Committee Members in attendance: John DiMeglio, Matthew DiMeglio, Dan Dixon, Chuck Hart, Sheila Raymond, David Rivera

Non-Committee Members in attendance: Pat Nave, Kristina Smith, Gwendolyn Henry, Laurie Jacobs, John Barbera, Megan Barnes City of Rancho Palos Verdes, Noel Gould Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council, Gregg Smith Navy Public Affairs Officer

1. Discussion and Public Comment on Navy plans to re-open Defense Fuel Supply Point (Fuel Depot) on Gaffey:
   - Pat Nave spoke about practicing environmental law as a City Attorney, restated statements from the Navy and asked questions of the impacts the Depot may have.
     - If the Navy was approached by a private entity it needs to be told publicly.
     - Disturbed by the lack of information
     - “Is the Navy keeping their hands on the project for economic reason?”
   - Dan Dixon spoke about some of the comments that the community have stated.
     - Dan also asked about option two which would only activate the fuel station on Terminal Island. He also asked if there was fuel storage on Terminal Island.
   - Noel asked about other independent entities doing the environmental report. CEQA study should be conducted at a minimum.
   - Gwendolyn Henry asked if there were any other Depots that are being looked at besides San Pedro.
     - Brought up fault lines and other impacts if they were brought up.
   - John DiMeglio spoke about his history of the waterfront and working contracts for the Navy fueling ships.
     - Spoke about how the Navy fuel depot on Terminal Island was the dirtiest and most mismanaged area in the port.
     - “Can more than one commercial company operate on site?”
   - Chuck Hart spoke about above or below ground pipes not being safe.
   - Gregg spoke on why the Depot is reopening. The Navy plans on doing an environmental assessment which may be complete by the end of year.
     - Pacific Fleet is expanding.
     - The goal is to create economic viability for the site. If the Navy were to just sell the property the money for the property would not come to the Navy.
     - The Navy was not approached, process for the Depot was completely done by the Navy.
     - Tanks in the facility were emptied.
     - All underground tanks have been closed and will not ever be used again, they are full of cement.
     - Only three tanks on the facility can be used and more tanks if wanted to be used they would be needed to be built.
     - Navy’s goal is to have fueling facility outside of San Diego as Pacific Fleet expands.
     - The only fuel storage on Terminal Island is overflow tanks.
     - Navy is not putting it out to community vote. The comments need to be towards environmental assessment.
     - Navy cannot fund another environmental report unless an entity would do it for free.
     - Contractor could build tanks on main terminal, on the hill and would pay for infrastructure.
     - Navy can go through the whole process and get offers back but not accept any due to non-viable proposals.
     - Pipelines are newer than the facility. For the depot to be put back into operation upgrades would be needed.
     - Commercial usage will be the main use of the facility.
     - Military usage might average three ships per quarter or more during emergencies.
   - www.cnic.navy.mil/sanpedroea to download current Navy documents

2. Special Meeting: TBD - Defense Fuel Supply Point Continued

3. Next Meeting: June 26, 2019

THESE NOTES ARE REPRESENTATIVE OF DISCUSSION DURING MEETING, BUT NOT COMPREHENSIVE