I oppose the plan to increase fueling operations on the corner of Palos Verdes North and Western Avenue. There are multiple negative effects of increased fueling operations that cannot be mitigated and would cause grave health concerns to children and families.

1. Lomita Little League houses baseball fields right next to the fueling tanks. Activating those tanks would affect the health of the children and families who participate through unhealthful air and soil. Their safety also would be in jeopardy should breaches or complications occur.
2. The detrimental effects to the air and soil would extend to the families living near the tanks, the new community being built, and the students and faculty at Mary Star High School.
3. The detrimental environmental effects would impact surrounding communities and businesses.
4. The noise pollution and traffic congestion would significantly reduce the quality of living for residents living in the immediate vicinity as well as residents in the greater community.
5. The area is already listed as the most polluted area in the nation; we do not need to exacerbate the situation.

I am totally opposed to the U.S. Navy reopening the 331 acre storage tank site located at 3171 N Gaffey. The facility runs between Western, Gaffey, and Palos Verdes Drive North. In the past this site once stored one million barrels of fuel! The Navy should NEVER reopen nor lease out this site to a private vendor for use or expansion. This World War II site is adjacent to or very close to several public and private schools. It is adjacent to a new 676 unit housing development under construction, multiple neighborhoods, an oil refinery, LNG storage tanks, and to underground jet fuel storage tanks. San Pedro is bordered by the Pacific Ocean, the Los Angeles Harbor and the Hills of Palos Verdes. There are limited streets leading to and from this community. The site borders three of the five major roads and a bridge leading to and from San Pedro. Fires, explosions and earthquakes would be catastrophic to our community! The air quality and environment of this community is already severely impacted by the plethora of ships and trucks that inundate this community on a daily basis! We don't need more fuel trucks impacting our health and safety!! This new reopening proposal is unwarranted and unexpected. There are other more suitable options to store military fuel where Navy ships are stationed or visit including San Diego or Seal Beach. Keep this site in San Pedro CLOSED PERMANENTLY!

I oppose the plan to increase fueling operations on the corner of Palos Verdes North and Western Avenue. There are multiple negative effects of increased fueling operations that cannot be mitigated and would cause grave health concerns to children and families.

1. Lomita Little League houses baseball fields right next to the fueling tanks. Activating those tanks would affect the health of the children and families who participate through unhealthful air and soil. Their safety also would be in jeopardy should breaches or complications occur.
2. The detrimental effects to the air and soil would extend to the families living near the tanks, the new community being built, and the students and faculty at Mary Star High School.
3. The detrimental environmental effects would impact surrounding communities and businesses.
4. The noise pollution and traffic congestion would significantly reduce the quality of living for residents living in the immediate vicinity as well as residents in the greater community.
5. The area is already listed as the most polluted area in the nation; we do not need to exacerbate the situation.
As a nearby resident, I am deeply concerned with the decision to reopen the Defense Fuel Support Point on N. Gaffey. I believe it will impact our neighborhood negatively and that the land could be used in a more beneficial way for the existing (homeowners and Mary Star students) and future residents (Ponte Vista development). Traffic on Western is already seriously impacted with the construction of Ponte Vista and recent pipe installations along Palos Verdes Drive North. Gaffey St. offered a solution, but I believe it will be further impacted by this decision.

In addition, I am against the additional pollution that will be caused by these daily tanker trucks in an area that is already polluted by the refinery.

We don't need more trucks causing more traffic in our lovely town. The air quality would become worse then it is now. We need to consider the health of our people.

I am a resident of San Pedro, owning home at 1083 Via La Paz.

My wife and I would like to provide feedback on Navy Proposal for expanding fueling operations at Defense Fuel Support Point Depot in San Pedro on N Gaffey St.

Given the close proximity to residential neighborhoods, we are concern that full environmental review has not been conducted on "Alternative 1", prior to commitments to the lessee.

Because of this, we would urge Navy to go with "Alternative 2" .

Thank you

Naval Facilities Engineering Command Southwest
Attention: Code EV25.TB
937 N. Harbor Drive Building 1, 3rd Floor (Environmental)
San Diego, CA 9213
nwssbpao@navy.mil

RE: Defense Fuel Support Point, San Pedro

To Whom it may concern:

Thank you for the opportunity for extended public input on the issue of reopening of the Defense Fuel Support Point in San Pedro, CA. This matter is controversial for many in San Pedro and neighboring communities who are concerned about health and safety risks in an area already exposed to several other significant health and safety risks. As a long-time former member of the DFSP’s Resident Advisory Board, I’m familiar with a number of environmental issues that resulted from the site’s previous operations.

The project summary included in the Environmental Assessment for Renewed Fueling Operations addresses a number of the public’s concerns, including measures to reduce impacts on the native habitat of the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly and the California Gnatcatcher. However, the native plant nursery managed on site by the Palos Verdes Peninsula Land Conservancy and serving to expand habitat for species of concern like the PV Blue and the California Gnatcatcher is not discussed in the document. I would urge project managers to continue the work to restore habitat by stipulating the continued operation of the native plant nursery and associated habitat improvement efforts.

Thank you for your consideration.
Definitely against this proposal... our homes are close to several schools a science center a yet uncompleted housing development project... this in itself pose a threat to countless children and to our neighborhoods... this is an operation that should have been put on Terminal Island years ago.

As a homeowner and parent in the NW San Pedro area, I am very concerned about this development. The safety of storing and distributing fuel is a concern, both from the potential of explosions and leaks to the possible effects on air quality and ground water. In addition, the increased traffic (coupled with future increases after Ponte Vista is completed) will add more congestion on Western and Gaffey, more cars using previously quiet and safe residential streets to avoid that congestion, and increased danger for neighborhood kids playing or simply walking near their homes. There are so many issues with this that we cannot treat it as one solitary snowflake falling on an empty hill, it is the beginning of a dangerous avalanche.

I am a resident in the Northwest San Pedro Neighborhood Council area. I do NOT support renewing/expanding fueling operations at the fuel depot on N. Gaffey St. in San Pedro.

The proposed reopening and expansion of the Naval Fuel Depot is a continuous threat to the residents of San Pedro, Rancho Palos Verdes, Harbor Gateway and Lomita. The increased carbon footprint and diesel exhaust, plus the increase in traffic are not acceptable to our community. This also expands the threat of terrorist activity being a target in our area. This is an affront to the health and safety of our community, and the visual blight of this project will have an adverse effect on the property values in our community.

The potential for leakage from these pipelines, considering their proximity to the Palos-Verdes-Inglewood fault is high, and would decimate our communities.

Adding insult to injury is the proposal to rent these tanks out to commercial entities. This proposal is ill-considered and will irreparably damage the habitat of the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly and the California gnat catcher.

I notice that NO CONCRETE PROPOSALS to protect and enhance the habitat were offered. The entire community of San Pedro joins me in declaring that this proposal would be gravely injurious to all of us, and the surrounding communities.

We, the Weiser family are vehemently opposed to the proposed plan to reopen this facility, especially in light of its proximity to the new Ponte Vista development, the high school, Rolling Hills Preparatory school and the adjacent businesses. Also, the Palos Verdes Blue Butterfly, extremely endangered would be adversely affected.

I think it is also outrageous that you would want to RENT the tanks out for commercial use. This proposal shows reckless disregard for the people of San Pedro, Eastview, and Harbor Gateway.

I will call the office of Representative Nanette Barragan to see if there is anything she can do to prevent this going forward.

Having this facility here is an extremely bad idea. It's bad enough that traffic is going to increase tremendously upon the completion of the Ponte Vista housing, but this facility is exposing residents and businesses to more hazardous materials and wastes and noise pollution. As a resident of Northwest San Pedro, we already at risk by being close to the refinery in Wilmington, we don't need another facility increasing our risk.

As a nearby resident, I am deeply concerned with the decision to reopen the Defense Fuel Support Point on N. Gaffey. I believe it will impact our neighborhood negatively and that the land could be used in a more beneficial way for the existing (homeowners and Mary Star students) and future residents (Ponte Vista development). Traffic on Western is already seriously impacted with the construction of Ponte Vista and recent pipe installations along Palos Verdes Drive North. Gaffey St. offered a solution, but I believe it will be further impacted by this decision.

Commercial use is unacceptable. IF there were a genuine military need, then maybe. This is NOT the time or place for these kinds of operations.
My concern is two fold, earthquake damage to the facility and pipelines and already being a target by terrorists as the third largest port in the world. Adding more fuel tanks and pipelines to the area just increases the risk to the thousands of residents in San Pedro, Lomita, Wilmington, Long Beach and Rancho Palos Verdes.

The California Geological Survey Map CA-213 shows part of the San Pedro Fuel Depot and all of the existing pipelines in a liquifaction zone creating risk of explosions and an inferno when the next big earthquake occurs. We have received myriads of warnings that the next big quake is overdue.

The Los Angeles City Mitigation Plan Revision states the Palos Verdes Fault line cuts across the northeast side of Palos Verdes Pennisula. A large magnitude quake would cause a direct hit to the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. [https://emergency.lacity.org/sites/g/files/wph496/f/LA%20SC%20%233_Meeting_Summary_0.pdf](https://emergency.lacity.org/sites/g/files/wph496/f/LA%20SC%20%233_Meeting_Summary_0.pdf)

Based on scientific findings of the Long Beach 1933 earthquake, water and oil pipelines were greatly affected in the zones of liquifaction.

The likelihood of terrorist activity or an act of war is probably greater than earthquake activity. Taking out the third largest port in the world would cripple the US economy. There is most likely a target on the port already but adding more fuel depot tanks to a high risk area seems irresponsible to place near our neighborhoods and schools.

Lastly, nitrous oxide at high enough levels can cause birth defects. The proposed tanks would be within close proximity to neighborhoods of young families.

I hope you will consider leaving the San Pedro Fuel Depot in its current state.

The proximity of more chemicals for our town is unacceptable, unjust and unsafe. As the town of San Pedro has grown the chemical storage facilities and refinery have become a serious threat to our health and safety. Indeed, the environment, property values and quality of our lives here have been and continue to be sacrificed and ignored. We have been treated like the 'tail of the donkey' since 1924. The proposal is counter-intelligent and places all of us in more danger! The earthquake zone, proximity to residents and life and safety risks this will impose on us is unjust and foolish.

I ask that you abandon this project for the reasons stated above and its proximity to seriously outdated/aging facilities already in place and of great danger to us. The project only add insult to injury and poses to multiply the risks to our community. This is not progress this is the further endangerment of citizens, a disregard for property and liberty/well-being of our people.

This reopening and expansion of the Navy DFSP in San Pedro presents a clear danger to the many homes, schools and businesses that exist immediately adjacent to the facility. Given the regions history of earthquakes, there is no way this can be done safely. Plus the addition of tanker trucks to the roads in and out of the facility present a huge risk to travelers on these highly trafficked roadways, particularly school children. There is no way to safely operate such a facility in this densely populated urban environment, and the risk only increases when you add a privately run facility to the mix.

Seriously, we should not even be talking about this at this point. This plan, if adopted, is folly and will eventually result in a catastrophic event. We will then wonder why, with all data on the above list, why people didn't step up to say, "No!" There is a chance here for all parties to do the right thing, protecting the environment, space, air quality, human health and safety. Not often do we get a do-over. this should qualify or nothing does!

Please keep the neighborhood clean and less crowded with trucks.

Number one concern is health and safety concerns.
This proposed opening and increased industrialization is in sharp contrast to the trending development of the neighborhood.

This provides no benefit to the neighborhood or surrounding areas; in fact, it will solely have negative affects in traffic, air quality, noise pollution and eyesore. A facility such as this should be cited in a more largely industrial-zoned property, well away from residences and schools.

Traffic due to excessive transportation, Public Health and Safety, visually not appealing, noise

NO NO NO NO NO

Because of the close proximity to residential area and schools, the traffic, pollution, and the danger of fires and explosions cannot be minimized. The fact that some of the properties will be under supervision of a private, non-governmental management amplifies the dangers and problems.

Within a mile or two the proposed storage tanks sits 25 million gallons of refrigerated butane and propane these tanks sit on an earthquake rupture zone and what Homeland Security called a tier one target for terrorism. The potential for disaster is already imminent with possible cascading affect of wiping out the entire port. Add these storage tanks and the results of an explosion would be unimaginable death and disaster. San Pedro is densely populated. None of these fuel tanks belong within our community.

I'm concerned about expanded use of the fuel depot by a private contractor with very vague guidelines. The existing storage tanks are very close to Western Ave, making them easy targets for potential vandalism or terrorist activity. If there were to be a fire or hazardous material incident, evacuation of local residents would be difficult because of the proximity to this major road. It's also not clear that the Navy actually has a clear need for refueling from this facility. So, it's strange that we'd see resumption and potential expansion of use.

I have been a long time resident of Rancho Palos Verdes and have watched Western Ave. develop and become a traffic nightmare over time. Gaffey Street has become the go to alternate route and the idea of having multiple tanker trucks on that thoroughfare daily is a huge nightmare that I cannot stand silently by to watch come to fruition. Most of the residents in this area bought not expecting to be caught in traffic before even getting to the freeway. There are also concerns of air quality, Public Health and safety, and other environmental factors that come along with re-activating the tank farms. These concern the entire community including new potential buyers for the new Ponte Vista tract and Mary Star High School. Without extensive studies and safeguards and even alternate transportation routes and methods, I do not see how this affected community would blindly waive off their rights, so I ask for the community leaders to stand up for us all and fight this uninformed and unjust use of land which could be used for the community residents instead of against them. Thank you.

The impact of 40 truck trips on Gaffey Street will not be minor. Noise, pollution, large trucks on an already busy and a road that will be busier in the future must be seriously considered. Plus the impact on Mary Star High School, the new housing development and all the existing housing, well this just isn’t a good idea in so many ways. The risk is just too great to justify opening this again and adding to it. With several schools nearby and all the residential housing this isn’t a good location. Please find an appropriate industrial area to put this operation there.
"Oil tank fires expected to burn for days"
San Pedro, CA

A fire at a Houston-area petrochemical storage site (ITC) burned for days as firefighters watched. It took several days to extinguish the fires that destroyed more than eleven holding tanks. The fire began March 17, 2019 and spread among rows of giant tanks that can hold up to 80,000 barrels of fuel. The burning tanks held naphtha and xylene, fuels used in gasoline and plastics and toluene - a volatile liquid used to make nail polish remover and paint thinner. Other tanks held base oils commonly used as machine lubricants.

Air emissions tests detected the presence of a volatile organic compound six miles away from the storage facility, but higher concentrated levels were detected closer to the source. School officials in Deer Park, population 32,000, and nearby La Porte, Texas, with about 34,000 residents, suspended classes on Monday and told employees not to report to work.

A hearing was held where local residents pushed for a response to the disaster that sent tons of carbon monoxide into the air and chemicals into waterways. Schools were closed and visits to area hospitals and clinics spiked to more than 1,000 people, many with symptoms related to respiratory issues, headaches, skin irritation and nausea. Schools in Houston suburbs remained closed for several days after air quality monitors detected elevated levels of benzene, a cancer-causing chemical that was contained in ITC tanks that burned.

More than 1,100 local, state and federal workers and contractors working at the site and waterways have removed 16,000 barrels of a fuel-and-water mix from the ship channel and another 33,000 barrels from ITCs grounds, said Adam Adams of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). This multi-million dollar effort was at the expense of the US Taxpayers. Thousands of people were displaced during and after the tank fires. Many were treated for respiratory and other reasons with the onset of the fires. The local county and state leaders are preparing lawsuits against the owners, alleging violations of environmental laws and seeking damages to cover response costs for the disaster that burned for days, releasing chemicals into the air and waterways.

The existing San Pedro Defense Department Fuel Depot was built in 1943, surrounded by empty, rolling hills. Since then, new home permits issued since the Defense Depot was constructed number in the tens of thousands, most recently with new townhomes on the corner of Gaffey Street and Anaheim the new former Navy housing area, and The Highlands Homes on North Gaffey Street. Several schools and daycare facilities have also been built over the years where many children now attend safe environments on a daily basis.

Now the Navy would like to re-open the Defense Department Fuel Depot next to thousands of existing homes and several local schools. The existing underground, seventy-year-old storage tank infrastructures may fail with the addition of new above-ground storage tanks. An attempt to re-open utilizing grandfathered permits from 1943 that fail to meet current facility requirements set forth by the EPA and other local, state and federal regulations for these types of facilities, must be denied. No current testing or reporting required by the EPA and other federal monitoring agencies have been provided to the public. Chemical ground-saturation levels surrounding the existing tanks and underground interconnecting infrastructures may already require soil removal and abatement measures that will far exceed the original re-opening costs. This is a scenario that is currently being played-out in the Torrance Carousel Housing area across the street from one refinery. Deaths and severe medical issues have forced many homeowners from their homes due to chemical ground saturation measured up to three-feet in some homes.

In closing, I would like to formally declare my stance against the re-opening of the San Pedro Defense Department Fuel Depot for the reasons mentioned above. A short-cut re-opening of this facility could have a severe impact on local families, homes, schools, hospitals and other services. Using the example of the Houston TX facility above, as well as the refinery fiasco in Torrance, we should look into this event and determine if we, as a community, would like to subject our families and neighbors to a potential catastrophic event like the Houston storage facility. We are required to learn from our mistakes.
This amounts to an egregious overstep and disregard for the health and safety of the area residents. We are totally opposed to this latest plan and respectfully ask that you STOP any action or forward movement on this idea.

Mixing residential use with industrial development is against the basic health and welfare of residents. An increased influx of large trucks carrying hazardous materials into an area that contains homes and schools is not in the best interest of the residents. The air quality will be negatively affected and residents run the risk of either developing asthma (from diesel exhaust) or having existing pulmonary conditions exacerbated. Additionally, the risk of accidental release of toxic, flammable materials increases the chance of injury to the community by either direct contact with the toxic materials, or exposure to their fumes. Our community relies on the roads through the intersections near this facility. A mishap with a truck which closes any of the streets bordering the property will pose a significant challenge to residents to reach freeway or - in the event of a catastrophic event - safe egress for the thousands of residents from the area. These types of existing facilities from an era when there was no housing ought to be reduced in those areas that now are used for homes and schools. Please reconsider allowing this facility to restart and/or expand. The risk to the health and welfare of the residents due to increased traffic, pollution from trucks, and the inherent danger of the materials themselves precludes the development of the renewal of Fuel Operations in San Pedro.

I urge you to not reopen the former fuel depot on Gaffey Street, as the entire surrounding community has grown to include extended education facilities and will also soon have new housing that'll have plenty of people who'll be completely unaware of the magnitude of what disaster could happen should an act of terror or equipment failure strike the facility in such a way that saying "I'm sorry" and lawsuit awards cannot remedy the horrific losses resulting from them. No one living in that entire area wants to be martyrs or survivors of any worst-case-scenario that could happen regardless of safety checks that would be in place to prevent them. Please, DON'T.

Good Morning- I rarely comment on these but think this time I should. As a long time San Pedro resident (and this is a pretty small town), we are all connected to the port and the activities that go on there. Our housing literally bumps up against this behemoth of a complex and in many ways it is great and, conversely, it is also at times, really difficult and concerning. For years there has been great concern with the massive butane tanks stored just up the road off of Gaffey. The potential for disaster is a real thing and our Congresswoman, Nanette Barragann as I type this, is looking to address and mitigate this dangerous mix of fuel and citizens. When we consider the proximity to civilians, schools and public access routes to the location of the to be revamped fuel depot, it carries all of the concerns of the butane storage facility. Things like traffic, noise and potential inconvenience aside, the real issue is the potential of calamitous event occurring and the full weight of a fuel depot catastrophe. Unlike when this depot was built, San Pedro is no longer hillsides sparsely populated with intermittent houses; it is now a very developed community, with schools, churches, businesses and and main arterial thoroughfares within the effects of some kind of event of at this proposed depot.

You will be hard pressed to find a community that supports our Armed Forces, the Port and the men and women serving our Country anywhere else, but the danger that these neighbors will face is very perilous. This should be considered a last resort site, when no where else is possibly available, the risks towards human life are simply too great.

Thank you,
Here is something that I have talked to Joe Buscaino about several times about the future use of this particular property.

A true "Tri-City", San Pedro, Wilmington & Harbor City Sports Complex.

Currently, there are the small Softball Fields (2) at the LAPD Pistol Range, the Lomita Little League Fields (2) & the San Pedro Softball Fields (4).

With the Fuel Depot between of these Sports Fields, there is enough "Flat" land to accommodate a "State of the Art" Sports Complex, which is something that is sufficiently lacking in the "Tri-City Harbor Area" of City Council District 15.

As a "Travel" Softball Grandparent, I can attest to the fact that a "True" Sports Complex, would not only provide a place for all of the Youth of the area a place to play organized sports, of different varieties, not only baseball or softball, a well planned & run complex would also be a "Money Generating" facility for all of the businesses in the local area.

Those of you, who are not familiar with "Travel Softball Tournaments", they are huge events, with teams coming from all over the Southern California region and even out of the state.

A weekend or week-long tournament has the potential to bring thousands of people into the local area, renting hotel rooms, eating at restaurants, visiting sightseeing venues.

Most of the Venues are out in the Inland Empire, Riverside, Chino Hills, Temecula, these Venues are called "Big League Dreams", plus as I mentioned before these "Complexes" also have space for soccer fields, within the full sized 90-foot baseball fields, space for a "Roller Hockey" rink, basketball courts.

It's time for the Tri-City Harbor Area to step up & provide something for its youth, after all, look at the success of the LAUSD high school sports in this area with Banning HS, Narbonne HS & San Pedro HS.

Give the people & youth of the Harbor Area, something to take pride in, something for them...

It will be a disastrous in case of something happens such as earthquake, the life of thousands of people will be in jeopardy.

I am a resident in San Pedro and I drive by this location on my daily commute to work. I strongly oppose the Navy building any new tanks and very strongly oppose any associated commercial activity. Western Ave already has major traffic problems which will get even worse with the new housing development. The area certainly cannot handle additional truck traffic. Increased truck traffic will result in a degradation of air quality, increased noise and increased traffic, and bring in hazardous flammable materials near a school and heavily populated residential area. This is also an environmental justice issue since the surrounding area is lower income.

Citizen response to Navy DFSP expansion proposal 2019:

1). "The purpose of the Proposed Action is the reactivation and sustainment of the Defense Fuel Support Point San Pedro facility to the maximum extent practicable for commercial fueling use..."

Our San Pedro peninsula community - being one of the top 10 volume ports in the U.S. - is already burdened by a density of population and traffic. Being a peninsula, the issue of safe ingress/egress is a constant challenge.

Adding to that challenge is the fact that The Harridge Group is currently developing a 700+ home residential community on the west property boundary of the Navy's DFSP San Pedro property located on N. Gaffey Street, with initial homes purported to be inhabited by early 2020.

Our San Pedro roads are in severe disrepair, industrial traffic will only serve to exacerbate that problem for a population already underserved by an over-matched and inefficient L.A. City Department of Transportation. Automobile lanes have been reduced in favor of bicycle lanes.
Being a port town, the community is fraught with congestion, pollution and questionable, pipe-dream self-serving political leadership. Simply stated, the infrastructure was designed and built over 6 decades ago, when the population was approximately 32% of what is projected in year 2020.

2). "The need for the Proposed Action is to ensure the fullest possible use and maintenance of the Navy’s assets (e.g., the Defense Fuel Support Point San Pedro Main..."

Safety of our San Pedro residential community is of the utmost concern. What will be the price paid when residents are forced to compete with the unsustainable industrial traffic that will be the unavoidable result of the Navy's full operation of DFSP, especially when considering that N. Gaffey St. is one of only two major thoroughfares allowing north/south traffic in this city?

Add to that the health and safety threat of transporting fuel (in any form), as well as the competition of all other industrial traffic from your neighboring tenants on the opposite side of N. Gaffey St., whose residents include the controversial Rancho LPG (note previous blast radius studies conducted and hotly debated for years), as well as numerous port distribution trucking companies.

What about the USFWS protection of the endangered species of Palos Verdes Blue butterfly and California Gnatcatcher? Providing some land for habitat is one thing, but the myriad of disturbances understandably associated with a fully functional DFSP operating at 100%+ cannot be healthy for those respective species.

As a five decade resident of San Pedro, living on the south border of the Navy DFSP, I am forced to seriously consider the pros and cons of remaining in this town. The modus operandi appears to be "development at any cost" - but at what price? How does my community benefit from this development? I fail to see any. Instead, I observe more competition for scarcer resources in deteriorating conditions.

Do we need more tanks in our community? More tanks = more safety risk.

Do we need more traffic in our community? More traffic = more road deterioration and more safety risk.

Do we need more people in our community? More people = more competition for limited resources, hence higher costs.

Where is the commitment and vision for open green space in our community? I urge you to take a drive and contrast the urban sprawl of San Pedro/L.A. and surrounding cities with that of the majority of Ventura County, Orange County and San Diego County - where open green space abounds, instead of the modus operandi of "build at any cost", or (we need more) "affordable housing" espoused in our town. Clearly tax revenue and profits are the sole concern in L.A. County - a longtime model of inefficiency, waste and self-aggrandizing political tunnel vision - all at the expense of the burdened working taxpaying legal citizen.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely,

I am completely against more tanks above ground or underground! There are 3 schools surrounding that! Mary Star High School, where my child attends school, Taper Elementary & Rolling Hills Prep! There are thousands of homes and more are being built! This is crazy and dangerous! Nobody wants this here!

Poor foresight...
Other landuse currently approved, is in direct conflict to the community
direction = safety/traffic = danger
Other side of freeway >>>
Concerned about accidents creating disastrous fuel tank explosions in residential area or for that matter anywhere. Now that there are schools and soon-to-be housing adjacent to the fuel depot, it is not safe to reactivate it, for the safety of those living/attending school in the area.

Also, the endangered blue butterfly's habitat is on/near the fuel depot, and further operation, particularly above-ground, would disturb and possibly further endanger this species.

The city of San Pedro is poised to become Southern California’s next great waterfront town and we don’t want to detract tourists and people from other neighborhoods from coming into town and spending their money. San Pedro already looks pretty commercial and new residential buildings will help alleviate that some. We want to be welcoming to individuals and families.

1. The city of Los Angeles, LA county, and Caltrans are not proactive in resolving issues in our area. You will need to help them fix potholes in the area so your trucks don't crash into other drivers on the road, especially on route 47 and 710 freeway. The drivers in the area aren't usually pulled over for speeding or traffic violations, so that leads to drunk drivers and speeders possibly crashing into your trucks. Your trucks need to be electric for noise and air pollution concerns. You need to offset the public's gasoline prices to offer gas at $2/gallon at nearby gas stations since this is a private/commercial venture at our expense. I am concerned about chemicals from your site getting into the local water supply, as well as diesel smog lingering in Ponte Vista and Seaport Homes area. I would recommend a better and larger security force there, with high caliber rifles. You should also help fund CHP to be better equipped with better radios, satellite phones, and more mechanics for reliable traffic enforcement on your route, so your trucks don't block the freeway due to traffic accidents involving your trucks and the poor driving skills of the some of the local community. I would prefer you not operate trucks between 11pm and 5am.