April 20, 2002

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

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Edward Martinez

Sincerely,

6249 Alston St
Los Angeles CA. 90022

Edward M

April 20, 2002

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

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely,

Mike Gogue
4742 Elmer Dr.
La Palma, CA 90623

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

April 20, 2002

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely, P. Boonchoo

Patrick Boonchoo
14827 Disney Ave.
Norwalk, Ca. 90650

April 20, 2002

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

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely, Bobby Delgado

Bobby DELGADO
14927 DISNEY AVE
NORWALK CA. 90650

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

April 20, 2002

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely,

FIDEL ROSAS
12245 ALONDRA LB
NORWALK CA 90650

April 20, 2002

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

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current.

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely,

ERNEST ULIBARRI JR.
5800 SOUTH ST. #225
LAKEWOOD, CA 90713

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

April 22, 2002

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I live in Long Beach with my son and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are listed some of the many reasons why I oppose the permit being issued to Ultramar: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Long beach or Wilmington to determine if here has been a negative impact.
2. Ultramar has never conducted detailed air quality studies in Long beach or Wilmington so their referenced data is not accurate or complete. 32-2
3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused Long Beach, Wilmington and other harbor communities. 32-3
4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Long Beach or Wilmington community meetings or provided any information to the public. 32-4
5. Ultramar proposal does not significantly decrease or eliminate air pollution in Long Beach or Wilmington. 32-5
6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Long Beach or Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Long Beach and Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely,

Mario Vasquez-Ramos

Mario Vasquez-Ramos
2669 Regway Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90810
562-988-5100

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

April 21, 2002

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I live in Wilmington and have heard about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are listed some of the many reasons why I oppose the permit being issued to Ultramar: 32-1

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington to determine if here has been a negative impact.
2. Ultramar has never conducted detailed air quality studies in Wilmington so their referenced data is not accurate or complete. 32-2
3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused Wilmington and other harbor communities. 32-3
4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meetings or provided any information to the public. 32-4
5. Ultramar proposal does not significantly decrease or eliminate air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5
6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely,

Esperanza Ramirez
136 W. Lomita Blvd..
Wilmington, CA 90744

April 20, 2002

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

Mr. Barry Wallerstein
Executive Officer

Ms. Kathy Stevens
CEQA-Planning Office

Reference: SCH No. 2000061113
Subject: Opposition to Issuance of Permit To ULTRAMAR, INC.

I attended a community meeting and learned about the Draft Subsequent Environmental Impact Report for Ultramar's, Inc. proposed expansion and I want to advise you that I am against the issuance of a permit because of their past failure to address the negative health impact on our community. Below are some of the many reasons why I oppose issuing a permit:

1. Ultramar has never conducted a health impact study in Wilmington, so their data is not accurate or current. 32-1

2. Ultramar has never conducted air quality studies in Wilmington so their data is not accurate or current. 32-2

3. Ultramar did not propose any Mitigation to address their Negative Environmental Impact and the Negative Health Impact it has caused the Wilmington community. 32-3

4. Ultramar never sent a representative to any Wilmington community meeting or provided any information to the public. 32-4

5. There will be more air pollution in Wilmington. 32-5

6. No Public Hearing was ever held in Wilmington.

I request that a Public Hearing be held in Wilmington immediately and more time be given for the public to respond. 32-6

Sincerely, Jovany Rubalcaba

Jovany Rubalcaba
1147 Bay View Ave
W. Covina, CA 90744

COMMENT LETTER NO. 32
LETTERS FROM COMMUNITY

April 20, 2002

Nine letters from the public were submitted to the SCAQMD and are identical. The comments in each letter are numbered and bracketed. The letters are the same and the following is the response to each comment.

Response 32-1

Your opinion regarding the Ultramar proposed project is noted. Please see Response 9-9 regarding the health impacts associated with the proposed project.

Response 32-2

Please see Response 9-8 regarding the air quality analyses completed for the proposed project.

Response 32-3

See Response 6-3 regarding the mitigation measures imposed on the proposed project.

Response 32-4

See Response 3-3 regarding the public meeting for the proposed project.

Response 32-5

While the proposed project is expected to result in emission increases, the project also is expected to result in regional emission reductions (see Final SEIR, Table 5-3, page 5-20) associated with vehicles that use the reformulated fuels. The benefits of improved air quality were not included in the calculated emissions estimates because they occur over a wide area, not just in the vicinity of the proposed project. However, air quality benefits resulting from lower vehicle emissions will also accrue in the local area of the Refinery and terminals. Please note that a number of mitigation measures have been imposed on the construction phase of the proposed project (see Final SEIR, page 4-28).

All new and modified components are required to comply with the SCAQMD's best available control technology (BACT) requirements as part of the proposed project. BACT, by definition, is control equipment with the lowest achievable emission rate. The use of BACT controls emissions to the greatest extent feasible for the new and modified emission sources. Therefore, additional emission reductions for stationary sources through mitigation measures are not feasible, i.e,. there is no other feasible control equipment. "Feasible" as used here is based on the definition contained in CEQA Guidelines §15364, which states "'Feasible' means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social and technological factors."

Response 32-6

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