



SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just aren't prepared

for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to watersheds: The

EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Jason
Rosenbaum
14 Cornel Drive
Goldens Bridge,
New York 10526



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Miranda Hernandez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Miranda Hernandez**
<mhernandez2852@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to mhernandez 2852

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in

my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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
Hernandez
1984 Leslie
Court
Arcata,
California 95521



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Lauren Hartz to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Lauren Hartz** <lhartz6029@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to lhartz 6029

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Hartz
676 Equador Pl
Davis, California
95616



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Alyssa Lee to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Alyssa Lee** <alyssa.dabichi.lee@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to alyssa.dabichi.lee

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Alyssa Lee
2113 Bristol
Park Circle
Turlock,
California 95382



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Abby Peterson to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Abby Peterson <awoolperson@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to awoolperson

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Abby Peterson
2519 Ridge Rd
Berkeley ,
California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Victoria Fernandez to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: Victoria Fernandez
<v.fernandez201015@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to v.fernandez201015

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in

my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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
Fernandez
2519 college ave

CA, California
94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Colin Loustalot to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Colin Loustalot <watermillvillage@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to watermillvillage

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Loustalot
17 w pueblo st
santa barbara,
California 93105



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

amber norori to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **amber norori** <ambenorori@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to ambenorori

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 norori
1642 Iron Horse
Circle
Colton,
California 92324



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Karaline Bridgeford to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Karaline Bridgeford <karalinerose@actionnetwork.org>

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Please respond to karalinerose

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Karaline
Bridgeford
Berkeley
CA, California
94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Anna Leopold to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Anna Leopold** <aleopold@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to aleopold

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Leopold
1050 N. Mills
#577
Claremont, CA,
California 91711



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jonathan Lake to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Jonathan Lake <Jonathan.lake@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to Jonathan .lake

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Lake
24333 Little
Valley Road
Hidden Hills,
California 91302



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

David Shugar to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: David Shugar <david.h.shugar@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to david .h.shugar

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Shugar
150 Tehama Ct.
San Bruno,
California 94066



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Joohi Kasliwal to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Joohi Kasliwal** <joohi@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to joohi

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Joohi Kasliwal
1608 Rhode
Island Ave. NW
Washington,
District of
Columbia 20036



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Radha Patel to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Radha Patel** <candymonster108@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to candymonster 108

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Patel
115 timber hitch
rd
Cary, North
Carolina 27513



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Pam Tuttle to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Pam Tuttle** <pennielane286@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to pennielane 286

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Pam Tuttle
2851 w 232nd st
Torrance,
California 90505



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Grace Lihn to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Grace Lihn <glihn@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to glihn

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Lihn
2601 Warring St.

Berkeley,
California 94720



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

John Reid to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **John Reid** <jreidsd@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to jreidsd

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Reid
506 Primero
Grove
Davis, California
95616



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Peter Launier to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Peter Launier** <marianastrenchabr@actionnetwork.org>

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

Please respond to marianastrenchabr

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Launier
30364 Barcelona
Rd
Castaic,
California 91384



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jessica Friedman to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Jessica Friedman** <dlofriedman@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to dlofriedman

11/25/2014 11:04 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Jessica
Friedman
12 baggins end
davis, California
95616



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Jeff Mailes to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Jeff Mailes <jeff.mailes@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to jeff .mailes

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Mailes
23408 Victory
Blvd.
Woodland Hills,
California 91367



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Daniel Martinez to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Daniel Martinez** <mrtallmart@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to mrtallmart

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Daniel Martinez
2527 Ridge Rd
Berkeley, CA,
California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Sofia Airaghi to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Sofia Airaghi <sairaghi@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to sairaghi

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Sofia Airaghi
25 Kingston St
San Francisco ,
California 94110



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Andrew Van Meter to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

Sent by: **Andrew Van Meter**
<andrewinafunk@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to andrewinafunk

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in

my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Van
Meter
572 E Foothill
Blvd. apt. 5
San Luis
Obispo,
California 93405



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Ben Rushakoff to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Ben Rushakoff** <ben.rushakoff@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to ben .rushakoff

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County Planning
Department Murry Wilson,

Hello there,

I am a student at UC Berkeley and I am writing you to express my demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal.

I am sure you've received countless letters about why this is an issue, but I want to say that this puts more than just SLO and community members at risk- it puts all of California and the United States at risk. If we don't stand up against these big and dirty oil industries, we aren't forced to look for alternative solutions to our energy demands. I hope you are familiar with the climate change that we are currently experiencing and the disastrous future that is highly probable. If we continue to dig deep into our planet for these dirty energy sources, our climatic situation will only worsen and become more dangerous than the possibility of an oil by rail accident.

It is time that California, the United States, and the world take a proactive and preventative approach to our climate situation and this starts at a local level. Stand up for SLO and California when you vote on Monday, and help defeat this proposal. Not only will you be saving your local community from hazardous air quality, and protecting communities across the coast from accidents, but you will be forcing industries to come up with innovative energy solutions.

This starts here, and now. Think of your community, and of future communities that will be affected by this decision and reject this oil by rail.

Your community is under attack from an industry that seeks profit instead of progress. Represent your constituents and your fellow Californians when you reject this proposal, and be proud of that decision.

Thank you for your time and consideration, and I urge you as a member of the County Planning Department to represent your community and be proud of your decision.

Sincerely,

Ben Rushakoff
ben.rushakoff@berkeley.edu
UC Berkeley Class of 2016
B.S. Environmental
Economics and Policy
B.S. Forestry and Natural
Resources

Ben Rushakoff
2527 Ridge Road

Berkeley, California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Harrison Hucks to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Harrison Hucks <harrisonhucks@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to harrisonhucks

11/25/2014 11:03 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Harrison Hucks
2330 Blake
Street
Berkeley,
California 94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Karina Alvarez to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Karina Alvarez <alvarezkarinar@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to alvarezkarinar

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 1192
Los Angeles,
California 90045



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Valerie Love to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Valerie Love <vmontanalove@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to vmontanalove

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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 Love
1304 Monterey
Ave
Berkeley,
California 94707



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Emili Abdel-Ghany to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Emili Abdel-Ghany <emabdel@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to emabdel

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Emili
Abdel-Ghany
815 Ashland Ave

SANTA
MONICA,
California 90405



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Wesley Adrianson to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Wesley Adrianson <wadrianson@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to wadrianson

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Wesley
Adrianson
2600 Ridge
Road
Berkeley,
California 94709



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Kiyomi de Zoysa to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: **Kiyomi de Zoysa** <kiyomidezoyasa@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to kiyomidezoyasa

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

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

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

Kiyomi de Zoysa

6719 Sabado
Tarde
Goleta,
California 93117



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Yustina Salnikova to: p66-railspur-comments

11/25/2014 11:06 AM

Sent by: **Yustina Salnikova**
<yustinasalnikova @actionnetwork .org>

Please respond to yustinasalnikova

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in

my town just aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all these reasons, I urge

the San Luis
Obispo County
Planning
Commission and
Board of
Supervisors to
soundly reject
the Phillips 66
proposed rail
spur.

Yustina
Salnikova
154 Panoramic
Way
Berkeley,
California 94704



Reject the Phillips 66 Rail Spur

Charlotte Hughes to: p66-railspur-comments

Sent by: Charlotte Hughes <chughes@actionnetwork.org>

Please respond to chughes

11/24/2014 05:05 PM

SLO County
Planning
Department
Murry Wilson,

I am writing to demand that the SLO Board of Supervisors reject the Phillips 66 dangerous oil by rail proposal. As a student, I am outraged that SLO County and Phillips 66 would put students across California at risk for the sake of oil company profit. This project creates unacceptable risks for students and our communities.

I am strongly opposed to this project for several reasons:

1. Risk of accidents:
Emergency responders in my town just

aren't prepared for these heavy, dangerous trains and current safety standards won't protect the public. The draft EIR uses outdated data that drastically underestimates the danger of a derailment or spill. Such a spill could devastate our scarce water resources, sensitive ecosystems, homes and local economies.

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

3. Risks to

watersheds: The EIR has yet to fully analyze the worst-case scenario of a spill near each of the many watersheds crossed en route to the Santa Maria refinery. A derailment near a river, stream, reservoir or aquifer could contaminate drinking water for millions of Californians, an unacceptable risk in this time of extreme drought.

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

For all 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
Hughes
1050 N Mills Ave

Claremont,
California 91711