Air Quality Management District
21865 E. Copley Drive
Diamond Bar, California 91765
909-396-3439 Off
909-396-3324 Fax

April 21, 2002

Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
Planning-CEQA

Re: Ultramar, Inc. (SCH No. 2000061113)
Su: Opposition To Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) And Issuance Of Permit To Ultramar, Inc.

I live in Wilmington and I have recently been informed of the above Draft SEIR regarding the proposed issuance of a permit by SCAQMD to Ultramar. Inc. and I wish to inform you that I am against the issuance of a permit for the following reasons:

1. It appears that once again there is another illegal cover-up and manipulation of the truth to Wilmington residents by a Government Agency and Private Business working together to avoid community involvement regarding a controversial issue. 27-1

2. The air pollution in Wilmington already exceeds state and federal quality standards and no one is doing anything of significance to reduce or eliminate it. 27-2

3. Pollution needs to be cleaned-up by the companies responsible for polluting it. 27-3

4. SCAQMD and Ultramar did not hold a Public Hearing in Wilmington so that we could be informed of the project and its impact. 27-4

I want a Mediation Plan to be prepared by Ultramar that addresses the negative environmental impact and negative health impact they are causing on our community. 27-5

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and the public comment time be extended another 60 days. 27-6

Wilmington Resident,

Mr. David Marquez
136 West Lomita Blvd.
Wilmington, CA 90744

COMMENT LETTER NO. 27
LETTER FROM MR. DAVID MARQUEZ

April 21, 2002

Response 27-1

Your opinion regarding the Ultramar proposed project is noted. The SCAQMD strongly disagrees with the comments that "there is another illegal cover-up and manipulation of the truth to Wilmington residents by a Government Agency and Private Business working together to avoid community involvement regarding a controversial issue." Public notice for the proposed project has been provided in a matter that meets or exceeds the CEQA requirements. See Response 3-1 regarding public notice for this project.

Response 27-2

See Response 24-2 regarding the ambient air quality and the plans in place to improve the air quality of the region.

Response 27-3

Your opinion is noted. However, this comment does not pertain to the environmental analysis in the Draft SEIR.

Response 27-4

See Response 3-3 regarding the public meeting.

Response 27-5

See Response 10-4 regarding a Mediation Plan.

Response 27-6

See Response 3-3 regarding the public meeting and extension of the public comment period.