

Preventing Catastrophic Collapse of Port Communities

Presentation to HCBF Board of Directors

Presented by Janet Gunter & Peter Rosenwald

Friday, September 27, 2019

Issue Relevance to HCBF

- HCBF's duty is to deliver projects that are meaningful as "mitigation" from the port.
- Board needs to understand all that is "detrimental" to the community stemming from port operations.
- Public safety is a major issue of detriment and one that should be carefully considered through existing and future port related business.

Video Background

- The existing LPG facility falls outside the port boundaries but was *introduced by the "port"* with the port issuing a tenancy for the original facility at Berth 120. That Berth was to "receive" propane gas from ships and transport the gas via pipeline to the storage site (approximately 1/2 mile away). The port conducted and approved a deficient Environmental Impact Report for this facility upon its introduction in 1973 that "never considered" potential impacts to nearby citizens from its hazardous operation. The facility was constructed under an "emergency exemption" to regulations and permits! It was "legalized" but never was it in regulatory compliance even in its day.
- The Port of LA refused in 2004 to renew the pipeline lease at berth 120 due to "safety concerns", yet continues to allow this completely "private" business operation to use port property (public trust lands) in order to conduct their business today. That business is entirely "different" than the one described in their environmental impact review. This means that there was NEVER an environmental Impact Report conducted to analyze the existing operation and its risks. Without the use of port lands to accommodate transport of butane from distant refineries by pipeline and move propane in and out by rail, the Plains All American Pipeline/Rancho LPG facility would be inoperable. Meaning that the risk exposure to residents of an over 3 mile blast radius from their 12.5 million gallon tanks of highly explosive butane gas, and their 1/2 mile blast radius from every single volatile rail car of propane traveling on port rail would be "eliminated".

Video 1 Context: Rancho LPG Edit

The 1st video was made by two filmmakers who wanted to do a full documentary on the story. However, the funds were never made available.

Members of the San Pedro Peninsula Homeowners United, INC. cooperated in providing information used for the video with retired oil company environmental consultant, Connie Rutter, Dr. Carl Southwell from the Risk Policy Institute, and Dr. Robert Bea from the Center for Catastrophic Risk Management at UC Berkeley.

This 1st video helps to paint the picture of the existing vulnerable geologic conditions and the overwhelming scope of disaster that the facility represents on multiple levels.

Link to Video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TBGt_XKNpRk&feature=share

Video 2 Context – Mayor Garcetti’s Response

The 2nd video is a tape of Mayor Garcetti responding to a question posed regarding the Rancho LPG facility and its seismic vulnerabilities on ABC news.

It reflects the obstinate attitude of government and the literal blind eye to the truth of the existing high risk that merits protective action. While the Mayor acknowledges the high risk of the situation, he completely denies that the City & Port could play any part in the revocation of existing "port permits" which allow use of LA City controlled assets crucial to the LPG facility's existence. And, there are currently 600+ new homes approved by the City of LA being built NOW in the shadow of those highly explosive tanks despite clear acknowledgment of danger by government.

Link to Video: <https://www.facebook.com/watch/?v=647889645340218>

HCBF Board Take-Aways

The urgency of public safety as it relates to the port complex and the surrounding communities.

The vulnerability of the port is immense and a public disclosure of the magnitude of its disaster potential is something that should be communicated to the unwitting dense population that will be impacted.

The highly explosive facility that we focus on is one of the most dangerous due to its extraordinary volume, its proximity to homes, schools, youth ball fields, shops, traffic corridors, its antiquity and its incredible seismic vulnerabilities.

This particular facility would be the easiest to eliminate by virtue of its lack of employees and the ability to revoke facets of operation rendering it defunct.

Requested from HCBF

Take the issue of public safety as it relates to the operations of the Port of LA to the high level of concern that it deserves.

No mural, air filtration system, pool, art project or anything else will have any value, whatsoever, if the population and the area is destroyed. At the very least, solicit proposals that do an accounting and assessment of the degree of hazard that hazardous marine terminals and surrounding hazardous facilities represent with recommendations on how to "mitigate" and/or "reduce" those risks. The process of addressing these risks must begin. The Government should wake up to the extraordinary number of bombs that they have sitting in these two baskets that they call the "ports". No one questions the coming of the "big one" ...yet no one is thinking about how to save people and assets before it strikes. It's time.

Closing Remarks

Follow up questions.