to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:07 PM
Please respond to taylor .solorzano

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Taylor Solorzano
Surfside Ave
Seal Beach, CA 90743
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
alicia falsetto to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:07 PM
Please respond to aliciaf 618

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

alicia falsetto
1830 santa cruz aveneu
menlo park, CA 94025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
john s to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:07 PM
Please respond to jsingiser

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

john s
yolmlio
gbon;m;, CA 94403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ken Burke to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to kenburke

11/17/2014 01:07 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ken Burke
21228 Gary Drive #417
Hayward, CA 94546
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Margaret Pierce to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:07 PM
Please respond to magpiecruzn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Margaret Pierce
340 Quail Run
Aptos, CA 95003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ruth Farnsworth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:06 PM
Please respond to ruth _farnsworth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ruth Farnsworth
408 pinefield rd
san jose, CA 95134
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Matt Olrich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:06 PM
Please respond to matt .olrich

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matt Olrich
9 Falmouth Cove
San Rafael, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Colin Murphy to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to callmurph

11/17/2014 01:06 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Colin Murphy
Some Street
Oakland, CA 94606
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Grace Feldmann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:06 PM
Please respond to morgainele

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Grace Feldmann
4896 Lookout rd
Santa Barbara, CA, CA 93105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Jane Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:05 PM
Please respond to jayklaus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Jane Adams
26 Hillcrest Drive
Paso Robles, KS 93446
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Frazer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:05 PM
Please respond to barbarafrazer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Frazer
668 39th Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ELMER BERGER to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:05 PM
Please respond to bergerearusty

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ELMER BERGER
58 BILLOU ST
SAN RAFAEL, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Genevieve Deppong to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:04 PM
Please respond to gdeppong

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Genevieve Deppong
10664 Baxter Ave
Los Altos, CA 94024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sandie Brown to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:04 PM
Please respond to brownsandie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sandie Brown
200 la colina dr
alamo, CA 94507
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Andrew Olsen to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to andrewolsen 76

11/17/2014 01:04 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrew Olsen
4440 Finley Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sandra Barlow to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:04 PM
Please respond to webblender 88

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Barlow
2951 Derby St.
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

wandis wilcox to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:03 PM
Please respond to wandisdw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Please deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I'm, also, opposed to this project for the following reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

wandis wilcox
1860 via pacifica, #1201
aptos, CA 95003

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chelsea Mosher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:03 PM
Please respond to chelseamosher

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chelsea Mosher
526 E. 8th
Long Beach, CA 90813
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Javier Del Valle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:02 PM
Please respond to jdelvalle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Javier Del Valle
P.O. Box 3060
Montebello, CA 90640
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Morgan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:02 PM
Please respond to Redwoodbird

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Morgan
10 Cherrywood Court
San Pablo, CA 94806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marlene Fisher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:02 PM
Please respond to marlenefisherla

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marlene Fisher
550N. Orlando Avenue
West Hollywood, CA 90048
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Martha Jordan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:01 PM
Please respond to mejordan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Martha Jordan
521 Lincoln St
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karen Brickell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:01 PM
Please respond to karenbrickell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Brickell
6523 Maplegrove St.
Oak Park, CA 91377
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Kutilek to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:00 PM
Please respond to Kuti 3058

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am a Nipomo, CA property owner and and my emotions regarding these oil trains range from fear to outrage. I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death. My property lies just a few miles from the refinery and I have children and grandchildren who will be directly at risk!

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands

are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

The question is not, "Will a spill occur" but "When and how often will spills occur and what we we lose in the process." For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Kutilek
601 s 15th st
San Jose, CA 95112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Zion Aregahegn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:00 PM
Please respond to zion .600

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Zion Aregahegn
1762 Castro Drive
San Jose, CA 95130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
catherine ridder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 01:00 PM
Please respond to caridder 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

catherine ridder
3091 lake
altadena, CA 91001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Paula DeFelice to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to paula .defelice

11/17/2014 01:00 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paula DeFelice
Mozart Dr.
Richmond, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sara Wan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:59 PM
Please respond to sarawan 425

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sara Wan
22350 Carbon Mesa Rd
Malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Andrea von Foerster to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:59 PM
Please respond to Firestartermusic

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrea von Foerster
5718 Beck Avenue
North Hollywood, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Heermance to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:59 PM
Please respond to cheermance

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Heermance
208 N California Ave
Palo Alto, CA 94301
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joanne Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:58 PM
Please respond to ghwilliams 6

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joanne Williams
Camino Alto
Mill Valley, CA 94941
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jackie Thompson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:57 PM
Please respond to jackie .thompson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jackie Thompson
4257 Lorrain St
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alejandra Cardenas to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to a .n.cardenas .92

11/17/2014 12:57 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alejandra Cardenas
5428 Aldama St.
Los Angeles, CA 90042
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Katie Ruthroff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:57 PM
Please respond to katiemruthroff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katie Ruthroff
P.O. Box 933
Eldridge, CA 95431
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gwen Romani to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:57 PM
Please respond to gcompass

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gwen Romani
28667 Meadowgrass Drive
Castaic, CA 91384
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
donna duran to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:56 PM
Please respond to dani

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

donna duran
17168 ballinger st.
northridge, CA 91325
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Scott Akemon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:56 PM
Please respond to scottakemon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Scott Akemon
4260 Harbor View
Oakland, CA 94619
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Andrea Hodges to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:56 PM
Please respond to andreahodges

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Andrea Hodges
8770 Carmel Valley Rd
Carmel, CA 93923
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Ramsey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:55 PM
Please respond to katyblue

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Ramsey
1626 Colusa Ave.
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Ramsey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:55 PM
Please respond to katyblue

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Ramsey
1626 Colusa Ave.
Davis, CA 95616
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
STACIE CHARLEBOIS to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:55 PM
Please respond to armostacie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

STACIE CHARLEBOIS
701 GRANDVIEW RD
SEBASTOPOL, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Phillips to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:54 PM
Please respond to carol .bear100

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Phillips
1825 Sonoma Blvd. #356
Vallejo, CA 94590
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisa Soon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:53 PM
Please respond to lissoon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisa Soon
121 Ladera Dr
santa cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Paul Bassen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:53 PM
Please respond to pbassen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Paul Bassen
5600 Merriewood Drive
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bob Thawley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:53 PM
Please respond to bthawley

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bob Thawley
15 Mirabel Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Steponaitis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:52 PM
Please respond to steponaj

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Steponaitis
910 Geary 20
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frederick Clegg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:52 PM
Please respond to fwc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frederick Clegg
Diablo Drive
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Megan Eding to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:52 PM
Please respond to eding .megan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Megan Eding
715 Camino Amigo
Danville, CA 94526
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joan Carrara to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to joanc 1943

11/17/2014 12:52 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Carrara
425 Ridgewood Ct.
Antioch, CA 94509
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Milliken to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:51 PM
Please respond to beth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Milliken
1256 Hudson Avenue
St. Helena, CA 94574
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jan Leath to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:50 PM
Please respond to ranjon 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Leath
1128 Princeton Drive
glendale, CA 91205
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Hampson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:49 PM
Please respond to jdh _sf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Hampson
729 Waller Street, Apt. B
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
B Phillips to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:49 PM
Please respond to Etoilerb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

B Phillips
K
B, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tara Gonzales to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:49 PM
Please respond to nocona 81

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tara Gonzales
5210 Magdalena Ave
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tina Ann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:48 PM
Please respond to 8tinaann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tina Ann
p.o. box 265
Bolinas, CA 94924
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
carmen palumbo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:48 PM
Please respond to carmenpalumbo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

carmen palumbo
6602 kilda cir
huntington beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Deisha Garcia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:48 PM
Please respond to moz .thesmiths

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Deisha Garcia
1277 Branham Lane
San Jose, CA 95118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Oliver to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:47 PM
Please respond to nancyoliver

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Oliver
2254 Moreno Dr.
Los Angeles, CA 90039
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sherry Handy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:47 PM
Please respond to sherryh 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sherry Handy
965 Gold Nugget Circle
Lincoln, CA 95648
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jack Phillips to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:46 PM
Please respond to cooperfiasco

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jack Phillips
2754 Hawks Landing Court
Placerville, CA 95667
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Wolf to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:46 PM
Please respond to davidwolfphoto

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Wolf
3063 25th Street
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
dale riehart to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:46 PM
Please respond to dale

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

dale riehart
86 south park st
san francisco, CA 94107
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Tomczyszyn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:46 PM
Please respond to mtomczyszyn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Tomczyszyn
243 Ramsell St
San Francisco, CA 94132
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ina Mitchell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:46 PM
Please respond to ina

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ina Mitchell
15305 Lanark St Apt 222
Van Nuys, CA 91406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
jamie coventry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to jwcoventry

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

jamie coventry
carriage dr
el sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Small to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to maryksmall

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Small
3463 San Marcos Way
Santa Clara, CA 95051
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
J Bonsal Weiner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to jbw 8

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

J Bonsal Weiner
76 Ross Ave
San Anselmo, CA 94960
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Aaron Ross to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:45 PM
Please respond to magnifico 451

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Aaron Ross
383 W. 14th Street
San Pedro, CA 90731
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rosann Lynch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:44 PM
Please respond to Handz 2000

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rosann Lynch
872 Laine Street
Monterey, CA 93940
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Lucas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:44 PM
Please respond to drluke 957

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Lucas
10110 Margo Ln
Westminsrter, CA 92683
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Iris Bruel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to Irisbruel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Iris Bruel
8 Bayo Vista Way
San Rafael, CA 94901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jane Edwards to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to janeedwards 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jane Edwards
7822 Trinity Ln.
La Palma, CA 90623
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kurt Speidel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to kswhatever

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kurt Speidel
761 Calle Los Olivos
San Clemente, CA 92673
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

William Mitchell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to bmitchell 94619

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Mitchell
5511 Fernhoff Rd
Oakland, CA 94619
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Heidi Gitterman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to heidigitt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heidi Gitterman
11 Charmaine Ct.
Novato, CA 94949
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Valerie Goldberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:43 PM
Please respond to Umgluck

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Valerie Goldberg
P.o. Box 8212
Calabasas, CA 91372
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Monika Radosova to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:42 PM
Please respond to monica .jimi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Monika Radosova
Kubranska 2
Trencin, ot 91101
SK

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
charlotte cook to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:42 PM
Please respond to ccook

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

charlotte cook
1133 55th street
sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steve Lustgarden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:42 PM
Please respond to slustgarden

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Lustgarden
28 Hanover Couirt
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Patricia Guevara to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:41 PM
Please respond to pldgwriteme

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Guevara
476 Winchester Dr
Watsonville, CA 95076
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jen Rios to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:41 PM
Please respond to jen _rios

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jen Rios
3241 Taper Ave
San Jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Teri Herbst to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:40 PM
Please respond to hisnherbst

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Teri Herbst
4910 Via El Sereno
Torrance, CA 90505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Stephen Markel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:39 PM
Please respond to markel 4242

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Markel
4242 Coolidge Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Uriel Aguilar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to urielchav

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Uriel Aguilar
977 Clark ave
Mountain View, CA 94040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karilyn Kirsch to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to batstatic

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karilyn Kirsch
335 S BErendo Apt 202
Los Angeles, CA 90020
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gina Sanfilippo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to gina .sanfilippo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gina Sanfilippo
3690 21st st
san francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ruth Lombard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to hunbard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ruth Lombard
514 Baines Ave
Sonoma, CA 95476
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sandra Britton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to sandrabritton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Britton
613 Woodgreen Way
Nipomo, CA 93444
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cristian Contreras to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:38 PM
Please respond to cris 006

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cristian Contreras
4700 Acacia St
Bell, CA 90201
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Thomas Carlino to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:37 PM
Please respond to cbd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thomas Carlino
549 Quail Bush Ct
San Jose, CA 95117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Janet Mc Entee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:36 PM
Please respond to jmmcentee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Mc Entee
940 Willowleaf Dr. Apt 2504
San Jose, CA 95128
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Helen Cooluris to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:36 PM
Please respond to hmc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Helen Cooluris
58 West Portal Avenue #138
San Francisco, CA 94127
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Kramer to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to nancy

11/17/2014 12:36 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Kramer
315 Franklin Street
Newton, MA 02458
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marion Taylor Baer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:36 PM
Please respond to mtbaer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marion Taylor Baer
3636 Corinth Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Julie Williamson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:36 PM
Please respond to 1wogdog

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julie Williamson
7424 Canady Lane
Citrus Heights, CA 95610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Shari Amos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:35 PM
Please respond to shariamos 3324

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Shari Amos
3324 OFarrell Drive
Sacramento, CA 95815
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Julianna Dickey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:35 PM
Please respond to julianna

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julianna Dickey
2107 Spaulding AVenue
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Camille Gilbert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to camillegilbert

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Camille Gilbert
1923 San Andres St Apt F
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lauren Murdock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to murdock _ls

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Murdock
3940 Via Lucero Apt #16
Santa Barbara, CA 93110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kevin Tharp to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to Kevtharp

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kevin Tharp
1863 Malibu Cir
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ERNESTO FERRERA to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to ferrerae 60

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ERNESTO FERRERA
82 CITY LIMITS CIR
EMERYVILLE, CA 94608
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
charlotte cook to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to ccook

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

charlotte cook
1133 55th street
sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Steele to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to online -activist

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Steele
24561 La Hermosa Ave.
Laguna Niguel, CA 92677
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Emily Carr to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:34 PM
Please respond to somamartial

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emily Carr
18301 Norlene
Grass Valley, CA 95949
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brian Kessler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:33 PM
Please respond to brian_100ca

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Kessler
14340 Addison Street 109
Sherman Oaks, CA 91423
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lisbeth Jaasko to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:33 PM
Please respond to crystalcave 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lisbeth Jaasko
14923 Leffingwell Rd.
Whittier, CA 90604
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
kris baker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:33 PM
Please respond to lillabo 2001

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

kris baker
3037 carey lane
brentwood, CA 94513
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Wendy Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:33 PM
Please respond to Wendy .wendy777

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wendy Anderson
112 marigold lane
Forestville, CA 95436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Howard Whitaker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:32 PM
Please respond to hjameswhitaker

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Howard Whitaker
2041 Campton Circle
Gold River, CA 95670
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Graciela Huth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:32 PM
Please respond to pesceto

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Graciela Huth
8732 EL MANOR AVE
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joan kaplan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:32 PM
Please respond to joankap

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joan kaplan
397 e las flores
altadena, CA 91001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joe Buhowsky to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jbuhowsky

11/17/2014 12:31 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joe Buhowsky
83 Tahoe Court
San Ramon, CA 94582
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Robert Griffin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:31 PM
Please respond to bgriffin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Griffin
5715 Vineland Ave #4
North Hollywood, CA 91601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
patricia boyle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:31 PM
Please respond to p .boyle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

patricia boyle
510 sand hill circle
menlo park, CA 94025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary Wiener to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:31 PM
Please respond to mbw 565

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Wiener
429 Lambert Road
Carpinteria, CA 93013
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
elaine hirtle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:31 PM
Please respond to hirzapps 99

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

elaine hirtle
1401 cottage Street, #d
Alameda, CA 94501
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:31 PM
Please respond to LKJohn 827

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura Johnson
22532 Tiermas
Mission Viejo, CA 92691
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robyn Sherrill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:30 PM
Please respond to cwbygrl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robyn Sherrill
PO Box 777
Penngrove, CA 94951
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Treffry to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:30 PM
Please respond to Nancytreffry

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Treffry
19221 Pioneer Pl
Aromas, CA 95004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Syd Rumford to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:29 PM
Please respond to syd 2588

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Syd Rumford
4746 Hazelbrook Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90808
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cynthia Ratliff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:29 PM
Please respond to peace 4alllife

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cynthia Ratliff
po box 3918
Santa Cruz, CA 95063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Cindy Bartlett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:29 PM
Please respond to ambhds

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cindy Bartlett
11968 Loch Lomond Rd
Middletown, CA 95461
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
casee maxfield to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:28 PM
Please respond to storyspice

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

casee maxfield
apt 213 1737 n sycamore ave
los angeles, CA 90028
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karesa McElheny to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:28 PM
Please respond to headofred

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karesa McElheny
10248 Whitegate Ave.
Sunland, CA 91040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Leticia Cowan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:28 PM
Please respond to elsiecowan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leticia Cowan
P.O. 5008
San Jose, CA 95150
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laurel Tucker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:28 PM
Please respond to tsva 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I live and work in my home in Claremont, just 1/2 mile away from the railroad tracks that bisect our town. My children's preschool, elementary and middle schools are even closer to the tracks.

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands

are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurel Tucker
676 W. 9th St.
Claremont, CA 91711
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alexis Wray Negele Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:28 PM
Please respond to alexis .negele

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alexis Wray Negele Miller
1342 Stanford St #3
Santa Monica, CA 90404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Suzanne DeerlyJohnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:27 PM
Please respond to suzannedj 3

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Suzanne DeerlyJohnson
2121 Locust Avenue
Long Beach, CA 90806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Evan Shamoon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:27 PM
Please respond to giantmech

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Evan Shamoon
1633 Waterloo St
LA, CA 90026
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Chuck Bailey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:27 PM
Please respond to zeldasgrampy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chuck Bailey
3 Cliffside Drive
Daly City, CA 94015
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ann Thryft to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to athryft

11/17/2014 12:26 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Thryft
15520 Big Basin Way
Boulder Creek, CA 95006
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Talbot to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:25 PM
Please respond to jamestalbot

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Talbot
16756 Simonds St
Granada Hills, CA 91344
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Arbuckle to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:25 PM
Please respond to crockerbuckle

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Arbuckle
524 Nimitz Ave
Redwood City, CA 94025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jeff Kline to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:24 PM
Please respond to kline .jb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jeff Kline
1221 Mariner Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
nancy zebracki to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:24 PM
Please respond to zebracki 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

nancy zebracki
20 east long lake
troy, MI 48085
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
n kaluza to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:24 PM
Please respond to natashakaluza

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

n kaluza
5396 carriage dr
el sobrante, CA 94803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephen Rosenthal to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:24 PM
Please respond to stros 29

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephen Rosenthal
1255 10th Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brian Hanson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:22 PM
Please respond to brother _cadfael

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brian Hanson
1057 torrance blvd
Torrance, CA 90502
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Broz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:22 PM
Please respond to inquirer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Broz
P.O. Box 5730
Sherman Oaks, CA 91413
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
denise kim potter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:22 PM
Please respond to kpottersf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

denise kim potter
898 wisconsin street
san francisco, CA 94107
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

R.Terra Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:21 PM
Please respond to terrawi

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

On behalf of my family of six adults and our circle of concerned friends, I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

My family, our friends and I strongly oppose this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, my family, our friends and I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

R.Terra Williams
1948 Pleasant Hill Rd
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laurie Hall to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:20 PM
Please respond to lahall

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laurie Hall
1674 Cypress Avenue
Richmond, CA 94805
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Lima to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:20 PM
Please respond to Limasherps

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Lima
220 Walnut Dr
Ventura, CA 93003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jonathan Green to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:20 PM
Please respond to gnahtanoj

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jonathan Green
4632 Don Miguel Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90008
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Chandra Stephens to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:20 PM
Please respond to chandras

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chandra Stephens
1623 W. Sexton Rd
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Johnson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:19 PM
Please respond to circej

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Johnson
4022 Ternez Drive
Moorpark, CA 93021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mary McGann to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:19 PM
Please respond to mmcgann

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary McGann
2542 Hilgard Ave
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kim Richards to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:19 PM
Please respond to krshowtime

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kim Richards
1611 Walnut St.
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael and Ann Wylie to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to mdwylie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael and Ann Wylie
1200 7th Street
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Perkins to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to neonatern

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Perkins
2480 Loch Way
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jacqueline Komninos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to jackie 4eng

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jacqueline Komninos
2737 E. 2nd Street #3
Long Beach, CA 90803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
annamarta dostourian to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to annarradha 17

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

annamarta dostourian
1970 San Pablo Ave #16
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

John Holtzclaw to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to john .holtzclaw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project and urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John Holtzclaw
1508 Taylor #5
San Francisco, CA 94133
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tim Guisinger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:18 PM
Please respond to guyzinger

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tim Guisinger
2548 Leafwood Drive
Camarillo, CA 93010
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Peter Gjerset to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:17 PM
Please respond to pgjerset

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Peter Gjerset
1238 1/2 N Sycamore Ave
Los Angeles, CA 90038
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Hailey Baker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:17 PM
Please respond to hhbaker 96

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Hailey Baker
9 Driftwood Ave
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dan Miner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:16 PM
Please respond to 1fish13

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dan Miner
2712 ostrom ave
long beach, CA 90815
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Craig Antrim to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:15 PM
Please respond to ckantrim

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Craig Antrim
1312 S. Pacific Ave.
San Pedro, CA 90731
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
DONNA KHOURY to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:15 PM
Please respond to DONNAKHOURY

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

DONNA KHOURY
855 SARATOGA STREET
Oxnard, CA 93035
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Steve Roth to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to slroth 24

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Steve Roth
8818 Oak Trail Dr
Santa Rosa, CA 95409
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Geraldine May to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to Huerhuero

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Geraldine May
9845 Huer Huero rd
Creston, CA 93432
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Noel Gould to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to aquarianstudios

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Noel Gould
728 Paseo Del Mar
San Pedro, CA 90731
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jacque Lefler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to jlefler

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jacque Lefler
7720 Bodega Ave., 20
Sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Chet Yee to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to chetyee

11/17/2014 12:14 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Chet Yee
1581 Hawes Court
Redwood City, CA 94061
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
mary barich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to mbarich

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

mary barich
3411 Milburn St
Rocklin, CA 95765
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Loy Zimmerman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to lzimmerm

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Loy Zimmerman
4325 E. Vermont St
Long Beach, CA 98014
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frank Ackerman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to Ackermanjay

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I cannot believe that you could allow this dangerous action. You would be allowing a corrupt foreign greedy corporation to endanger the health and property of Californians. We would loose health, property, our environment to satisfy greed. There is on up side for us. We take all the risks while the tax dodging rich reap all the profits.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers

fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frank Ackerman
1232 Leisure Lane
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Roberta Stauffacher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:14 PM
Please respond to stellarart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roberta Stauffacher
2011 lyon avenue
Belmont, CA 94002
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
david drummond to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:13 PM
Please respond to manzanita 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

david drummond
5725 burlingame ave
richmond, CA 94804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
steven rathfon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to sdrathf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

steven rathfon
2262 Emerald Circle
Morro Bay, CA 93442
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patricia Wilson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to pwilsontchr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Wilson
PO Box 7516
Spreckels, CA, CA 93962
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Therese Sing to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to dolphindreamteam

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Therese Sing
1328 2nd Street
Santa Monica, CA 90401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dana Linder to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to mrdanalinder

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dana Linder
5911 Lake Almanor Drive
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Charles Beals to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to chasbeals

11/17/2014 12:11 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Charles Beals
6611 McLennan Avenue
Van Nuys, CA 91406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Goldberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to Sgoldb 5785

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Goldberg
1609 Arbor Dr
Glendale, CA 91202
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen u to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to kulring

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen u
934 Page St.
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nadya Tichman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to nadyatichman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nadya Tichman
1789 Leimert Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Candy Frantz-Crafton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to candy _frantz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

You should know BETTER by now!!

Candy Frantz-Crafton
2636 17th Ave. #111
Santa Cruz, CA 95065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lari Davis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to lari

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lari Davis
6801 Cumberland Dr.
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barrie Newell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:11 PM
Please respond to Marknbari

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barrie Newell
1644 23rd Street
Manhattan Beach, CA 90266
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nicole Savage to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:10 PM
Please respond to nssfheart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nicole Savage
Geary Blvd
SanFrancisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sally Abrams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:10 PM
Please respond to perigrey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sally Abrams
138 Cortland
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
William Cody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to codywpc 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Cody
321 Lori Dr.
BENICIA, CA 94510
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
vicki hughes to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to vdh 2810

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

vicki hughes
4351 boardwalk dr. #205
huntington beach, CA 92649
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Donna Sharee to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to dsharee

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Donna Sharee
459 Naples Street
San Francisco, CA 94112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Heather Hanly to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to hanly

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Heather Hanly
4297 Lakeshore Ave
Oakland, CA 94610
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Martha Goldin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:09 PM
Please respond to Honmgret

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

7. My family and I are users of Amtrak trains, which use the same rail lines

as the proposed monster oil trains. The delays and distruptions to passenger train traffic caused by these trains are simply other nails in the coffin of decent less polluting public transportation along the California coast. That is the antithises of what our coastal areas need.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Martha Goldin
701 4th Ave
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joel Hill to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:08 PM
Please respond to joelrocket 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am particularly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

7. Tar sands crude oil has become known in the industry as FAR more toxic and

more likely to explode than the conventional crude oil we have previously been dealing with. This is the oil which led to the devastation of the Canadian town of Lac-Magantic in the tar sands train derailment and explosions on July 26, 2013. Here is a link to a photo of that event http://g.foolcdn.com/editorial/images/58400/lac_megantic_burning_large.jpg

8. The force of these explosions have caused railroad regulators to acknowledge that the tank cars which are currently being used to transport tar sands oil are inadequate for this task. However, to retrofit the existing U.S. tanker car fleet with additional safety measures would cost more than $1 billion, according to the Association of American Railroads. These kinds of expenses will lead to higher costs to move oil by rail, and regions that have relied on rail could lose their competitive advantage. But the proposed spur will carry the dangerously inadequate tank cars; which are unfit for this duty.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joel Hill
556 Sunlit Lane
Bonny Doon, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frank B. Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:08 PM
Please respond to fbmjet

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frank B. Anderson
515 North Meyler St.
San Pedro, CA 90731
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Susan Wright to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:08 PM
Please respond to suzettew 47

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Susan Wright
7521 Wyoming St
Westminster, CA 92683
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Allan Fix to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to afixafix

11/17/2014 12:08 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Allan Fix
1305 Solano Apt G
Albany, CA 94706
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
katheine muller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:08 PM
Please respond to kanmuller

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

katheine muller
4415 highgrove ave
torrance, CA 90505
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Roger and Judy McClure to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:07 PM
Please respond to r -j_mcclure

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roger and Judy McClure
29111 Lotusgarden Dr.
Canyon Country, CA 91387
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

bob nace to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to robertnace 512

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

bob nace
pleasant valley drive
pleasant hill, CA 94523
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Barbara Rickman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to brickmanlac

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara Rickman
10484 Valley Blvd
El Monte, CA 91731
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lu Ann Flechsig to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to luannf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lu Ann Flechsig
260 Kennedy Rd
Los Gatos, CA 95032
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Emilie Olson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to Emilie .olson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Emilie Olson
65 Golden Hind Passage
Corte Madera, CA 94925
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
rebecca koo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to memoriesjc

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

rebecca koo
1050 johnson ave
san jsoe, CA 95129
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Myron Meisel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:06 PM
Please respond to myron 023

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Myron Meisel
2780 McConnell Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90064
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jennifer Will to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:05 PM
Please respond to jennifer

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Will
964 White Cloud Dr.
Morgan Hill, CA 95037
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
john contos to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:05 PM
Please respond to jcontos

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

john contos
n/a
n/a, CA 90623
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
John De La Torre to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:05 PM
Please respond to jdlt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

John De La Torre
1106 Sonata Drive
Vallejo, CA 94591
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Timothy Larkin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:05 PM
Please respond to FlyBearSF

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Timothy Larkin
1515 Sutter Street Apt. # 210
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ellen Blum to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:05 PM
Please respond to ellenblum 66

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ellen Blum
5074 Mecca Ave.
Tarzana, CA 91356
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Merle, Mary & Spencer Smallwood
To: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sdsmall

11/17/2014 12:04 PM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

We are writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

We are strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, We urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Merle, Mary & Spencer Smallwood
4919 Charter Road
Rocklin, CA 95765
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Barbara Klng to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:04 PM
Please respond to Brb 3Ki

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Barbara KIng
PO Box 29448
Los Angeles, CA 90029
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joel Davidson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:04 PM
Please respond to joelscottd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joel Davidson
504 Thain Way
Palo Alto,, CA 94306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Megan McKay to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:04 PM
Please respond to gromek 101

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Megan McKay
849 56th St
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jane Kwiatkowski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:04 PM
Please respond to kwiatkowskij

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jane Kwiatkowski
212 S Catamaran Circle
Pittsburg, CA 94565
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ryan Bunson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:03 PM
Please respond to rbunson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ryan Bunson
2915 Carlsen Street
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
ARLENE STEVENS to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:03 PM
Please respond to stevensarlene

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ARLENE STEVENS
8451 Montpelier Way
Sacramento, CA 95823
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wil Rodriguez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:03 PM
Please respond to Willierod 14

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wil Rodriguez
2857 S. Bascom Ave.
Campbell, CA 95008
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Alicia Salazar to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:03 PM
Please respond to lola .salazar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alicia Salazar
3436 E. 2nd Street
Los Angeles, CA 90063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
denise skeeter to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:03 PM
Please respond to pskeeter

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

denise skeeter
829 loma ave
long beach, CA 90804
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ira Levine to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:02 PM
Please respond to ilevine 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ira Levine
2404 Wilshire Blvd.
Los Angeles, CA 90057
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Julian Chazin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:02 PM
Please respond to chazij

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Julian Chazin
13956 San Pablo Ave,, Apt 213
San Pablo, CA 94806, CA 94806
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Karen Kirschling to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:00 PM
Please respond to kumasong

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karen Kirschling
633 Oak
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kelsey Baker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:00 PM

Please respond to yeslek 777

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kelsey Baker
9 Driftwood Ave
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
judith roach to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 12:00 PM
Please respond to jroach

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

judith roach
140 valparaiso avenue
atherton, CA 94027
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Natacha Lascano to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:59 AM
Please respond to natachalascano

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Natacha Lascano
3200 Zanker Rd
San Jose, CA 95134
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Craig Michler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:59 AM
Please respond to Cmichler

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Craig Michler
2717 Chelsea Drive
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frances Goff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:58 AM
Please respond to frananth

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frances Goff
5311 Corteen Pl #32
Valley Village, CA 91607
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Virginia Shontell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:58 AM
Please respond to zimtel

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Virginia Shontell
4325 VErmont Street
Long Beach, CA 90814
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Hoover to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:58 AM
Please respond to mfhoover

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Hoover
8630 lookout mountain ave
los angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Laura Dutton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:58 AM
Please respond to lauradutton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Laura Dutton
2607 Greenvalley Road
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Grant Rich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:57 AM
Please respond to grantrich 88

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Grant Rich
697 30th Street
Oakland, CA 94609
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Michael Kemper to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:57 AM
Please respond to mckemper 84

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Kemper
1388 California Street
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dannys Cody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:56 AM
Please respond to dannys _cody

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dannys Cody
321 Lori Dr.
Benicia, CA 94510
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sharon Richardson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:56 AM
Please respond to sharon

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sharon Richardson
19710 Pinehurst Ln
Salinas, CA 93906
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathryn Spence to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:56 AM
Please respond to kathryn 853

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathryn Spence
288 DONALD DR
MORAGA, CA 94556
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Grainger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:56 AM
Please respond to eavgrainger

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Grainger
1688 Lynoak Drive
Claremont, CA 91711
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Gingrich to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to nanseegee

11/17/2014 11:56 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Gingrich
4317 Gloria Ct
Rohnert Park, CA 94928
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
anthony montapert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:56 AM
Please respond to amontapert

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

anthony montapert
1375 ficus way
ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
r Chirpin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:55 AM
Please respond to gldlight

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

r Chirpin
18520 Vincennes St
Northridge, CA 91324
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Mock to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:55 AM
Please respond to cmock

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Mock
287 Hirsch Ter.
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Judy Sachter to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to sachter

11/17/2014 11:55 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Judy Sachter
1933 Selby Ave #102
Los Angeles, CA 90025
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jill Hartman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:54 AM
Please respond to jillyhart

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jill Hartman
1631 Meander Dr.
Simi Valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Yan Linhart to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:54 AM
Please respond to yan .biobuff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Yan Linhart
2624 Brooks Avenue
El Cerrito, CA 94530
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Illia Rosenthal to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to illia .rosenthal

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Illia Rosenthal
455 Vallejo St
San Francisco, CA 94133
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brice Beckham to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to bbeckham

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brice Beckham
8261 Norton Ave #2
West Hollywood, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Miyuki Powell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to nnco 0409

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Miyuki Powell
15672 Jefferson Street
Midway City, CA 92655
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
kristin thigpen to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to kristint

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

kristin thigpen
4039 Shadowhill Drive
Santa Rosa, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Karyn Gil to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to gilkaryn

11/17/2014 11:53 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Karyn Gil
1518 54th Street
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Matthew Pollard to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to m .pollard

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Pollard
6176 Pershing
St. Louis, MO 63130
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Florencia Valle -Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to florencia .valle.miller

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Florencia Valle-Miller
580 McAllister Street
San Francisco, CA 94102
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Bruce Cozzini to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to bruce .cozzini

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Cozzini
PO box 205
Capitola, CA 95010
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Angeles Sosa to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:53 AM
Please respond to angeles 2535

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Angeles Sosa
3474 E. 1sr. st.
Los Angeles, CA 90063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Marilyn Chinivasagam to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:52 AM
Please respond to m .chini

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marilyn Chinivasagam
1632 Fairlawn Av
San Jose, CA 95125
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
lois shelton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to sisubear

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

lois shelton
13580 Capitol Drive
Grass VAley, CA 95945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sandi Covell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to scovell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandi Covell
1183 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Amy Malick to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to amyamalick

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Amy Malick
185 N Bailey dr
Porter, IN 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Frances Blythe to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to francesb 5601

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frances Blythe
555 Morgan Lane
Dixon, CA 95620
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Elizabeth Jackson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to ejackson 263

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Jackson
9551 Rockybrook Way
Elk Grove, CA 95624
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Meigs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:51 AM
Please respond to katymeigs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Meigs
304 Shady Lane
Ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Penny Koines to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:50 AM
Please respond to pkoines

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Penny Koines
1731 Tonini Dr.
san Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Adam Trauger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:50 AM
Please respond to AdamT 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Adam Trauger
5160 E. Atherton St #83
Long Beach, CA 90815
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dennis Kish to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:50 AM
Please respond to dkish 3883

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur. For 20 years I lived about 2 miles from the plant.

Dennis Kish
35,22nd.st
Cayucos, CA 93430
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Nancy Couperus to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:50 AM
Please respond to couperus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Couperus
13680 Page Mill Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paul caarlton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:50 AM
Please respond to pfcsage

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paul caarlton
3280 Paseo Gallita
san clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

gary dowling to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:49 AM
Please respond to garyb 24s

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

gary dowling
po box 26
pope valley, CA 94567
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Carol Gold to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:49 AM
Please respond to carolgold

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Gold
2901a Sir Francis Drake Blvd.
Fairfax, CA 94930
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Sandi Covell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:49 AM
Please respond to scovell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandi Covell
1183 Alemany Blvd.
San Francisco, CA 94112
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Gary Boren to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to garybardo

11/17/2014 11:49 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gary Boren
501 Guerrero #6
San Francisco, CA 94110
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Marie Ellis to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to marieartistry

11/17/2014 11:49 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Marie Ellis
125 holly
Watsonville, CA 95076
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Gary Lloyd to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to gary .skychi

11/17/2014 11:49 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gary Lloyd
1901 Morgan Lane
Redondo Beach, CA 90278
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gail Camhi to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to gailcamhi 24

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gail Camhi
4 Fallen Leaf Way
Novato, CA 94949
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
janice tieken to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to orequiem

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

janice tieken
297 colusa ave
ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

georgia goldfarb to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to georgia .goldfarb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

georgia goldfarb
20650 whitecap
malibu, CA 90265
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Hod Gray to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to hg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Hod Gray
521 Arroyo Avenue
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
barrie Avis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:48 AM
Please respond to barrie .d.a

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

barrie Avis
15321 Padres Street
Westminster, CA 92683
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Roberta Kansteiner to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:47 AM
Please respond to rskclothes

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Roberta Kansteiner
190 Canyon Acres Dr
Laguna Beach, CA 92651
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Dipa Suri to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:47 AM
Please respond to dipasuri

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dipa Suri
715 Hibernia Ct
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jude Todd to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:47 AM
Please respond to todd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jude Todd
2655 Brommer St. #18
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Zoey Bothwell -Mitlitsky to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:47 AM
Please respond to zfunnybunny 123

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Zoey Bothwell-Mitlitsky
1125 Canton Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Celia Kutcher to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to celia 552

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Please deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put many communities directly in harm's way.

1. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

2. The cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals must be examined as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

3. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, please soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Celia Kutcher
34681 Calle los Robles
Capistrano Beach, CA 92624
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Fredrick Seil to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to seilf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Fredrick Seil
1 Twain Ave.
Berkeley, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Edward Barrall to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to embarrall

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Edward Barrall
5878 Allen Ave.
San Jose, CA 95123
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gretchen Whisenand to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to gmwhisen

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gretchen Whisenand
1949 BELMONT CT
SANTA ROSA, CA 95404
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Helmer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to kath 51

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Helmer
23125 Dolorosa Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dennis Kish to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to dkish 3883

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

I was a resident of the Nipomo mesa for twenty years, living about 2 miles

from the plant.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dennis Kish
35,22nd.st
Cayucos, CA 93430
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Bruce Bennett to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to brucecbennett

11/17/2014 11:46 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce Bennett
818 Reina Del Mar Ave
Pacifica, CA 94044
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joseph Gilbert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to joeg 4us

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joseph Gilbert
1037 N. Rice Rd.
Ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frank Lahorgue to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to frank

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frank Lahorgue
12 Mount Susitna Court
San Rafael, CA 94903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joseph Gilbert to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:46 AM
Please respond to joeg 4us

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joseph Gilbert
1037 N. Rice Rd.
Ojai, CA 93023
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bev Huntsberger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:45 AM
Please respond to bits

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bev Huntsberger
3030 El Nido Dr
Altadena, CA 91001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Theresa Perry to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to theresaperry

11/17/2014 11:45 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Theresa Perry
10480 Sunland Bl
Sunland, CA 91040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Alice Kelly to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to alicemarykelly

11/17/2014 11:45 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Alice Kelly
6493 Cooper St.
Felton, CA 95018
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Ross to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:45 AM
Please respond to headhunt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Ross
235 Mountainview Ave
Santa Cruz, CA 95062
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Winnafred Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:45 AM
Please respond to winnafred

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Winnafred Smith
4370 Faulkner Dr.
Fremont, CA 94536
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Madeline Wright to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:45 AM
Please respond to snowbear 913

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Madeline Wright
6727 W 87th Place
Los Angeles, CA 90045
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bruce England to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to bkengland

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bruce England
328 Whisman Station Drive
Mountain View, CA 94043
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lupe Anguiano to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to lupeanguiano 9

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lupe Anguiano
1031 Kumquat Place
Oxnard, CA 93036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cynthia Romer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to cynthia

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cynthia Romer
c/o 214 Grant Ave, #325
san francisco, CA 94108
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ardis Jackson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to ardisjackson 100

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ardis Jackson
320 Napa Ave.
Rodeo, CA 94572
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Athena Lake to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to athenareiki

11/17/2014 11:44 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Athena Lake
25556 La Mirada St
Laguna Hills, CA 92653
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

WILLIAM O'HARE to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to tim .ohare1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

WILLIAM O'HARE
90 Pinehaven Dr
Daly City, CA 94015
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
CARLA DAVIS to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to CMOUSE 1945

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

CARLA DAVIS
777 MEADOWSWEET DR
CORTE MADERA, CA 94925
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Stephanie Walker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to swalker

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Stephanie Walker
638 Los Ninos Way
Los Altos, CA 94022
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
joan wager to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to joanwager 204

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

joan wager
109 cragmont aveune
berkeley, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kay Dillon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to beauxgateaux

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kay Dillon
654 33rd Ave.
San Francisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Janet Pielke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to jvop 43

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Pielke
1589 Webster Ave.
Claremont, CA 91711
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Bill Vartnaw to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to taureanhorn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Bill Vartnaw
55 Mcnear Avenue
Petaluma, CA 94952
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Doris Nelson to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to thewizardessofoz

11/17/2014 11:44 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Doris Nelson
3218 Coolidge Ave.
Los Angeles, CA 90066
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Cecilia Maida to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:44 AM
Please respond to cmaida

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

Add my voice to 1000s writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Cecilia Maida
3840 Market Court
Shingle Springs, CA 95682
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Evelyn Trevethan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:43 AM
Please respond to ejtrevethan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Evelyn Trevethan
238 Lakeview
Napa, CA 94559
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gillian Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:43 AM
Please respond to gilliansmith 2

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gillian Smith
1550 N. Fairfax Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kristen Monsell to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:43 AM
Please respond to kristenmonsell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kristen Monsell
6393 Colby St
Oakland, CA 94618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ivona Xiezopolski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:42 AM
Please respond to annacarmen 2000

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ivona Xiezopolski
25047 Oakridge Ct.
Hayward, CA 94541
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vasu Murti to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:42 AM
Please respond to vasumurti

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vasu Murti
30 Villanova Lane
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Arthur Alenik to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:42 AM
Please respond to aalenik

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arthur Alenik
via Sacramento
Capistrano Beach, CA 92624
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lynn zuazo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:42 AM
Please respond to Zlynn 22

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynn zuazo
25885 Trabuco rd #298
Lake Forest, CA 92630
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gregg Holzer to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:41 AM
Please respond to pt .lobosdiver

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gregg Holzer
140 Theodor Lane
Sonoma, CA 94903
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jennifer Irani to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:41 AM

Please respond to winifree

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jennifer Irani
3201 Broad St. Unit B
Newport Beach, CA 92663
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

M. Eaton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:41 AM
Please respond to amoseaton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

M. Eaton
Chandler st
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gary Kuehn to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:41 AM
Please respond to frump 55

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gary Kuehn
21228 Simay Lane
Newhall, CA 91321
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Beverly Jennings to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:40 AM
Please respond to bevjenn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Beverly Jennings
602 Chestnut St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mario Salgado to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:40 AM
Please respond to msaddemar

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mario Salgado
1392 N. Schooner Lane
Anaheim, CA 92801
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carlton Keppelman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:40 AM
Please respond to tkeppelman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carlton Keppelman
p.o. box 22578
Carmel, CA 93922
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Vickie Chandler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:39 AM
Please respond to vickiechandler

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Vickie Chandler
1640 Canna Ln
San Jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Lucas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:39 AM
Please respond to drluke 957

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Lucas
10110 Margo Ln
Westminsrter, CA 92683
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tiffany Ruiz -Murillo to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:39 AM
Please respond to tiffanyyellow

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tiffany Ruiz-Murillo
2508 n naomi st apt f
Burbank, CA 91504
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

K. Oberle to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to oberlek

11/17/2014 11:39 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K. Oberle
200 Caldecott Ln Unit 314
Oakland, CA 94618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jorge Velez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:39 AM
Please respond to jmvvdv

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jorge Velez
753 Goodwin Av
San Jose, CA 95128
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Linda Dragavon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:38 AM
Please respond to traiga

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Linda Dragavon
1295 Church Street
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Carol Patton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:38 AM
Please respond to carol .patton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Carol Patton
321 Rugby Ave.
Kensington, CA 94708
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
patricia ternahan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:38 AM
Please respond to ternahan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

patricia ternahan
5835 colton blvd
oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Armando A. Garcia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:38 AM
Please respond to mondopwr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Armando A. Garcia
16710 Orange Ave Unit F35
Paramount, CA 90723
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Gabriella Turek to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to gaby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Gabriella Turek
112 N. Michigan Ave #12
Pasadena, CA 91106
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Monica Ventrice to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to moventrice

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Monica Ventrice
10002 Pescadero Creek Rd
Loma Mar, CA 94021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Evelyn Greenwald to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to hgreenwa

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Evelyn Greenwald
3428 SEQUOIA DR
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Y. Tseng to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to ElinaHsiao

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Y. Tseng
1471 Bradshawe Ave.
Monterey Park, CA 91754
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kim O'Bryan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to kimo 62

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kim O'Bryan
P. O. Box 5411
San Luis Obispo, CA 93403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jan Rein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to janny 007

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jan Rein
2704 E street
Sacramento, CA 95816
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
claudia melteff to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to cmelteff

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

claudia melteff
214 alta mesa drive
south san francisco, CA 94080
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert Keats to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to bobswave

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Keats
630 Miramonte Dr.
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mar Buck to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to edbmeb

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mar Buck
410 Paseo Ganso
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
diane olsoon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:37 AM
Please respond to puckdog

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

THERE IS JUST NO REASON WHY WE IN CALIFORNIA SHOULD HAVE TO SUFFER IN ANYWAY TO MAKE PROFITS FOR PHILLIPS 66. THESE BIG OIL COMPANIES NEVER TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE DAMAGE THEY CAUSE THEY JUST TAKE THE MONEY AND RUN. PLEASE "NO" TO THE PHILLIPS 66 RAIL EXPANSION IN SANTA MARIA.

diane olsoon
521 montana ave. #305
santa monica, CA 90403
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
James Lozano to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to Jlozano 137

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Lozano
1515 Hearst ave.
Berkeley, CA 94703
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elaine Genasci to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to elgenasci

11/17/2014 11:36 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elaine Genasci
462 Chorro Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93405
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Jordan Diggs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to jordan

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jordan Diggs
6440 Hazel Circle
Simi Valley, CA 93063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Virginia Volk -Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to vanderv

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Virginia Volk-Anderson
1408 La Sierra Drive
Sacramento, CA 95864
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Matthew Nasser to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to mmatt 37

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Nasser
1920 Violet Street #202
Los Angeles, CA 90021
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lynn Shauinger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to starpath

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lynn Shauinger
941 Oak St
San Francisco, CA 94117
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lala Stanley to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:36 AM
Please respond to lstanleysf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lala Stanley
567 Corbett Ave
San Francisco, CA 94114
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
kathy bilicke to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:35 AM
Please respond to scherkathy

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

kathy bilicke
1550 sunset plaza dr
los angeles, CA 90069
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Leah Zoller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:35 AM
Please respond to zoll 8

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leah Zoller
1235 Parker St
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jamie Rosenblood to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:35 AM
Please respond to jamie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jamie Rosenblood
12235 Gorham Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90049
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Leslie Kneeland to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:34 AM
Please respond to Leslieeneeland

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide oand other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Leslie Kneeland
2324 Gads Hill St
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Wollrich to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:34 AM
Please respond to northca 707

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Wollrich
10292 Marlaw Way
Elk Grove, CA 95757
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Raymond Marshall to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to raynavcad

11/17/2014 11:34 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Raymond Marshall
20635 Spring Garden Road
Foresthill, CA 95631
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
michael rubinstein to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:34 AM
Please respond to mr .ruby

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

michael rubinstein
1821 Oakden Dr
Los Angeles, CA 90046
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Tim Butler to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to tbutler 997

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tim Butler
1520 Gough St. #505
San Francisco, CA 94109
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
terance tashiro to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to ttashiro

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

terance tashiro
8036 westlawn avenue
los angeles, CA 90045
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pat Thompson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to patthompson 1

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pat Thompson
312 Berkeley Ave.
Roseville, CA 95678
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Debra Triacca to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to debratriacca

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Debra Triacca
455 Valley View Ave
Felton, CA 95018
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lindsay Mugglestone to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to lindsmuggl

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lindsay Mugglestone
3023 Deakin St.
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Frances Aubrey to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to francesaubrey

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Frances Aubrey
764 Coventry Rd
Kensington, CA 94707
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Landon Neustadt to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to lneustadt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Landon Neustadt
595 Winterhaven Way
Arroyo Grande, CA 93420
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Rhoda Holabird to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:33 AM
Please respond to rholabird

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

As a Native Californian, I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I most strongly urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rhoda Holabird
2244 Beverly Glen Pl.
Los Angeles, CA 90077
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nicole Gordon to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:32 AM
Please respond to garciagordon 2012

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nicole Gordon
Freeman Ave
La Crescenta, CA 91214
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Christopher Vargas to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:31 AM
Please respond to cvargas 1113

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Christopher Vargas
20329 Elkwood St.
Winnetka, CA 91306
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Thomas Savino to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:31 AM
Please respond to tjsavino 22

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Thomas Savino
1020 N Parish Pl
Burbank, CA 91506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Judith Smith to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:31 AM
Please respond to axisdance

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Judith Smith
2712 Grande Vista Ave
Oakland, CA 94601
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michelle Davis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:31 AM
Please respond to rjdandmvd

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michelle Davis
155 Lighthouse Way
Vacaville, CA 95688
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
sharon lacy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:31 AM
Please respond to earthhrt

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

sharon lacy
536 so. main st.
sebastopol, CA 95472
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Joanna Williams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to prusty

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joanna Williams
2327 Webster St.
Berkeley, CA 94705
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mark Weinberger to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to msweinberger

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mark Weinberger
391 28th Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Marchessault to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to distantthunder 50

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Marchessault
4543 Bonny Doon rd.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

ANN MARGUCCI to : p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM

Please respond to asm 5621

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

ANN MARGUCCI
16845 GRESHAM STREET
NORTHRIDGE, CALIFORNIA, CA 91343
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Arthur Chan to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to aumtn

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Arthur Chan
3727 Northridge Drive
Concord, CA 94518
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Brent Riggs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to brentriggs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brent Riggs
1157 E. Hyde Park Blvd.
Inglewood, CA 90302
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Rosalind Helfand to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to rozhelfand

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Rosalind Helfand
1956 N Beachwood Dr Apt 8
Los Angeles, CA 90068
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jim Domenico to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to jdidom

11/17/2014 11:30 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jim Domenico
400 43rd Ave
San Francisco, CA 94121
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Chittenden to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to dc 32

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Chittenden
2930 Sacramento St.
San Francisco, CA 94115
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Elizabeth Adams to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:30 AM
Please respond to e .a.adams62

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Elizabeth Adams
3165 Erle Rd
Marysville, CA 95901
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ria Young to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to cenonox

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ria Young
6312 Rainbow Dr
San Jose, CA 95129
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Dr Randy Martin to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to drrandymartin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Dr Randy Martin
17000 Ventura Blvd
Encino, CA 91316
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Penny Heintz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to pennyheintz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Penny Heintz
PO Box 362
Cedar Ridge, CA 95924
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Victoria Miller to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to vemiller

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Victoria Miller
15857 Moorpark Street
Encino, CA 91436
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Grace Foster to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to grace .foster

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Grace Foster
507 South Fuller Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90036
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathryn Britton to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to kbritton

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathryn Britton
3757 Vienna Drive
Aptos, CA 95003
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Lauren Van Gundy to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to cjorange 48

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lauren Van Gundy
353 S. Tustin, Apt. 218
Orange, CA 92866
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Matthew Reid to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to matt .reid

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Reid
1311 Pine St
Calistoga, CA 94515
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
james baker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to bakers 99

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

james baker
202 Vista Del Monte
Los Gatos, CA 95030
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Tom Pitman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to thomaspitman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Tom Pitman
1913 1/2 Magnolia blvd.
Burbank, CA 91506
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

janet maker to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:29 AM
Please respond to jamaker 2001

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

janet maker
925 malcolm av
Los Angeles, CA 90024
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
K Rice to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:28 AM
Please respond to kyra

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

K Rice
merriewood drive
oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
David Hollier to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:28 AM
Please respond to nexxus

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

David Hollier
PO Box 3453
Crestline, CA 92325
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Janet Crist-Whitzel to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:28 AM
Please respond to jcristw

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Janet Crist-Whitzel
1330 Cabrillo Hwy N
Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mohanan Pisharody to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:28 AM
Please respond to mohan .pisharody

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mohanan Pisharody
6018 Calle de Felice
San Jose, CA 95124
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert Ellis to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:28 AM
Please respond to bobellisds

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Ellis
1290 Hopkins St Apt 37
Berkeley, CA 94702
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Phillip Randall to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:27 AM
Please respond to filipsamovichr

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Phillip Randall
22549 Berdon Street
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Mary Hamilton to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to mary .hamilton

11/17/2014 11:27 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

7. As policy, state and county officials MUST think long term, planning for less fossil-based industry and more solar and environmentally sound

industries. Plan for creating jobs in those industries with products that increase the quality of life for our citizens. Think "outside the box." Reject any potentially destructive and toxic intrusions into California's precious wild lands, neighborhoods and water supplies.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mary Hamilton
1526 Fordham Way
Mountain View, CA 94040
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Patricia Bennett to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:27 AM
Please respond to 48pab17

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Patricia Bennett
Santa Clara Rd.
Atascadero, CA 93422
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Wayne Isham to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:27 AM
Please respond to wayneisham

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Wayne Isham
320 Amador Ave
Ventura, CA 93004
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
gordoon reed to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:27 AM
Please respond to gordonreed 20

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

gordoon reed
101 scholz plaza #223
newport beach, CA 92663
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Pattie Meade to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to plmsurf

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Pattie Meade
421 Via Montego
San Clemente, CA 92672
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Diane Brazil to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to dvbrazil

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Diane Brazil
3178 Fowler Road
San Jose, CA 95135
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Giar-Ann Kung to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to gallatora

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Giar-Ann Kung
930 N Stoneman Ave Apt C
Alhambra, CA 91801
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Lorca Hart to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to lorcahart

11/17/2014 11:26 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Lorca Hart
353 10th ave.
San Francisco, CA 94118
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Melvin Taylor to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to melvin -taylor

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Melvin Taylor
6585 Calvine Road
Sacramento, CA 95823
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Richard Valencia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:26 AM
Please respond to platy 01

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Richard Valencia
1570 West Colorado Bl
Pasadena, CA 91105
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
JOHN HYDE to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:25 AM
Please respond to chopisparky

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

JOHN HYDE
1118 DUTTON AVE
SAN LEANDRO, CA 94577
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Jamaka Petzak to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:25 AM
Please respond to jmuhjacat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Jamaka Petzak
1222 Graynold Ave.
Glendale, CA 91202
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Robert Ortiz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:25 AM
Please respond to r 77ortiz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Robert Ortiz
25 H Lane
Novato, CA 94945
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Mrs James Denison to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:25 AM
Please respond to LAnnD 4animals

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Mrs James Denison
6931 E. 11th St.
Long Beach, CA 90815
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

James Dawson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:25 AM
Please respond to james -dawson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

James Dawson
1055 Trinita Terrace
Davis, CA 95618
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kevin Diggs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to kevin

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kevin Diggs
6440 Hazel Circle
Simi Valley, CA 93063
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Melanie Moorehead to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to mmoorehead 7

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Melanie Moorehead
P.O. Box 1305
Santa Monica, CA 90406
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
O. Bisogno Scotti to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to scotti

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

O. Bisogno Scotti
2266B S Figueroa St
Los Angeles, CA 90007
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
NORMA CAMPBELL to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to SQRRLADY

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

NORMA CAMPBELL
37 Decorah lane
Campbell, CA 95008
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Katherine Crawford to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to fishpol

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Katherine Crawford
1121 13th Street
Los Osos, CA 93402
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Sandra Anderson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:24 AM
Please respond to sandra .e.anderson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Sandra Anderson
12530 Martha Street
Valley Village, CA 91607
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nell Langford to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to drnell

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nell Langford
871 Stratford
Pismo Beach, CA 93449
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Brenda Haig to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to brendajoyce 4

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Brenda Haig
45 1/2 65th Place
Long Beach, CA 90803
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Eileen Brodie to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to ollie

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Eileen Brodie
804 Orange Grove Way
Folsom, CA 95630
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ann Seccombe to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to annmseccombe

11/17/2014 11:23 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ann Seccombe
388 Sequoia Ave
Redwood City, CA 94061
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ardis Jackson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to ardisjackson 100

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ardis Jackson
320 Napa Ave.
Rodeo, CA 94572
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

William Perren to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to wperren

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Perren
510 The Village
Redondo Beach, CA 90277
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Ellyn Sutton to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to ellynsutton

11/17/2014 11:23 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ellyn Sutton
P.O. Box 18754
Spokane, WA 99228
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Kathryn Fitzwater to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to kathryn .fitzwater

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathryn Fitzwater
33121 Southwind Ct.
San Juan Capistrano, CA 92675
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
paula mejia to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to pmhappy 52

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

paula mejia
17332 mount Stephen ave
santa clarita, CA 91387
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kathleen Engberg to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to kengberg

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kathleen Engberg
5432 Canehill Ave.
Lakewood, CA 90713
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Matthew Coleman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:23 AM
Please respond to mjc 01

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Matthew Coleman
3830 Harrison Street #201
Oakland, CA 94611
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Michael Evans to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to heymeat

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Michael Evans
2024 Madison Ave
Altadena, CA 91001
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Ron Maertz to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to ronmaertz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Ron Maertz
67 Primrose Way
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Nancy Simon to: p66-railspur-comments
Please respond to nesimon

11/17/2014 11:22 AM

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Nancy Simon
321 d anacapa st
Santa Barbara, CA 93101
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

Joan Zawaski to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to jzawaski

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Joan Zawaski
2883 MacArthur Blvd.
Oakland, CA 94602
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Malcolm Groome to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to otorongo

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Malcolm Groome
19688 Grandview
Topanga, CA 90290
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Orasio Gutierrez to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to Orasiogtz

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Orasio Gutierrez
1021 53rd street
Sacramento, CA 95819
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Anna Thurman to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:22 AM
Please respond to akthurman

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Anna Thurman
870 Anson Street
Simi Valley, CA 93065
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion

William Combs to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:21 AM
Please respond to william .m.combs

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

William Combs
Wilbeam Ave.
Castro Valley, CA 94546
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Kaylee Savage-Wright to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:21 AM
Please respond to kiwikay 320

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Kaylee Savage-Wright
517 Cedar St.
Santa Cruz, CA 95060
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Helene Whitson to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:21 AM
Please respond to helenewhitson

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Helene Whitson
1824 Arch Street
Berkeley, CA 94709
US

Protect Our Towns , Reject Oil Train Expansion
Willard Simms to: p66-railspur-comments 11/17/2014 11:21 AM
Please respond to willardsim

Dear San Luis Obispo County Commissioners and Supervisors,

I am writing to strongly urge you to deny the proposed oil-by-rail project at the Phillips 66 Santa Maria Refinery. Bringing tar sands to California will undermine our state's efforts to be a global leader addressing climate change, and these trains will put our communities directly in harm's way.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR misinforms first responders because it doesn't adequately assess the risks of an oil train disaster; the draft only evaluates rail-accident rates from 2003 to 2012 and spill rates between 2005 and 2009, omitting crucial data about accident frequency and magnitude in 2013 and 2014. This is troubling because we know that more crude spilled from trains in 2013 than during the past four decades combined. The EIR must look at recent data, which reflects the increased quantities of crude being transported in old and unsafe tank cars.

2. The EIR's worst-case scenario estimates a spill of 180,000 gallons, or roughly six tank cars of crude. This has to be an error because most crude trains have 100 or more tank cars, carrying millions of gallons. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

3. The toxic air emissions that will accompany this project pose an unacceptable risk to public health. In its latest environmental review Phillips 66 admits that its proposed oil train facility will create "significant and unavoidable" levels of air pollution along the rail route, with sulfur dioxide and other toxic chemicals leaked that increase risk of cancer, heart disease, respiratory disease and premature death.

4. The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. The proposed route brings oil trains through the San Francisco Bay-Delta watershed and along California's central coast. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

5. The planning department must examine the cumulative impacts of the Santa Maria and Rodeo proposals as a single project -- not in isolation -- since the proposed terminal in Santa Maria is directly linked by pipeline to the Phillips 66 refinery in Rodeo. Phillips 66 is proposing to modify both facilities to allow it to refine the most toxic crude oil on Earth: Canadian tar sands.

6. Phillips 66 must disclose crude-quality information so decision-makers fully understand the climate impacts of the proposed rail project. At every stage of the mining, transportation and refining process, Canadian tar sands are more carbon intensive than any other source of oil -- making this project simply incompatible with California's plans to be a climate leader.

For all these reasons, I urge the San Luis Obispo County Planning Commission

and Board of Supervisors to soundly reject the Phillips 66 proposed rail spur.

Willard Simms
23369 Erwin St.
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
US