

From: Jody James <jody.james@sbcglobal.net>
To: <ceqacomments@portla.org>
Date: Mon, Aug 11, 2008 6:49 PM
Subject: pacific L.A. marine terminal llc crude oil terminal

R.G. Appy,
Dr. Spencer D. MacNeil U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Los Angeles District,

I am submitting my comments and questions concerning the supertanker crude oil terminal proposed for the west side of Pier 400.

My greatest objection and question to your offices is that since there are so many impacts to this project that rate an "unavoidable and significant" status, isn't it unreasonable to approve this project? With SCAQMD data from the Mates II and III establishing that air quality in the Harbor area is greater than 1,400 times the Federal threshold of cancer risk, shouldn't the correct response be to never allow any new project that increases the health hazards to residents of L.A.? A Harbor area Health Risk Assessment has never been done. The Port of L.A. and the City of L.A. the State of California and the Federal Government appear to have been derelict in their duty to protect the health and safety of the public. Publicly presented reports from the UC Particulate Matter Study Group have alerted the LAHD of their findings that "we are in a state of emergency right now" concerning our Port related pollution.

Researchers have

found that there are three cardiovascular "incidents" per each cancer case due to ultra fine particulate matter. Harbor area children suffer from a high rate of asthma and the UC study revealed that the ultrafine particles are being found in the mitochondria of human cells. No project should be approved until a Health Risk Assessment is done for the Harbor area.

After explosions and fires from the oil tanker, Mackey in 1947 and also the Sansinea in the 1970's, Pier 400 was planned for the stated purpose of relocating hazardous cargo away from populated and sensitive use areas in accordance with the Port Risk Management Plan (1983). Since not a single hazardous liquid bulk facility has been relocated to this site, isn't it a betrayal of public trust to allow an additional and substantial risk to our Harbor area citizens? Isn't the stated purpose of NEPA and CEQA --with the USACE serving as the federal lead agency-- charged with "avoiding or minimizing significant impacts or to enhance the quality of the human environment"?

Shouldn't the relocation of "hazardous" materials within populated areas around the Port be accomplished before any other additional use of Pier 400? More "hazards" should not be added. Relocation to a safe and sane area (and building to current safety standards) of the 26 million gallon Butane and 180,000 gallon propane facility, AmeriGas Propane Inc., should be the first to occur.

Are there any plans to convert this proposed crude oil facility into an LNG terminal? With rising numbers of Harbor vehicles using this fuel there is a concern that a conversion of this facility might be anticipated. Long Beach City Council rejected the proposed LNG terminal because of serious concerns over public safety.

California Assembly Bill 1007 directed development of an "Alternative Fuels Plan" to increase the use of alternative fuels without adversely affecting air pollution, water pollution, and public health. Shouldn't safe alternate fuels be considered far ahead of this proposed facility? Why is a lease term of 30 years being considered for this facility?

The EPA office of Environmental Justice must be involved in this matter because of the additional and significant impacts of this project. The residents of Fort MacArthur are not living in this area by choice and are the first in line to be negatively impacted regarding their health. I am submitting my comments to their office.

Thank you, Jody James e-mail jody.james@sbcglobal.net