

ATTACHMENT 5

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS

BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, AUGUST 9, 2010

Long Beach, California, August 9, 2010

-0-

CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Good afternoon, everyone. I'd like to begin the Board of Harbor Commissioners' meeting for August 9th. I'm Nick Sramek, president of Board of Harbor Commissioners. Allow me to introduce my colleagues here today. On my right is Commissioner Mike Walter. My far left is Commissioner Mario Cordero, and next to him is Vice President Susan Wise. Commissioner Thomas Fields is out on personal business today.

Agendas for today's meeting are in the back of the room and also available at our Web site at polb -- polb.com. Also the agenda with full staff reports are available at our Web site along with archive Web streams of the meetings.

We welcome public involvement at our meetings. To speak on any agenda or nonagenda items, please sign in at the podium. There's a request-to-speak form there.

The Harbor Commission has four standing committees: Engineering and environmental, finance and administration, legislative, and trade relations and port operations. Most board meeting's actions are first

1 reviewed and approved by the committee and then put on  
2 the full board agenda for approval later on.

3 After we finish our committee reports, we'll  
4 move on -- we will move on to the formal board meeting.  
5 I'd like to begin with recognizing our employees who  
6 have provided ten or more years of service. I'd like to  
7 introduce Sheryl Bender. Okay. Sheryl Bender from HR  
8 will present those.

9 MS. BENDER: Thank you, President Sramek. Good  
10 afternoon, President and fellow Commissioners. I am  
11 pleased to have the privilege to introduce you to our  
12 service award recipients. Today the individuals we're  
13 recognizing have a combined total of 60 years of service  
14 for the port.

15 First I'd like to introduce Patricia Robinson.  
16 Will you please stand. Patricia started at the port in  
17 1980 as a Clerk Typist I in the finance division. In  
18 1981 she was upgraded to a Clerk Typist II, and the  
19 following year Clerk Typist III. In 1984 she made the  
20 transition to a new discipline under the classification  
21 of Cargo Audit Clerk II. In 1989 she progressed again  
22 through the ranks and became a Cargo Audit Clerk III and  
23 has been contributing her services ever since. She  
24 currently works under the leadership of  
25 Curtis Christiansen and Sam Joublat. Congratulations,

1 Patricia.

2 (Applause.)

3 MS. ROBINSON: Thank you.

4 MS. BENDER: Next we have Sue Ritter. Will you  
5 please stand. Like Patricia, she also has 30 years of  
6 service to the port, and both of them have actually been  
7 here the whole time. Sue started at the port in April  
8 of 1980 as a Clerk Typist I in the administration  
9 division, which we now know as human resources. In  
10 September of the same year, she was promoted to a Clerk  
11 Typist II, and she transferred over in the engineering  
12 division. In 1981 she was upgraded to a Clerk Typist  
13 III, and in 1989 she made her home in engineering  
14 design. As of 2007 she served as secretary for the  
15 division, and she currently works under the leadership  
16 of Neil Morrison. Congratulations, Sue.

17 MS. RITTER: Thank you.

18 MS. BENDER: Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. Thank you, Cheryl.

20 Also before we get started, I'd like to  
21 introduce to everyone our new director of human  
22 resources, Margaret Huebner, and give you a little bit  
23 of bio on her. Hope you don't mind. I saw that look.  
24 But she is a 35-year veteran of the field with numerous  
25 accolades including outstanding achievement in labor

1 relations from the national director of the Federal  
2 Mediation and Conciliation Service, an independent  
3 agency of the U.S. government that seeks to prevent or  
4 settle disputes between labor unions and management.  
5 She has recently completed the Mediation Conflict  
6 Resolution Program at CSU in Northridge.

7 She has also worked for a variety of -- wide  
8 variety of industries in her career, including the  
9 maritime industry, government contracting, and defense  
10 manufacturing. Most recently she spent nearly ten years  
11 in the Middle East in the practice of human resources.  
12 She has a master of science degree in human resources  
13 design from Claremont, a graduate university, and holds  
14 the professional designation as senior professional in  
15 human resources certification from the Human Resources  
16 Certification Institute. So I'd like to welcome you,  
17 Margaret.

18 (Applause.)

19 We're looking forward to working with you. We  
20 may need some help.

21 Okay. I'd like to begin with committee reports  
22 now, and our first committee is Engineering and  
23 Environmental Committee chaired by Commissioner Cordero.

24 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Thank you,  
25 Mr. President. This afternoon we have two items on the

1 Engineering and Environmental Committee. Item Number 1  
2 I'll defer to Mr. Larry Cottrill with regards to the  
3 substance of the presentation on the issue of reporting  
4 of job-related jobs --

5 MR. COTTRILL: Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: -- and infrastructure  
7 improvements.

8 MR. COTTRILL: Thank you, members of the  
9 committee. It's nice to see this big turn-out for my  
10 jobs creation presentation. A little bit of  
11 input/output analysis.

12 As you know, you -- you've been receiving jobs  
13 creation information since the beginning of the fiscal  
14 year. Engineering in particular has done an excellent  
15 job of reporting on job creation connected with their  
16 construction projects. After we had an opportunity, I  
17 think early on, to meet with him and decide how we would  
18 do this in an expeditious way, and out of that came the  
19 development of the so-called rule-of-thumb factor which  
20 I'll talk about in a few minutes.

21 Quite frankly for the other divisions and  
22 bureaus, it was a little more hit and miss including our  
23 own bureau. And some -- some folks simply use the  
24 engineering factor. Others consulted with their  
25 contractors to try to estimate what the direct jobs

1 impact would be, and a few called master planning for a  
2 little one-on-one consultation. So we really wanted to  
3 tighten up the methodology for calculating jobs across  
4 all of the divisions, and we wanted to do a little  
5 better job, a more coordinated job, of reporting  
6 information to you on a monthly basis, which I'll get  
7 into here.

8 So just to recap the first bullet, we plan on  
9 looking at jobs across all divisions connected with  
10 decisions that you make to spend money, and that means  
11 that we're going to look, not only at construction, but  
12 also consulting services and even equipment that's  
13 fabricated locally as well as installation. And we are  
14 setting a floor of \$200,000 as a minimum expenditure  
15 we're going to look at because we want to make sure that  
16 we get at least a full job count on an expenditure.  
17 Anything less than that we're probably talking about  
18 fractional jobs for jobs.

19 And finally we want to count the expenditures  
20 connected with the receipt of grants, but we're only  
21 going to count that when you've made the assignment of  
22 the grants to the recipients.

23 Here's conceptually how we calculate jobs. We  
24 identify some spending that the Board will be asked to  
25 approve, and we need to categorize that in terms -- in a

1 way that the model, our input/output model, understands.  
2 We need to express that standing in terms of Standard  
3 Industrial Classification Code, SIC code. Other models  
4 work on other codes including the NEICS Code, which  
5 we'll probably go to.

6 But we need to make a decision as to what  
7 industry expenditure -- expenditures that you will  
8 approve and is associated with. We run the model. The  
9 model estimates the direct jobs connected with that  
10 expenditure as well as all the spinoff effects. Since  
11 the model is calibrated in 2001 dollars, we need to  
12 perform a final step which is to deflate the job number  
13 based on wage and salary information that we get from  
14 the BLS and BEA. So that's how it's done conceptually.

15 This is what we really do. Early on we are  
16 actually in preparations for this protocol. We ran the  
17 model for -- all at once for a number of expenditure  
18 types that we thought best represented what you would be  
19 making decisions on, and we inserted in the model a  
20 dummy expenditure value of a million dollars, hence the  
21 development of these factors including the rule of thumb  
22 which represents jobs from a million dollars of  
23 expenditure. And I circled the rule-of-thumb item here  
24 calling it general construction, ten jobs from the  
25 expenditure which you're all familiar with now. But



1 that was really derived as an average from the number of  
2 very specific kinds of maritime construction which I've  
3 highlighted in red.

4 And you'll notice, too, that we've got a number  
5 of other nonconstruction factors that we've added to our  
6 list, so when we see in a board memo certain  
7 expenditures that you will be asked to approve, we'll --  
8 we have a spreadsheet model which this is included in a  
9 drop-down menu, and we'll link that expenditure with the  
10 expenditure type that is most associated with it, and  
11 we'll multiply that factor times the number of millions  
12 of dollars connected with, you know, whatever you're  
13 being asked to approve.

14 So that's how we really do it. We've run the  
15 model a number of times up front so that we can do these  
16 calculations really quickly when we need to.

17 In terms of reporting and what we want to do is  
18 report this information to you on a monthly basis on new  
19 job creation from the previous month, and we'll also  
20 report in calendar-year terms what that cumulative total  
21 is to the previous month. The idea is to basically take  
22 out of each committee memo the job numbers that have  
23 been estimated for specific projects, although we won't  
24 use that information.

25 We'll continue to calculate jobs on an average

1 annual basis, so if a project is less than 12 months,  
2 less than a full year, we'll treat that as an annual  
3 expenditure. If a contract or a job extends beyond 12  
4 months, we'll calculate the average annual expenditure  
5 for purposes of estimating new jobs in that first year.  
6 And at beginning of each calendar year, we'll restart  
7 that clock or that counter for jobs, so we'll -- we'll  
8 begin each January with zero, or however many jobs are  
9 created for January -- that will be reported to you in  
10 February.

11           And here's an illustration of the kinds of  
12 things that we'll be able to do in terms of reporting.  
13 We'll have the information by bureau, by division, by  
14 the type of project. And here we've -- we actually have  
15 a real job number for July. Your decisions resulted in  
16 the creation of 59 new jobs, and you can see with the  
17 preponderance of the jobs came out of the engineering  
18 bureau, and you can see to the right the kinds by  
19 project the numbers of jobs that were created. Using  
20 the same template, we can see for calendar year 2010  
21 where we're at: 519 jobs, and you can see on the left  
22 that the nonengineering bureau over the year so far has  
23 contributed a bit more to the total job count than what  
24 we saw in July.

25           Now we haven't back-casted yet to pick up the

1 engineering jobs by project just yet, but we're working  
2 on that. So the next -- hopefully the next time we  
3 report this information, if this is what you want to  
4 see, we'll have for the calendar year a count. We'll  
5 have information on all -- by all of these projects.

6 And this is how we're going to sustain the  
7 reporting. Engineering will continue to do what it  
8 does, applying for the most part the rule-of-thumb  
9 factor. We'll get that information from them each  
10 month.

11 Master planning, on the other hand, will take  
12 care of the calculations for all of the other divisions,  
13 and for the most part, we can get what we need just from  
14 the information that's contained in board memos. Now  
15 once in a while, we'll have to loop back and ask them a  
16 few questions, and I expect that that will be the case  
17 in particular for equipment purchases because we want to  
18 make sure that if we're going to count jobs connected  
19 with making something, the stuff is made here, not in  
20 Korea or, you know, Sheboygan.

21 So we'll do those calculations. We'll get the  
22 numbers from engineering. We'll produce reports in  
23 tabular form and hand them off to communications, who  
24 will prepare the final graphics for presentation to you,  
25 and there will also be press releases and anything else

1 that is appropriate for release of this information.

2 Now, once a year master planning will take a  
3 look at the deflators, and then in some instances will  
4 probably recalculate those factors, and less frequently  
5 we'll probably be modifying the multipliers that are  
6 basically embedded in the IO or derived from running the  
7 input/output model. The model itself is updated less  
8 frequently and depending upon the federal government's  
9 production of this information that comes from the  
10 survey of the census of business that takes place every  
11 five years.

12 So that's basically it. And thank you very  
13 much. Any questions?

14 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Thank you, Mr. Cottrill.

15 Before we entertain questions from the Board,  
16 let me ask, is there anybody from the public that wishes  
17 to comment on this item?

18 Seeing none, back to the Board.

19 Questions and discussion. Dr. Walter.

20 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, Mr. Cottrill. I  
21 applaud what you've done here. I think it's a good  
22 effort, and it's an organized approach to doing this. I  
23 think that's just fine. I'm supportive of that, but I'd  
24 like to, I think, request one more addition to this, and  
25 that's the added value to the economy of the jobs

1 creation. There's a factor, multiplying factor -- I  
2 think it's like 1.4 -- for each job created or the  
3 investment in the community adds considerably more to  
4 the total economy.

5 MR. COTTRILL: Sure. In fact, the model does  
6 produce a value-added component as well as total  
7 business sales and wages and salaries. Normally people  
8 don't ask us for that. I should have known better in  
9 this case. So we'll work on including that in some sort  
10 of summary statistic fashion.

11 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, well, these numbers  
12 are really important. Both of them are. As you know,  
13 one of the top goals of President Sramek is job  
14 creation, and that's so important in today's situation  
15 and environment. And that's an impressive number we're  
16 adding jobs through our, you know, construction efforts  
17 and everything we're doing here, and that's marvelous  
18 and good for the city and the community and all of that.

19 So that's real important. And that's a good  
20 number to have, and I think that number will show that  
21 the port creates far more jobs than -- than probably the  
22 rest of the businesses put together, but I don't know  
23 that that's so, but I'd like to know that at the end of  
24 the year.

25 MR. COTTRILL: But just as a reminder of the --

1 what the input/output model does, not only does it  
2 calculate direct jobs, but it calculates all of the  
3 spinoff jobs connected with industry spending as well as  
4 the spending of -- by employees of their wages and  
5 salaries. So you've got all of the spinoff effect, so  
6 we can show the corresponding value-added number as  
7 well.

8 COMMISSIONER WALTER: And so, Mr. Cottrill,  
9 you've got it exactly right, and I have every confidence  
10 in what you're doing, and I really look forward to that  
11 added value to the economy, and I think it will be  
12 really significant. And I think it's probably more  
13 impressive to the -- what I want to say -- to the  
14 general community interest to say even more how many  
15 dollars of impact that had on the economy. So I'm glad  
16 you're going to get that. I applaud you for doing it,  
17 and I like an organized approach that is repetitive in  
18 nature and things like that. Good job. I will vote for  
19 it, of course. Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Commissioner Wise.

21 COMMISSIONER WISE: Yeah, I have two questions.  
22 One, how many contracts do we have that are less than  
23 \$200,000?

24 MR. COTTRILL: Not many. I wish there were  
25 more. No, not -- not many. We're -- we don't lose many

1 jobs by not counting . . .

2 COMMISSIONER WISE: That's fine. That answered  
3 the question.

4 MR. COTTRILL: I couldn't tell you offhand. I  
5 could get you a number by the next time we report on  
6 jobs.

7 COMMISSIONER WISE: My other question has to do  
8 with equipment, and I need to understand if we were to  
9 pass on a contract for a new crane or something like  
10 that, if it's manufactured in Shanghai, if it's  
11 manufactured in Manitowoc, not Sheboygan . . .

12 MR. COTTRILL: I was hoping nobody would ask me  
13 to spell Sheboygan.

14 COMMISSIONER WISE: It wouldn't -- it wouldn't  
15 go into --

16 MR. COTTRILL: No. What we would do, and the  
17 little bit of challenge would be to -- and this would be  
18 part of the communication we would have with another  
19 division -- is we would want to net that out if it's not  
20 made locally. So the jobs connected with equipment are  
21 the jobs involved -- the people involved in making the  
22 stuff, and in fact, when we look at port-user impacts,  
23 and you may recall that in the past we've -- I'm sure  
24 you've seen that number of 315,000 direct/indirect  
25 induced jobs in the five-county region connected with a

1 year's worth of port operations. That number's been out  
2 there for a little while.

3 One component of that is export manufacturing,  
4 so what we do if something comes through the port in  
5 terms of cargo that is made locally, we take credit for  
6 the jobs connected with fabricating medical instruments  
7 or whatever it might be. So if it's from Beckman  
8 Instruments, you know, from La Habra, and likewise we  
9 feel it's appropriate to count the number of fabrication  
10 jobs associated with something that we purchase. As  
11 long as it's made here, we'll count that as part of our  
12 five-county region job impact.

13 COMMISSIONER WISE: Well, one of the things I  
14 would just think about that might modify that  
15 calculation would be the fact so that, from what I  
16 understand, a lot of parts are being exported, and  
17 things are being assembled, and then they're coming back  
18 in one piece. So in fact, so if we buy a huge piece of  
19 equipment, there may be parts that are manufactured.

20 MR. COTTRILL: That's a good point. That's  
21 really an excellent point. It might be a little tough  
22 to parse that out. You know, it seems to me, the  
23 alternatives are we don't count it or that we have a  
24 disclaimer or just, you know, some language that  
25 explains this -- you know, some of the parts might have



1 come in from outside the area. Most likely, that is the  
2 case.

3 COMMISSIONER WISE: This isn't an exact  
4 science, but I think we could attempt to firm up the  
5 figures that we -- that we have for the jobs.

6 MR. COTTRILL: Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Are there any further  
8 questions? Dr. Walter.

9 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, Mr. Cottrill. I  
10 think that Commissioner Wise raised some very good  
11 questions there, and I would like to suggest that  
12 perhaps you send her a copy of the economic report that  
13 was done a couple of years ago here through the economic  
14 department of Cal State in Long Beach which showed when  
15 we import things, and then they're modified, and they  
16 produce a final product that's exported, what a  
17 difference that makes. And I think for background,  
18 you'd find that very interesting.

19 COMMISSIONER WISE: Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER WALTER: It's not a lot of  
21 reading, but it's really interesting information.

22 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Okay. Dr. Walter, thank  
23 you for that plug for Long Beach State, a noted  
24 authority in this city.

25 Any further questions? Discussion?

1                   Okay.    Could I have a motion?

2                   COMMISSIONER WALTER:    So move.

3                   CHAIRMAN SRAMEK:    Second.

4                   COMMISSIONER CORDERO:    We have a first and  
5   second.    Any further questions or discussion?

6                   All in favor?

7                   BOARD MEMBERS:    Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
8   Cordero).

9                   COMMISSIONER CORDERO:    Opposed?    Abstentions?  
10   Motion passes unanimously.

11                   Item number two, the last item, I'll defer to  
12   Mr. Cardamone who will address the issue of change order  
13   number 9 in regard to contractual issue with FTR  
14   International.    Mr. Cardamone.

15                   MR. CARDAMONE:    Thank you,  
16   Commissioner Cordero.    This item is a request for  
17   ratification of a change order authorized by the  
18   executive director in the amount of \$57,465 to perform  
19   various structural, architectural, electrical, and fire  
20   code-related changes found to be necessary during  
21   construction of the Pier G Administration and Operations  
22   Buildings Project.    These changes represent extra work  
23   that the contractor has been requested to perform that  
24   was not in the original scope of the contract.

25                   The changes are necessary for several reasons

1 including to assure the structural integrity, water  
2 tightness, and functionality of the building as well as  
3 to comply with fire code requirements. We have reviewed  
4 the changes and have determined that they are outside  
5 the original scope of the contract, and therefore, the  
6 contractor is entitled to additional compensation, and  
7 that the compensation being requested is fair and  
8 reasonable.

9 Now, this is the ninth change order issued to  
10 date on this contract, which brings the total changes to  
11 \$1,133,738 or 2.47 percent of the contract amount. For  
12 a contract of this size and complexity, that volume of  
13 changes would be considered well within industry norms.

14 Funding for the change order will be drawn  
15 against the \$1.9 million contingency approved by the  
16 board with the award of the contract. Therefore, no  
17 additional funding is being requested at this time.

18 As of June 30th, the contract is about  
19 62 percent complete, and we have used about 60 percent  
20 of the available contingency. So we believe the project  
21 is still on budget and on schedule for completion in  
22 December of next year. Additional details are provided  
23 in the staff report. I'd be happy to answer any  
24 questions.

25 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Okay. Before we have

1 any questions or discussion, any members from the public  
2 wish to comment on this item? Seeing none, back to the  
3 Board.

4 Questions? Discussion?

5 Mr. Cardamone, recognizing that this is within  
6 the 1.9 contingency amount, in other words we're well  
7 within that. Nevertheless, this is the ninth change  
8 order in this particular project. Just for further  
9 elaboration as to the basis for the change order on this  
10 particular work, what was it specifically that was not  
11 foreseen or -- when we first did the RFP, what beyond  
12 that the contractor realized needed to be done?

13 MR. CARDAMONE: Commissioner, this particular  
14 change order involves about 14 different items that  
15 we've sort of aggregated into a single change order.  
16 And that's typically what we do to minimize the amount  
17 of the change orders, the formal change orders that have  
18 to be processed.

19 What typically happens on a construction  
20 contract is the contractor will ask a question. They'll  
21 generate what we call an RFI, or request for  
22 information. That RFI would then be handed off to the  
23 designer; the designer would evaluate the question and,  
24 then, in many cases come back with some type of design  
25 change or design revision or sketch of some sort that

1 would represent additional work for the contractor.

2           Maybe I can give you one example of one of the  
3 14 items that happened on this particular change order.  
4 The contractor identified three locations in the  
5 operations building where there was a gap between the  
6 columns at the grid line and the adjacent parapet wall  
7 and required modification to the typical flashing  
8 detail. So the designer issued additional details which  
9 were given to the contractor to implement, and the  
10 contractor, therefore, incurred additional cost that he  
11 didn't have in his original -- original proposal. But  
12 that's typically what happens. A question is asked.  
13 Some clarification is needed that results in some  
14 additional work that the contractor has to perform.

15           In this particular change order, there were 14,  
16 not identical, but similar types of situations involving  
17 either the structural work, architectural work,  
18 waterproofing, fire code compliance, those kind of  
19 issues.

20           COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Okay. And I think again  
21 when we reference to amount of money, the original  
22 contract for this job, as you've indicated, is in excess  
23 of \$45 million; am I correct?

24           MR. CARDAMONE: That's correct.

25           COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Again, nine change

1 orders. So I think the purpose of my question is to  
2 make sure -- not that I'm doubting staff or the  
3 representations of the contractor -- but we're talking  
4 about a \$45 million contract, and it was, as I suspect,  
5 the result of a low bid; right? Low bidder?

6 MR. CARDAMONE: Yes, sir. That's correct.

7 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: You have issues like,  
8 for example, modify ceiling framing at the restroom  
9 ceiling to accommodate recessed lighting, additional  
10 light fixtures. These -- on the scope of things, I  
11 would acknowledge they're rather benign. But on the  
12 other hand, when you talk about a 45 million-plus  
13 contract award, at what point do we kind of -- maybe  
14 it's a poor word I'm using -- nitpick to the point of  
15 having these 14 items to justify a change order?

16 And I think again -- and I don't actually want  
17 you to answer the question. But I think we've come to  
18 the point that maybe at some point when you do have  
19 these issues regarding change orders I have acknowledged  
20 and you have acknowledged -- you've informed that I've  
21 acknowledged that in the scope of things, this is rather  
22 minor in the contract that in regard to things that we  
23 do award and that you want a change order.

24 But on the issue of the lowest possible bidder,  
25 maybe if we have a situation like this, after the fifth

1 change order, maybe we should attack the RFP or the bid  
2 price and start looking through what these contractors  
3 actually bid for as opposed to the competitors and now  
4 with the change orders amounting to. Because again, I  
5 think for further transparency to the issue I have  
6 related to this, if you're going to be the most  
7 responsible bidder in terms of the lowest responsible  
8 bid on this, then some things like lighting fixtures --  
9 you know, maybe you could look at this issue when you  
10 apply -- submit to the job, and if things don't come to  
11 the penny, maybe this is some of the cost of doing  
12 business.

13 Now again, I ask these questions, and I'm  
14 making this point when we talk about the kind of  
15 contract we have here, \$45 million, and the seventh  
16 change order -- oh, excuse me, ninth -- so I think that  
17 the last comment I would make with regard to contractors  
18 who submit these type bids, maybe it would be  
19 interesting to see when we get the bid with the change  
20 order, so if you were the lowest possible bidder, and  
21 you represented you could do this job for X amount of  
22 dollars, and maybe we can hold you to that. And you  
23 have to redo the light fixtures; well, that should be  
24 your cost.

25 So anyways -- unless there are any further

1 questions or discussion, that's all the comments I have  
2 on this.

3 Do we have a motion?

4 COMMISSIONER WALTER: So move.

5 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second.

6 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Okay. Unless there are  
7 any questions or discussion, all in favor?

8 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
9 Cordero).

10 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Opposed? Motion passed  
11 unanimously. Thank you.

12 And that concludes the agenda from the  
13 Engineering and Environmental Committee, Mr. President.

14 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Commissioner  
15 Cordero.

16 Okay. Our next committee is the Trade  
17 Relations and Port Operations Committee which would be  
18 chaired by Dr. Walter here.

19 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Thank you, Mr. President.  
20 The Trade Relations and Port Operations Committee has  
21 four items on the agenda this afternoon. We have pulled  
22 Item Number 5 and 6 from the area of communication.  
23 We'll just take Items 1 through 4.

24 The first item is an amendment to the contract  
25 with Queen Beach Printers, Inc. for communications and



1 community relations printing cost. Ms. Morris.

2 MS. MORRIS: Thank you, Commissioners. In June  
3 of last year Queen Beach Printers was awarded a one-year  
4 contract totaling \$165,000 with two one-year options.  
5 Our communications staff recommends that this contract  
6 be extended again this year, and to add an additional  
7 \$137,500 to accommodate projected printing costs for the  
8 coming year.

9 Printing with this contract is for annual --  
10 annual report and our quarterly port newsletter. We  
11 find that Queen Beach has provided the port with, not  
12 only with an outstanding product, but also outstanding  
13 service. We, therefore, recommend that the Trade  
14 Relations and Port Operations Committee approve and  
15 refer to the Board of Harbor Commissioners the approval  
16 of a first amendment to the communication division  
17 contract with Beach city printers from June 1st, 2010,  
18 to May 31st of 2011 with \$137,500 in funds. Thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Ms. Morris, before we  
20 open this up, I'd like to ask a couple of questions  
21 here. What is the total amount of money that you are  
22 requesting?

23 MS. MORRIS: 137,500.

24 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, okay. And now,  
25 is -- that is in addition to the 165 -- yeah, the

1 165,000?

2 MS. MORRIS: That's correct. 165,000 --  
3 majority of that was spent this fiscal year, and so the  
4 137,000 [sic] was for the next fiscal year June 1st,  
5 2010, through next 2011.

6 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, so just make sure,  
7 165 plus the 137.

8 MS. MORRIS: No. The 137,500 and the remainder  
9 of what we didn't expend for the 165 for this year.

10 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Okay.

11 MS. MORRIS: I'm sorry. I should have been  
12 more clear on that.

13 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Okay. I had a little  
14 trouble following you. All right. Fine. I understand  
15 it now. Thank you very much. It clarifies that.

16 Let me ask if there's anyone in the audience  
17 that would like to address this agenda item? Seeing no  
18 one, I'd like to ask the Board for a motion to approve.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Motion to approve.

20 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second.

21 COMMISSIONER WALTER: And second. And now, are  
22 there any questions from any of the commissioners? As I  
23 say, I have done work with Queen Beach Printers, and  
24 they do an excellent job. Everything I see here -- it  
25 is really first rate, first class, which is the way we

1 want the port represented.

2 MS. MORRIS: That's right.

3 COMMISSIONER WALTER: All right. All in favor,  
4 say aye.

5 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
6 Cordero).

7 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Motion carries  
8 unanimously.

9 And we will move on to Item Number 2, which is  
10 a request for sponsorship from Central CHA, Inc. for the  
11 2010 Nuestra Imagen Community Leadership Award  
12 Recognition and Celebration. Again, Ms. Morris.

13 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. This organization will  
14 host an event on September the 16th. The event  
15 recognizes businesses, organizations, and individuals in  
16 Long Beach who have made a significant contribution to  
17 our community. The event gives the port an opportunity  
18 to showcase on our role as a key community partner, and  
19 in fact, this year we've had a number of opportunities  
20 to work with Central CHA. We have taken the  
21 organization out on a number of harbor tours, and our  
22 staff has been over to their organization and made  
23 presentations.

24 We would, therefore, recommend a sponsorship at  
25 the \$750 level. And Jessica Quintana, the executive

1 director, is in the audience. Ms. Quintana.

2 MS. QUINTANA: Good afternoon, hello, members  
3 of the Commission. My name is Jessica Quintana from  
4 Central CHA. And again I am so delighted to be here  
5 today and have the support of the port. As you know,  
6 this year we are honoring the Arts Council of Long  
7 Beach, Mr. Jim Mencher (phonetic), for his lifetime  
8 dedication to fighting intolerance and social justice.  
9 We are honoring Interval House, the Long Beach Fire  
10 Department, Phil Hester from Parks and Rec, and  
11 Mr. Juan -- Dr. Benitos (phonetic) from Cal State Long  
12 Beach, and Corina (phonetic) who's from the connected  
13 corridor. So we are so excited.

14 We look forward to seeing the commissioners out  
15 there this year in support of us, but as I'm up here,  
16 also I want to take this opportunity to also really ask  
17 the Commission if it's in your purview to maybe increase  
18 our sponsorship. I know that, you know, the economy is  
19 hard, and it is for everybody. But our organization is  
20 a community, local-based agency that's in Long Beach,  
21 who provides education and social services and job  
22 training for the most hard-to-reach population that's  
23 isolated which is the Latino community, and they are  
24 isolated in the communities that they live in that's  
25 most impacted by unemployment, violence, and

1 environmental health issues.

2           And you know, we continue to -- to do those  
3 education workshops within the community, and you know,  
4 work very hard to do that partnership with -- with the  
5 port. So I would just like to make -- put a plug in for  
6 the agency if you think -- so if you could please maybe  
7 consider increasing our sponsorship.

8           COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, Jessica, we thank  
9 you very much for coming today, and the people that  
10 you're honoring here are very, very impressive. They're  
11 wonderful citizens, and they really help. Central  
12 CHA -- I don't know if you know, I try to attend that  
13 every year. It's one of the things that we donate to,  
14 and I think you do a marvelous job.

15           MS. QUINTANA: Thank you, Dr. Walter.

16           COMMISSIONER WALTER: I can't speak for anyone  
17 else, nor can I make a motion to increase, but what you  
18 have requested -- that would be up to my fellow  
19 commissioners here, but I do appreciate your coming and  
20 answering any questions that we might have.

21           Before we move on, let me just ask if there's  
22 anyone else in the audience that would like to address  
23 this agenda item? Seeing no one, if you'll just wait  
24 for a moment, any questions?

25           Oh, I need a motion.

1 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: I'd like to ask a question.  
2 Ms. Morris, how much did we give last year?

3 MS. QUINTANA: \$1,000.

4 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: I don't know if you want to,  
5 but I think that -- I think we ought to leave it at the  
6 \$1,000. I'd like to increase it. So I will make that  
7 motion that we approve it at the \$1,000 level that we  
8 did last year.

9 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Second.

10 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Okay. I have a motion  
11 and a second that we increase it to a thousand dollars.  
12 Any discussion?

13 Okay. All in favor, say aye.

14 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
15 Cordero).

16 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Very well. That motion  
17 carries unanimously for \$1,000. Any questions?  
18 Discussion? Okay. Well . . .

19 MS. QUINTANA: Thank you so much,  
20 Commissioners.

21 COMMISSIONER WALTER: We'll look forward to  
22 seeing you.

23 MS. QUINTANA: Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Item Number 3 is a  
25 request for the sponsorship from the Children's Clinic

1 for the 20th Anniversary Beach Walk, Walk with a Child,  
2 Walk for a Child. Again, Ms. Morris.

3 MS. MORRIS: Thank you. The Children's Clinic  
4 provides medical care, outreach, and mental health  
5 services to low-income and underserved Long Beach  
6 children and their families. The clinic will host their  
7 20th Anniversary Beach Walk on October the 23rd.  
8 Roughly 1500 volunteers including businesses and  
9 community leaders are expected to participate. We,  
10 therefore, recommend sponsorship at the \$1,000 level,  
11 and Diane Nichols, assistant director of development and  
12 communications, is here with us today. Ms. Nichols.

13 MS. NICHOLS: Good afternoon, members of the  
14 Commission. Thank you. My name is Diane Nichols. I'm  
15 here representing the Children's Clinic. And this is  
16 our 70th year in Long Beach, and we are a licensed  
17 community health center with six sites in Long Beach.  
18 And last year we were able to provide over 70,000 health  
19 care visits to uninsured and underinsured residents in  
20 the greater Long Beach community, and I just want to  
21 take this opportunity to thank you. We really  
22 appreciate all of your support. Your support is really  
23 vital to the Clinic's ability to continue to provide  
24 health care to the uninsured here in the Long Beach  
25 community. And I'm happy to answer any questions you

1 may have.

2 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Thank you very much.  
3 I'll see if there are any questions from the  
4 Commissioners here.

5 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Yes. Just to make a  
6 motion and then a comment. I make a motion that we  
7 approve it.

8 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Okay. Any second?

9 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second.

10 COMMISSIONER WALTER: All right. We have a  
11 motion and a second.

12 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: And just a comment on  
13 this -- in reading in particular what your organization  
14 does, I think I just want to emphasize and elaborate in  
15 the course of what you see this component of our meeting  
16 in which we sponsor various organizations. But I think  
17 the public, I'm sure, realizes, but I think on behalf of  
18 the Board and the staff, when we talk about people in  
19 need in this community, I think let the record be very  
20 clear. This really impressed me in terms of what your  
21 organization is doing, meeting a need that most people  
22 believe or may not know how, you know, what an urgency  
23 it is to do that.

24 And for a port in this country to step up to  
25 the plate and support these events, and granted, it may



1 not be the kind of money you would like to see -- you  
2 have been -- we have some restrictions, so to speak.

3 But nevertheless, I just wanted to emphasize  
4 especially in these times what this port does for  
5 organizations. I'm sure these monies make a difference  
6 to you. More importantly, it really emphasizes the  
7 corporate responsibility that we have engaged in  
8 accordance with policies like the Green Port Policy, so  
9 I think I just wanted to make this known to you.

10 I don't think we have funded you before; am I  
11 correct? Pardon me?

12 MS. NICHOLS: I believe this is the second  
13 year.

14 MS. MORRIS: I think it's the first time for  
15 the beach walk.

16 MS. NICHOLS: First time for the beach walk.

17 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Right, and that's why --  
18 that's why I wanted to make a comment, because it's an  
19 example how the port is attempting to diverse its  
20 support when it comes to societal issues, in this case,  
21 health care. I think it's a commentary that needed to  
22 be said, and I'm sure I speak on behalf of the other  
23 four commissioners, and we're happy to do that. It  
24 really separates us from other ports in what we're doing  
25 in a small level to support organizations like yourself.

1 MS. NICHOLS: Thank you, and I agree that  
2 it's -- it's every little bit does help us. We are  
3 seeing an increase in the uninsured, about 35 newly  
4 uninsured patients a day in our clinics -- teachers and  
5 engineers and UPS workers that have been laid off, so .  
6 . .

7 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: How about lawyers? Are  
8 we including them?

9 All right. Thank you again for being here.

10 MS. NICHOLS: Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER WISE: Yes, I've been on the board  
12 of this organization since the mid '90s, and depending  
13 on time we get done here today, I'm supposed to go to a  
14 board meeting at the Children's Clinic at 4:30. So  
15 that's probably -- I might not very well be there, but I  
16 just wanted to say that if unless I'm summoned to  
17 something else, I plan to participate in the walk on the  
18 23rd of October, and if there's anybody else here,  
19 either this side of the rail or that side of the rail,  
20 that would like to join me down there, that would be  
21 great. Mario, you can run it if you want. It is not a  
22 strenuous activity; you go at your own speed.

23 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Well, with that, I'm not  
24 going to have this part of my motion because I will  
25 address that communications is doing a great job of

1 rounding up port personnel, and I really encourage port  
2 personnel at every level to participate.

3 Just again, in fact, working with that process  
4 and making sure that the community sees that people who  
5 work here in this department, not only do their due  
6 courses in terms of responsibility, but out there in the  
7 community, participating whether it be a marathon or a  
8 bike-a-thon or, in this case, beach walk. So perhaps  
9 communications could take the lead and identify a group  
10 and call us the green walkers or whatever you want to  
11 call us; we'll be there.

12 MS. MORRIS: We'd be happy to work with our  
13 human resources division and our employees club to  
14 promote this.

15 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Maybe we need a special  
16 T-shirt.

17 MS. MORRIS: I got the message.

18 COMMISSIONER WALTER: All right. I don't know.  
19 I don't believe I asked if there is anyone in the  
20 audience -- anyone else in the audience that would like  
21 to comment on this? Seeing none, can I -- I have a  
22 motion and second.

23 All in favor, say aye.

24 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
25 Cordero).

1                   COMMISSIONER WALTER: The motion carries  
2 unanimously.

3                   We'll move to the fourth item on the agenda  
4 which is a request for sponsorship from the Southern  
5 California Relocation Council for a harbor tour. Again,  
6 Ms. Moore.

7                   MS. MORRIS: Thank you. The Southern  
8 California Relocation Council is widely recognized as  
9 the authority on global workforce mobility. The SCRC is  
10 heavily involved in the domestic and international  
11 relocation of personnel. They've requested a harbor  
12 tour for their organization on September the 9th.

13                   Additionally, the SCRC has also asked to book  
14 our port's board room, this facility here, to hold its  
15 meeting prior to their tour, and we'll have an  
16 opportunity to brief the organization on the Green Port  
17 Policy and our other green initiatives. The tour will  
18 help promote a greater understanding of our port  
19 operations' environmental efforts and our overall  
20 efforts to enhance the maritime business in this region.

21                   We, therefore, request a harbor tour at a cost  
22 not to exceed \$1,000. Mary O'Donnell, I believe, the  
23 president, is in the audience to address the board. Ms.  
24 O'Donnell.

25                   COMMISSIONER WALTER: Welcome, Ms. O'Donnell.

1 MS. O'DONNELL: Thank you for your attention at  
2 the board, and thank you for your approval for the  
3 request. I'm the current board president for the  
4 Southern California Relocation Council. We are a  
5 regional group. We've been in business for 20 years.  
6 We just celebrated our 20th year. We actually started  
7 our organization in Long Beach.

8 We are tied to a national organization out of  
9 D.C. which is the Employee Relocation Council. We work  
10 with corporations for global mobility, relocating their  
11 employees domestically as well as internationally. And  
12 our keynote speaker for September will be Peggy Smith.  
13 She is the new CEO of ERC, and we'll be having it in the  
14 board room, so thank you very much.

15 COMMISSIONER WALTER: All right. Well, thank  
16 you so much.

17 Is there anyone else in the audience that would  
18 like to comment on this agenda item? Seeing no one, I  
19 will ask for a motion to approve.

20 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: So move.

21 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second.

22 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Okay. We have a motion  
23 and second. Any discussion on this from the commission?  
24 All right.

25 All in favor, say aye.

1 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
2 Cordero).

3 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Motion carries  
4 unanimously. Thank you very much for coming.

5 I think that wraps up the Trade Relations and  
6 Port Operations Committee report, and I would just point  
7 out to you that these are really good organizations that  
8 we have supported this afternoon. And they will make  
9 significant impact in a wide segment of our community  
10 here, so I think we can take pride in what we've done to  
11 help them. I want to thank everyone for coming to  
12 discuss these items, and so that completes the report  
13 for Trade Relations and Port Operations committee.

14 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Dr. Walter. We  
15 will begin the regular board meeting now. We have a  
16 consent agenda, Items 1 through 7, and Commissioners  
17 wish to take or pull any of these items. I think there  
18 was a question on the minutes.

19 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: I need to recuse myself  
20 from Item Number 4 and, I believe, Item Number 6. In  
21 terms of Item Number 6 I think more for perception more  
22 than any other reasons, but most definitively, Item  
23 Number 4.

24 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Both -- both items?

25 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Yes.

1 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. All right. Dominic,  
2 can we vote on the rest of them?

3 MR. HOLZHAUS: Yes, on the consent calendar  
4 where there's no discussion, the minutes would just  
5 reflect the recusal, and all commissioners can vote on  
6 all items with the exception of the recusal.

7 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. Thank you. Also I had  
8 a couple corrections in the minutes. Dr. Walter?

9 COMMISSIONER WALTER: No, I have nothing.

10 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. We have item --  
11 consent agenda Items 1 through 7. Can I have a motion  
12 with the changes to the minutes and also Commissioner  
13 Cordero recusing himself with 4 and 6.

14 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Yes, so move.

15 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: We have a motion and second.  
17 Anybody in the audience wish to discuss any of these  
18 Items 1 through 7?

19 Seeing none, Commissioners? Any more  
20 discussion?

21 Okay. We have a motion and second. All in  
22 favor of the motion, say aye.

23 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
24 Cordero).

25 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: All right. Motion passes.

1 Thank you.

2 Okay. We will take Items 9 and 10 out of order  
3 and then come back to Item 8 which is the EIR. Let's  
4 get these items out of the way and save our time for  
5 discussing Item Number 8.

6 So Item Number 9, please.

7 MR. ADAMOWICZ: Item Number 9, communication  
8 from Director of Real Estate requesting first reading of  
9 Ordinance approving a License Agreement with the Port of  
10 Los Angeles and the Alameda Corridor Transportation  
11 Authority. I have no changes. This was approved in  
12 committee in June. I'm happy to answer any questions.

13 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. Do we have a motion?

14 COMMISSIONER WISE: So move.

15 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Second.

16 Okay. We have a motion and second. Anybody in  
17 the audience wish to make comments on Item Number 9?

18 Seeing none, Commissioners, questions? Seeing  
19 none, we have a motion and second.

20 All in favor of the motion, say aye.

21 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
22 Cordero).

23 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Any opposed? Okay. Motion  
24 passes. Thank you.

25 Item Number 10.



1           MR. ADAMOWICZ:   Communication from Director of  
2 Real Estate requesting second reading and adoption of  
3 Ordinance approving Third Amendment to Lease with ARCO  
4 Terminal Services Corporation.   Likewise I have no  
5 changes since that has been approved by committee, and  
6 there has been a first reading.

7           CHAIRMAN SRAMEK:   Great.   Thank you.   Could I  
8 have a motion?

9           COMMISSIONER CORDERO:   So move.

10          COMMISSIONER WALTER:   Second.

11          CHAIRMAN SRAMEK:   I have a motion and second.  
12 Anybody in the audience wish to make any comments on  
13 Item Number 10?

14          Seeing none, Commissioners?   Yes,  
15 Commissioner Cordero.

16          COMMISSIONER CORDERO:   Just one question.  
17 Mr. Adamowicz, on page 2 of the memorandum, you  
18 reference the fact that this particular lease and  
19 negotiation of, pursuant to the terms or pursuant to our  
20 authority of the City Charter, what particular section  
21 gives this authority?

22          MR. ADAMOWICZ:   Got it here.   Under Section  
23 1207, leasing, of the City Charter, under Subparagraph  
24 D, I'm not sure this addresses your question here.   But  
25 it says every such grant shall provide for a

1 readjustment of the rental or the compensation at least  
2 every five years during the term thereby created upon  
3 such procedures as shall be specified in such grant,  
4 grant referring to the lease.

5 So as a standard with all our leases that go  
6 beyond five years, we have the responsibility and the  
7 ability to renegotiate the rates every five years. And  
8 that's what this item is renegotiating the rent for the  
9 coming five-year period for this lease.

10 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Thank you. And I  
11 appreciate that. But I wasn't asking the question to  
12 question our authority. I just want to make sure that  
13 when we refer to the City Charter, we have a section  
14 that we can refer to once again as a basis for this type  
15 of action, and I think again it's important to know, not  
16 just as individual board members but I believe as staff,  
17 anytime that we refer to the charter, that we have a  
18 specific section and language in terms of what that is,  
19 so that we are very cognizant what powers we have and  
20 what we don't have. And again it was basically  
21 educational in terms of the purpose of my question,  
22 particularly educational for myself as well as other  
23 commissioners. Thank you.

24 MR. ADAMOWICZ: You're welcome.

25 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you. Any other

1 questions?

2 We have a motion and second. All in favor of  
3 the motion, say aye.

4 BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
5 Cordero).

6 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Motion passes. Thank you.

7 Okay. We'll go back to Item Number 8.

8 SECRETARY: Item Number 8, communication from  
9 director of environmental planning requesting adoption  
10 of a resolution for the Gerald Desmond Bridge  
11 Replacement Project, certifying the Final EIR, making  
12 certain findings, adopting a Statement of Overriding  
13 Considerations, a mitigation monitoring and reporting  
14 plan, approving the project, adopting the application  
15 summary report, and issuing Level III Harbor Development  
16 Permit Number 04-086.

17 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you.

18 Mr. Cameron.

19 MR. CAMERON: Commissioners, good afternoon.  
20 I'd like to just read a couple of the bullet points that  
21 are in the staff report, and then I'm going to be giving  
22 a little bit of a presentation summary of what is in the  
23 staff report in terms of background, process, findings,  
24 and next steps including staff recommendations on the --  
25 as stated in the actions.

1           One, it is important for the Board of Harbor  
2 Commissioners that on one we received this report from  
3 the staff and its environmental consultants and  
4 carefully consider all oral and written comments  
5 received on the site. I think that's very important.

6           Second, if the Board concurs, you'll be making  
7 several different approvals as part of this -- this  
8 request here, and we'll be taking them, I believe, on in  
9 one order, but when we get to that point, I'll have  
10 Dominic just clarify that. It's important that, prior  
11 to taking this action as recommended by staff, that the  
12 Board carefully review and consider the Final EIR  
13 including all the comments and responses to comments.

14           Also we'd like to remind the Board that the  
15 Final EIR was distributed to the Board under separate  
16 cover on July 28th, 2010. That's the date at which we  
17 released the Final EIR to all stakeholders. The revised  
18 Draft EIR/EA was previously transmitted to the Board in  
19 early February. Once again we released out for public  
20 review for all stakeholders. And for ease of reference  
21 we have included in the staff report the executive  
22 summary of the Final EIR/EA which also includes the  
23 mitigation monitoring reporting program, as well, that  
24 is part of the final document.

25           Now, what I'm going to do is just go through

1 real quickly and just provide the Board a little bit of  
2 a background and talk about a little bit of the process.  
3 This project, the proposed project, the replacement of  
4 the existing Gerald Desmond Bridge, is not new. It  
5 actually has been around since 2002 when the port first  
6 scoped through the CEQA process the intent to replace  
7 the Gerald Desmond Bridge.

8 As you know, the Port of Long Beach is acting  
9 as the CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act,  
10 lead agency. We have our partner. This is a joint  
11 document. We have our partner, the California  
12 Department of Transportation, Caltrans, who also has the  
13 authority under -- on behalf of the Federal Highway  
14 Administration, of FHWA, and they're also the lead  
15 agency under NEPA, and they're the ones who have  
16 prepared the Environmental Assessment that's part of  
17 this joint document.

18 We've gone through a very rigorous process.  
19 This is the second round for this environmental  
20 document, and I'd have to say overall we have made a lot  
21 of changes from the first draft that was put on the  
22 street back in 2004. And this project was rescoped in  
23 terms of a revised Notice of Preparation in -- I believe  
24 it's December of '05, and from that point up until  
25 February of this year before we released the revised

1 draft, we were working on a lot of different revisions  
2 of the studies, a lot of additions in terms of  
3 alternatives and overall analysis within the document.  
4 So it's a little bit of a -- a little bit of a  
5 background of where we started from and where we are  
6 today.

7           Just to remind the Board of what we're talking  
8 about, and I would remind the Board, I think we're all  
9 very aware of the existing bridge condition. The Board  
10 has heard some of the findings from the studies that our  
11 engineering division has prepared as well as Caltrans  
12 throughout the year in terms of the -- primarily the  
13 seismic deficiencies of the existing bridge. There is a  
14 lot of constraints. Obviously, it has a high grade.  
15 Its capacity is limited.

16           It was built over 40 years ago, and one of the  
17 important things also is the deterioration of the  
18 bridge. I think, as you know, we have what we call the  
19 diapers that are underneath -- the screening and the  
20 netting that's underneath the bridge currently. We  
21 currently have the responsibility for maintaining that  
22 bridge. And every day we're out there doing just that  
23 to ensure that the bridge is operating efficiently as  
24 possible. But we do have these deficiencies.

25           We also have height limitations. The current

1 bridge height is 156 feet above the channel. We have  
2 very modern and very large vessels that cross that  
3 bridge, but from a navigational safety perspective, it  
4 has been noted by our pilots, Jacobson's pilots, that  
5 it's a very scary transit underneath that bridge.  
6 There's a lot of other improvements in terms of the  
7 navigation improvements that are not part of this  
8 project that also need to happen to ensure complete safe  
9 navigation through the back channel through the back  
10 part of the harbor.

11 As you know, this bridge is not just a port  
12 bridge. This is a major commuter bridge. I myself  
13 cross this bridge twice a day going -- coming to work  
14 and going home. 75 percent of the traffic or  
15 thereabouts, give or take, is commuter traffic. It's  
16 non-port truck-related, heavy duty. The other  
17 25 percent is both port drayage as well as other heavy  
18 duty vehicles that are not doing business in the port  
19 because they're crossing the highway system just like  
20 they would on any major highway system: The 405, the  
21 110, the 710.

22 I think lastly, it's to the point of where we  
23 are on the efficiency of the rating on the seismic and  
24 the overall need for this project, and that is the  
25 Gerald Desmond has received a rate of 43, with less

1 than, you know, 50 running replacement, and this is part  
2 of the study that has been conducted by Caltrans.

3 I think I've gone over a lot of the objectives  
4 of the project. This has clearly been laid out. The  
5 objectives -- the proposed project objectives have not  
6 changed since the original issuance of the NOP back in  
7 2002, nor have they changed from the release of the  
8 draft in '04 or from the revised draft released in  
9 February or what you have before you as the Final EIR.  
10 These are the major objectives of this project.

11 The Revised Draft EIR did consider four  
12 alternatives. Two of the alternatives are the same  
13 except for the alignment, and that is the north and  
14 south, and that is as relates to the location of the  
15 existing bridge. We did add a rehabilitation  
16 alternative to the revised draft that we carried forward  
17 for public review. (Unintelligible.) We also, as  
18 required under CEQA, have the no-project alternative.  
19 So there were four alternatives that were carried though  
20 this environmental document.

21 In conclusion of our analysis taking into  
22 consideration comments from agencies and all  
23 stakeholders, in looking at the potential impacts and  
24 how to feasibly mitigate those, the north-side alignment  
25 of the preferred project alternative that was listed in



1 the Draft EIR is the one that is part of staff  
2 recommendation for the project approval.

3 Just to remind the Board of the north side  
4 alignment alternative, going back a little bit actually,  
5 I need to just remind the Board, the difference between  
6 the north and south which are essentially the same exact  
7 location. The rehab does not look at additional  
8 capacity. Basically what we would be doing is  
9 rehabilitation work from a seismic perspective as well  
10 as some other necessary improvements. We would not be  
11 adding any height or raising the bridge. We would not  
12 be adding any capacity from a lane standpoint. And so  
13 the life of that rehab is looking at about 30 years. So  
14 within 30 years after completing the rehab, we'd be  
15 right back to square one in terms of meeting the full  
16 objective of this project as listed.

17 Once again, I believe these are -- the proposed  
18 alignment -- that's just in the background. Just to  
19 remind you, that's conceptual design of the bridge. It  
20 will be a cable-stayed bridge. It will be designed to  
21 last over a hundred years. It will be at about 140 feet  
22 north of the existing bridge and about approximately  
23 200 feet above the back channel. There will be three  
24 12-foot travel lane in each direction. As you can see,  
25 the grades don't change too significantly, but there is

1 a slight reduction in the grade change which is  
2 important that the project area is spread out a little  
3 bit in terms of having the vehicles too much work going  
4 up and down.

5 We will also -- most important feature is we  
6 talk about this from a safety standpoint from traffic is  
7 the addition of 10-foot- to 12-foot-wide inside/outside  
8 shoulders that was analyzed. That currently does not  
9 exist on the existing bridge, and as you know, when it  
10 comes to safety, if anything breaks down on that bridge,  
11 it can have tremendous effects both on the island as  
12 well as on the 710. I believe what the proposed project  
13 is going to do is allow for, not only addressing those  
14 types of breakdowns, but also allow emergency vehicles  
15 to get across the bridge as well. It would not be the  
16 case in some of the other alternatives.

17 In addition, there would be a lot of  
18 reconnections into how we get on the bridge or on the  
19 system either from the island or through connections on  
20 the I-710. Part of our in-depth analysis, we analyze  
21 all of the alternatives and the potential impacts  
22 associated with those alternatives. For the proposed  
23 project before you for your consideration, the major  
24 impacts to be identified were from air quality both from  
25 construction and operation, climate change such as

1 greenhouse gas emissions, and transportation and  
2 circulation.

3           Also missing from here is the bio. We do have  
4 the bats and other avian birds that either roost or  
5 reside on the bridge, and that was fully analyzed, and  
6 we do have mitigation which I will be describing here as  
7 well. From -- but most of the impacts are from  
8 construction, and mitigation deals with most of these  
9 impacts or operations that feed the bridge. These are  
10 we have street intersection improvements which are once  
11 again listed as part of the staff report in the Final  
12 EIR as part of the mitigation monitoring reporting  
13 program, very similar to Middle Harbor as we move  
14 forward integrating those measures that are applicable  
15 to this from construction, cleaner construction  
16 equipment, low -- ultra low-sulfur fuels that definitely  
17 helps us as we -- with a multiyear, multiphased program  
18 such as what we're proposing here. This is important.  
19 This is the mitigation measures associated with both for  
20 the construction and to the operation, associated with  
21 the bats and some of these other avian birds.

22           I think we know the benefits. As laid out from  
23 staff's perspective, the proposed north-side alignment  
24 definitely meets all of the project objectives as laid  
25 out clearly, and I'd also like to remind the Board that,

1 as I stated before, it will be multiyear, in terms of  
2 approximately five years from start to finish, to build  
3 the new bridge and then to also take down the old  
4 bridge. And that will happen in phases, and we've  
5 addressed that in the analysis and adopted or  
6 recommended the appropriate mitigation to address that  
7 phase or the proposed phase of the project.

8 Another important point, even with everything  
9 that I've just stated in terms of impacts and the  
10 proposed mitigation that are listed in the Final EIR,  
11 very similar to Middle Harbor, we also have residual  
12 impacts associated both with construction and operation  
13 as with this project. Staff has before you recommended  
14 that this project participate in each of the three  
15 programs as listed above, as listed in the staff report  
16 and the Final EIR: \$1 million for schools and related  
17 sites program, \$1 million for health care and senior  
18 facilities program, and the greenhouse gas reduction  
19 program -- \$400,000 for that program.

20 And just to note, staff has been working  
21 diligently with moving forward with the grant mitigation  
22 programs, at the Board's request and as part of the  
23 resolution from City Council, there was the creation of  
24 an advisory committee that actually has been formed, and  
25 we've provided updates to the Board on our progress. To

1 date we have gone through with the first solicitation of  
2 schools and related programs. We've held three  
3 workshops. We have -- we received -- at the closing  
4 period of that solicitation, we have received  
5 approximately 73, 74 applications for the first round,  
6 and that is being reviewed right now by the advisory  
7 committee with the hopes that recommendations would be  
8 made here in the fall and that we can begin to move  
9 forward with the next step in that process which would  
10 also include coming back to the Board of Harbor  
11 Commissioners for consideration of approval of some of  
12 these grants.

13 As part of the process, we conducted two public  
14 hearings in addition to having the revised draft  
15 environmental document out for public review from  
16 February 4th to March 22nd was the official comment  
17 period. During the middle of that part of that process,  
18 we had two public hearings, both off-site and in the  
19 evening. They were well attended.

20 As listed in the staff report. Here are some  
21 of the types of comments that we received. They are  
22 very consistent type of comments we received both in the  
23 public hearings and that we saw in written form at the  
24 end of the comment period. They've all been addressed.  
25 Both the public comments that we received during the

1 public hearings have been formally addressed in the  
2 Final EIR as well as all written comments that we  
3 received which is part of the Board's package.

4 As I stated before, even since that time frame,  
5 even though we have received all the comments, and we've  
6 been able to respond to them. Before I get to my next  
7 steps, we have received two letters since the close of  
8 the -- since the final document was released on July  
9 28th. The first letter was received, and the board --  
10 we transmitted to this board as a board information  
11 item, dated August 9th, and that is the letter that we  
12 received from the Natural Resources Defense Council,  
13 NRDC, and then we've also attached our response to the  
14 received -- three bulleted comments that we provided our  
15 response to those -- to those comments.

16 The first comment was addressing the concerns  
17 with the zero emissions ways of transportation  
18 containers, and the second was related to the community  
19 mitigation program. I believe I've given the Board a  
20 little bit of a summary of how we have been making  
21 progress. And we've added a lot more clarification to  
22 those responses to those comments as part of the packet.

23 In addition, at about 11 o'clock this morning I  
24 received another comment letter from the NRDC, and the  
25 Board has a copy of that as well. So what I'd like to

1 do is just start off by maybe responding to a few of  
2 these, and then turn it back over to the Board after  
3 that and complete the process here.

4           The first item -- and this is a letter dated  
5 August 9th; does everybody have that? I'm sorry. Okay.  
6 The first number one on here, the port must ensure that  
7 the mitigation programs established under the Middle  
8 Harbor Development Project are rapidly executed. I  
9 would agree with that, and I would say that we have done  
10 that. And I believe that is reflected in our response,  
11 and this is a very similar comment that was in the  
12 August 5th letter. In addition, this comment was also  
13 addressed in the Final EIR/EA as it relates to response  
14 to comments NRDC-5.

15           Item number two, the EIR/EA offers no  
16 sufficient justification for its dismissal of feasible  
17 alternatives. The staff does not concur with that. In  
18 fact, this is part of the essence of this comment is  
19 very similar to the second bulleted item from August  
20 5th. We responded appropriately, we feel. We've also  
21 addressed this throughout the Chapter 1 of looking at  
22 all alternatives, and those alternatives considered as  
23 well as those alternatives not considered for further  
24 evaluation in both the Revised Draft EIR as well as the  
25 Final, and NRDC-7, our response to that comment, is also

1 part of the record.

2 Item number three, the EIR/EA fails to discuss  
3 how air quality analysis of this transportation project  
4 will affect -- will be affected by the new bridge  
5 height. Once again, we do not concur with this as well,  
6 and we would like to add some clarity to the record as  
7 well for the Board. First section, both starting in the  
8 Draft Revised EIR that was put on the street in  
9 February 2010, Section 2.1.2 is related to growth  
10 inducement. And in fact, that is the core part of our  
11 analysis, and nothing sufficiently has changed from the  
12 draft. Actually, there have been no changes from that  
13 section and that analysis.

14 To get at the height -- the core of this  
15 comment is related to the height of the bridge and  
16 allowing for larger vessels to get under the bridge and  
17 the fact that this project does not account for those  
18 vessel emissions. We feel as if we have accounted for  
19 this very clearly in how we're addressing the growth  
20 inducement effect, both from the navigational as well as  
21 from the traffic standpoint in terms of increasing  
22 capacity. We do not believe that additional vessels,  
23 whether they may be able to cross under this bridge in  
24 the future, at least at this point in time from the  
25 increased bridge height would not amount -- increase



1 emissions would not occur from this project from our  
2 analysis.

3           And part of that is the navigational  
4 constraints in the back channel that are completely  
5 separate from this project, and that is dredging and  
6 other improvements that would be necessary for larger  
7 ships to be able to safely transit into the back channel  
8 and to the other marine terminals. We made that very  
9 clear in our analysis, and we stand firm to this, a very  
10 similar comment, as noted by the NRDC, from AQMD -- we  
11 responded to AQMD, I think, pretty appropriately to that  
12 point, and that is SCAQMD-2.

13           Also when we start to talk about analyzing  
14 future emissions from vessels that are not part of the  
15 project that may cross this bridge, it starts to cross  
16 the threshold of speculative, and we feel that if this  
17 is a hundred-year bridge, it's who knows what types of  
18 vessels and their sizes will be crossing there,  
19 underneath that bridge. A lot of it is based upon  
20 business. I think that we've seen as a result of the  
21 downturn in the recession -- and overnight we saw the  
22 fleet change in a heartbeat from very mid size to large  
23 vessels back to very small vessels. It's very  
24 business-driven. We once again feel as if we've  
25 appropriately handled this type of analysis, both once

1 again in the draft utilized, as well as the final which  
2 there are no changes.

3 The fourth item on this letter associates --  
4 suggests that we have -- contains significant new  
5 information that requires recirculation. We do not  
6 agree with this. There is no new information that was  
7 not provided in the Revised Draft EIR. The Final EIR is  
8 consistent in terms of the data and the analysis and our  
9 findings. And frankly, the reference to  
10 (unintelligible), this information is clearly in Section  
11 2.1.2 -- or 2.1.2, I guess that's the distribution  
12 section, as well as responding to this appropriately in  
13 the RCTAs.

14 Item number five on here is the Final EIR/EA  
15 makes confusing statements to the amount of pollution  
16 the project will emit and how will it be distributed  
17 through the region. A lot of this goes back to whether  
18 or not we've appropriately analyzed the bridge in terms  
19 of its height and how that could distribute emissions  
20 outside of the project area. And frankly, the  
21 dispersion model that we used for both the air quality  
22 analysis and the health risk analysis from a  
23 quantifiable state was presented in the draft as well as  
24 the final with no changes. The dispersion model is a  
25 three-dimensional model that takes into account the

1 height and location of emissions. So as a result, the  
2 modeling as a result for this project do take in account  
3 the new bridge height on the configuration.

4 The model also takes the bridge configuration  
5 parameters to determine the air quality impacts  
6 throughout the modeling domain which includes the  
7 region. This is very consistent with what a lot of  
8 other -- what we've done through our emissions inventory  
9 is what we do through other EIRs. This is very  
10 consistent with what SCAQMD and other agencies use as  
11 well.

12 Finally, item number six, failure to prepare,  
13 as I stated in the past, Environmental Impact  
14 Statement -- violates NEPA, once again, we are not the  
15 NEPA lead. We are the CEQA lead, and we have addressed  
16 this. This is a comment we received originally as part  
17 of the comments from the draft, and we responded to this  
18 in NRDC-1.

19 So with that I'd like to go ahead and conclude  
20 and make the final staff recommendation that the Board  
21 of Harbor Commissioners consider the certification of  
22 the Final EIR for replacement of the Gerald Desmond  
23 Bridge, make certain findings and adopt statement of  
24 overriding considerations, adopt the mitigation  
25 monitoring and reporting plan, approve the

1 north-alignment alternative as stated in the staff  
2 report, and adopt the application summary report  
3 pursuant to the California Coastal Act and Port Master  
4 Plan, and finally the issuance of a Level III Harbor  
5 Development Permit. With that I'd be happy to answer  
6 questions.

7 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Cameron. Also  
8 thank you for addressing this letter that was sent to us  
9 at the last minute. I know it's tough to address.  
10 Thank you for addressing all of the items on that. A  
11 lot to read, so -- even for us to read, so appreciate  
12 you doing that.

13 First, what I'd like to do is open up to  
14 commissioners just who have basic questions. Then we'll  
15 open up to the audience, and then we'll bring it back up  
16 here for comments. So Commissioners, if you have any  
17 questions of Mr. Cameron.

18 COMMISSIONER WALTER: You want a motion first?

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Motion to approve.

21 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Dominic, can we do this all  
22 in one motion.

23 MR. HOLZHAUS: Yes, Commissioners, the  
24 resolution is comprehensive. It addresses all the  
25 points that Rick mentioned that are subsumed within this

1 action, so one single motion to adopt the resolution  
2 would accomplish all those things.

3 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. So this, like, by  
4 having a motion we -- gives us a chance to discuss it,  
5 so . . .

6 We have a motion. Is there a second? On the  
7 motion for discussion, is there a second?

8 COMMISSIONER WISE: Second it.

9 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. There's a motion and  
10 second. Questions by Commissioners? You want to do  
11 questions now or later? Is there any basic questions?  
12 Ask them now or we can do it after members of the  
13 audience speak.

14 Yes, go ahead. Commissioner Cordero.

15 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Yes, thank you. Just  
16 one comment. In reference to the letters of August 9th,  
17 there's a couple of things in the letter that we could  
18 probably elaborate more after the public comments, but  
19 just so that we note. The first two points are very  
20 important, and I think you referenced. I think staff is  
21 cognizant of the fact with regard to the grant. The  
22 grant process needs to move forward. I can see as a  
23 particular issue in terms of expediting that procedure,  
24 at least putting more emphasis on that.

25 But number two, on the zero emission system,

1 and the only reason I bring it up at this time so that  
2 we understand that just last week, this issue was  
3 debated here at the Board in terms of the status. And I  
4 think it's fair to say that especially in light of the  
5 discussion last week, I know President Sramek wants this  
6 to move expeditiously, so I think on the first two just  
7 for the record, emphasis are being made.

8 In fact, on the zero emission system, it seems  
9 to me or seems to us that we perhaps -- we, in fact, may  
10 be ready to move forward on the demonstration project  
11 without too much of a delay, so that is being constantly  
12 debated at this point. So I just wanted to emphasize  
13 that this is not something that we've lost sight of. In  
14 fact, quite to the contrary, after last week it's  
15 something that we have placed even more of a priority.

16 MR. CAMERON: And Commissioner, I believe staff  
17 has accurately given that type of summary in our  
18 response to the comments from the August 5th letter, but  
19 I would refer to Dr. Kanter if he wants to add anything,  
20 but I would agree with you.

21 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Thank you. That's all  
22 the comments I have at this time.

23 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: I just make comment on what  
24 you were just saying. The mitigation programs that we  
25 had -- we actually started those many months before --

1 before the project was even well -- we're still not. So  
2 we've actually started those things many months before  
3 they were even scheduled to be because we wanted to  
4 emphasize those and make sure we're ready to move  
5 forward very quickly with those things. So we actually  
6 started those many months before they were even  
7 scheduled to be started; correct?

8 MR. CAMERON: That is correct, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Right.

10 Okay. So any other comments by -- questions by  
11 commissioners before we go to the audience?

12 COMMISSIONER WALTER: I think I'd prefer to  
13 hear comments from the audience. I assume there are  
14 some anyway.

15 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. Now what I'd like to  
16 do is invite both Niki Tennant up and Brian Menagino  
17 (phonetic) to make comments for the two assembly members  
18 that they're going to make comments for, and then we'll  
19 take regular audience.

20 Okay. Do you want me to call names, or do you  
21 have the list of call names? Okay.

22 MS. TENNANT: Good afternoon. I am  
23 Niki Tennant, and I am representing Assemblymember  
24 Bonnie Lowenthal. She is the chair of the assembly  
25 transportation committee.

1 I'm here to voice her support for this project  
2 for three reasons: Jobs, jobs, and jobs. And we have a  
3 very short window of opportunity to take advantage of  
4 federal and state funds to complete this project, and it  
5 is also critical that we take this step to increase the  
6 port's ability to remain competitive and to be able to  
7 compete with the myriad of projects and improvements to  
8 other ports worldwide and to protect our maritime and  
9 trade-related jobs.

10 In that we also encourage you to be mindful of  
11 sensitivities, mindful and sensitive to environmental  
12 and community concerns regarding construction and the  
13 project in total. Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Ms. Tennant.

15 Okay. Next. You get to speak today.

16 MR. MIMMS: Good afternoon, my name is actually  
17 Derek Mimms, and I'm here on behalf of the assembly  
18 member Warren Furutani. The assemblyman is also in  
19 support of the resolution by the staff. He supports the  
20 momentum that is taking place to improve the bridge and  
21 the replacement. He understands the challenges that are  
22 before us.

23 He was just out here recently, and the Harbor  
24 Commission has hosted him and the state controller  
25 John Chiang trying to find resources and funding to move



1 forward to maintain the momentum to face this challenge  
2 and to move forward so that we can have a very efficient  
3 and very safe and very productive bridge for the  
4 community and also for the businesses that operate goods  
5 movement.

6 He also understands that the EIR is very  
7 important, and one of his biggest concerns is always air  
8 quality. It is a big issue throughout the district, so  
9 we understand as we're moving forward and looking at  
10 this issue very carefully, and he recommends that you  
11 continue to do so, that you continue to make sure those  
12 mitigation programs like you mentioned move forward  
13 ahead of time which is very important for our schools,  
14 our children, our seniors, and very important for  
15 everyone.

16 So we understand this is a very holistic and a  
17 comprehensive process, a very challenging process. The  
18 issues that the community raises, he doesn't take  
19 lightly. He understands them all, and he has confidence  
20 that this commission that's moving forward to address  
21 all those issues and make sure you have a very safe  
22 bridge for the future so we can all have a great city.  
23 Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you very much.

25 Okay. Read names, but everybody that comes up,

1 please be mindful of the three minute time limit.

2 SECRETARY: David Thornburg.

3 MR. THORNBURG: Good afternoon, Commissioners,  
4 port staff. My name is David Thornburg, and I represent  
5 SA Recycling. We operate at 40 locations throughout the  
6 Southwestern United States, and our most important  
7 operation are two operations on Terminal Island.

8 I think we can all agree that the bridge where  
9 it is now or in the future -- it will be important to  
10 the port and to the region. And we wholeheartedly  
11 support the replacement of the bridge and the EIR that  
12 allows -- the bridge would allow our operations to  
13 continue without interruption.

14 In the event of a stalled vehicle just like the  
15 one or something happened on the way to work, and there  
16 was certainly some backup. Our business was hampered  
17 slightly with this backup, but more importantly with an  
18 earthquake that can close the bridge, our business would  
19 be severely hampered.

20 I'd also told my family that if there's an  
21 earthquake, that my delay to get to them might be  
22 hampered because the bridge could be closed. Also, the  
23 new bridge will bring, as Mr. Cameron pointed out,  
24 larger, more environmentally friendly vessels, and that  
25 would all be good for the port. Therefore, I ask you to

1 adopt this resolution and strengthen our ability to grow  
2 together. Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Thornburg.  
4 Next.

5 SECRETARY: Carlo DeAtouguia.

6 MR. DE ATOUGUIA: President Sramek and fellow  
7 Board of Harbor Commissioners, thank you for allowing me  
8 the opportunity to address you today. My name is  
9 Carlo DeAtouguia, and I am the president of the Foreign  
10 Trade Association.

11 The Foreign Trade Association is the oldest  
12 international trade association in Southern California.  
13 The Foreign Trade Association is a private, nonprofit  
14 trade association that represents over 200 members and  
15 individuals of the international trade community. Since  
16 its founding back in 1919, the FTA has always taken the  
17 lead, not only on international trade issues affecting  
18 Southern California, but also acting as an informative  
19 resource for its members in monitoring and advocating  
20 legislative issues on a state and federal level.

21 As our economy recovers today from the world's  
22 recession since the Great Depression, it will be the  
23 international trade community that will lead the way to  
24 recover. An important piece of this equation is the  
25 approval to proceed with the replacement of the Gerald

1 Desmond Bridge. The replacement of the Gerald Desmond  
2 Bridge is not only an important part in the  
3 modernization of the Port of Long Beach, but the project  
4 would generate a proposed \$2.8 billion in economic  
5 activity and, more importantly, would support about  
6 4,000 jobs a year during the five years of construction.  
7 As was mentioned earlier we all know how important the  
8 creation of jobs is in today's environment.

9 The development or the replacement of the  
10 Gerald Desmond Bridge is very crucial to ensure that the  
11 ports of Southern California continue to be the market  
12 leader in international trade here in the United States.

13 In my capacity as the president of the Foreign  
14 Trade Association, I implore you to approve the  
15 replacement of the Gerald Desmond Bridge as we, the FTA  
16 members, believe it's the right thing to do for the  
17 Southern California community not only for today, but  
18 for the many years to come. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you very much.

20 SECRETARY: Tom Moxley.

21 MR. MOXLEY: Mr. President and Board  
22 Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity to speak.  
23 My name is Tom Moxley, and I'm president of the L.A./  
24 Orange County Building and Construction Trades Council.

25 We have supported the replacement bridge since

1 its concept originally, and I talked to Mr. Steinke  
2 originally in 2000, and it was just an idea. My dad  
3 worked on building the current Gerald Desmond Bridge.  
4 It was opened when I graduated from high school, so you  
5 can see how long ago that was.

6 And we stand with our craft members -- some of  
7 them are here to speak -- in support of this resolution  
8 of approval. The jobs are needed, so we are standing in  
9 approval with the port when we had a hundred and ten  
10 percent employment. Now we have 40 percent to  
11 45 percent unemployment. We are ready to build this job  
12 with quality, with trained, professional, skilled  
13 workers, and we look forward to it. We just support the  
14 recommendations as presented in the bullet points.  
15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you very much.

17 SECRETARY: Tom Faavae.

18 MR. FAVAE: Good afternoon, President Sramek,  
19 Fellow Commissioners and staff. My name is  
20 Thomas Faavae. I represent IBEW electrical workers in  
21 local 11 in the Los Angeles area.

22 I just would like to say that I know on the  
23 first of two public meetings that we had a really strong  
24 turnout from the trades and fellow community members  
25 that lived in the city of Long Beach, and I don't think

1 President Sramek and Mr. Cordero and Dr. Walter there,  
2 and we talked a little bit about the project.

3 But you know, it's something that's really  
4 needed over here in the Port of Long Beach and in the  
5 city of Long Beach that we all can share that a new  
6 bridge that's going to be built, that we all have our  
7 hands on it. And normally, that, you know, especially  
8 when it comes to lighting energy efficiency, that it's  
9 going to be the best energy efficiency that's going to  
10 be put on that bridge. And we would like to be a part  
11 of it.

12 Second, I just wanted to mention that under  
13 federal project labor agreements President Obama lifted  
14 the restrictions under the federal PLAs that there's a  
15 certain threshold from \$25 million and over, that  
16 project labor agreements can be negotiated under federal  
17 construction projects. So I suggest that you keep that  
18 in mind. But I would also like to add that maybe we can  
19 piggyback a project labor agreement on top of the Middle  
20 Harbor development so we can see good local hire within  
21 the community, and I know that's what the port's goal is  
22 and the city's goal. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Tommy.

24 Next.

25 SECRETARY: Joel Thurwachter.

1           MR. THURWACHTER: Good afternoon,  
2           Commissioners. My name is Joel Thurwachter. I'm a  
3           business representative for the International Union of  
4           Operating Engineers, Local 12. I represent operating  
5           engineers that live and work in the harbor and the  
6           surrounding area. Local 12 supports the certification  
7           of the Final EIR and approval of the project. Thank  
8           you.

9           COMMISSIONER WISE: Thank you.

10          Next.

11          SECRETARY: Jessica Duboff.

12          MS. DUBOFF: Good afternoon. My name is  
13          Jessica Duboff, and I'm representing the Los Angeles  
14          Area Chamber of Commerce.

15                 On behalf of the members and their employees,  
16          I'm here to support certification of the Final EIR for  
17          the Gerald Desmond Bridge, an investment which we  
18          believe is essential to the trade in California and the  
19          nation. Built in the '60s, the bridge was not designed  
20          to handle traffic volume that it is currently serving.  
21          Nearly 15 percent of all goods entering this country  
22          pass over this bridge. Couple that with the commuter  
23          traffic that comprises 75 percent of the bridge's use,  
24          and you have a structure that is rapidly deteriorating,  
25          incapable of handling the needs of a twenty-first

1 century port complex.

2 The proposed new span will be built to ease  
3 traffic flow and at a height that would accommodate a  
4 new generation of larger, cleaner freight ships while  
5 creating much needed jobs. As port competition  
6 increases in the next year, it is essential that we  
7 invest in our aging infrastructure. This bridge is one  
8 of the country's most vital trade routes providing goods  
9 to every single part of the nation. The ports are the  
10 backbone of our regional economy. Replacing the Gerald  
11 Desmond Bridge is a vital step in maintaining our  
12 competitive edge. Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER WISE: Thank you.

14 Next.

15 SECRETARY: Michelle Grubbs.

16 MS. GRUBBS: Good afternoon. The Pacific  
17 Merchants Shipping Association which represents ocean  
18 carriers and marine terminal operators make up the vast  
19 majority of tenants and customers at the Port of Long  
20 Beach. We strongly support the replacement of the  
21 Gerald Desmond Bridge, and we respectfully urge a "yes"  
22 vote by all the commissioners. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER WISE: Thanks.

24 Next.

25 SECRETARY: Michael Larison.



1 MR. LARISON: Thank you, President Sramek. Oh,  
2 I guess he's not here anymore.

3 COMMISSIONER WISE: He'll be right back here.

4 MR. LARISON: Thank you, Commissioners. As  
5 another subset of the representatives in the harbor, I'm  
6 here to represent the heavy marine construction industry  
7 here in L.A./Long Beach. I have been vitally involved  
8 since the inception in 2002 for this bridge particularly  
9 on the north alignment. It comes real near and dear to  
10 my heart. Some of the privately held property that  
11 would be on that side -- I'm behind it.

12 Looking very much forward to getting this  
13 started, and I didn't realize until today that these  
14 letters that came in apparently from the NRDC on the 5th  
15 and then again today -- I don't think in my own  
16 estimation see any particular difference in the overall  
17 findings of approval of the Final EIR. And I recommend  
18 and I'm fully behind the approval of the Final EIR  
19 today. Thanks.

20 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you very much.

21 SECRETARY: John Schafer.

22 MR. SCHAFER: Good afternoon. My name is  
23 John Schafer. I'm from Pile Drivers Local 2375,  
24 Wilmington, California. It is part of the Southwest  
25 Regional Council of Carpenters. And like Mr. Moxley, my

1 father also worked on the original Gerald Desmond  
2 Bridge. I am a third generation pile driver. We also  
3 worked in the breakwater and a lot of other things.

4 I'm going to be representing the workers who  
5 will do the foundation work, the bridge carpenters and  
6 the divers on these projects. It's really, really  
7 important to our community. We're based in Wilmington,  
8 and we have been for about 67 years, and we were in  
9 Centerville before that. And many people don't know,  
10 but a lot of our members do major infrastructure  
11 projects throughout Southern California. And while  
12 they're essentially -- they're essential for the future  
13 of our community in designing trade, mobility, and so  
14 forth, there just hasn't been that many projects. And  
15 what really makes a difference in our member's life is  
16 having a major project close to home. We all have parts  
17 of families and so forth and having your parent close to  
18 home to be made available to do a job and to have  
19 something that they're proud of. My father showed me  
20 when I, you know, was going to school and so forth.  
21 This can make a really strong impact on the community.

22 I just want to also add as far as environmental  
23 and a lot of concerns. These are jobs with medical  
24 benefits and decent medical benefits. People can come  
25 out. In the community we have an open orientation here

1 in Wilmington -- that's down in Wilmington that has  
2 about 40 people every month looking for work. Once they  
3 get 600 hours, they get medical, dental, and vision for  
4 them and their family. And that can make an immediate  
5 difference. Starting off at \$15 an hour with no  
6 experience whatsoever, having a project labor agreement  
7 or having a local hiring goal. You can imagine what  
8 kind of an immediate impact that can have on this  
9 community, especially at these times.

10 So that's why I urge as soon as possible the  
11 approval of this project and to ask you to move forward.  
12 Thank you very much.

13 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

14 Next.

15 SECRETARY: Dan Hoffman.

16 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Oh, that was Dan Hoffman?  
17 Okay, Mr. Hoffman now. We'll get it straight.

18 MR. HOFFMAN: Good afternoon. My name is  
19 Dan Hoffman. I'm the executive director for the  
20 Wilmington Chamber of Commerce, and the Wilmington  
21 Chamber of Commerce supports the replacement of the  
22 Gerald Desmond Bridge for the following reasons. First  
23 and foremost is safety, and it's obvious, not  
24 speculative, the bridge is falling down.

25 Secondly, for the economy. It's going to

1 produce approximately 4,000 new jobs which will go for  
2 five years, and we all know the associated benefits with  
3 the improvements in the economy because of those jobs.

4 Thirdly is the environment. And because of the  
5 new grade and the fact that traffic will be able to flow  
6 more smoothly, there will be less pollution when the new  
7 bridge is completed, but also because of the  
8 competitiveness. We all know that there's competition  
9 in today's marketplace. We all have to put our best  
10 foot forward in order to get the business that we want.  
11 If we can move goods more efficiently, more quickly,  
12 then we will keep our business here, and if we can  
13 handle larger ships, we will keep our business here. If  
14 we can't do that, we have seen that it is possible for  
15 business to take other routes. So we urge your support  
16 on the Final EIR, and I thank you very much for your  
17 time.

18 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Hoffman.

19 Next.

20 SECRETARY: Rich Dines.

21 MR. DINES: Thank you, President Sramek and  
22 members of the Board of Harbor Commissioners. My name  
23 is Rich Dines. I'm the president of the Southern  
24 California District Council of the International  
25 Longshore and Warehouse Union.

1           The Port of Long Beach has a long history of  
2 helping the city of Long Beach and its residents. This  
3 project highlights the port's efforts to help stimulate  
4 the local economy. While every one of us will benefit  
5 from replacing the Gerald Desmond Bridge, the project  
6 will provide a lifeline for some of those in most need  
7 of economic relief.

8           In the short term the construction of the new  
9 bridge will create thousands of living-wage, local jobs  
10 and keep many families from filing bankruptcy and others  
11 to avoid foreclosures. It will give workers a sense of  
12 pride and dignity, taking away the despair and  
13 frustration they suffer today. In the long term this  
14 improvement project will pay for itself many times over  
15 in jobs created throughout the supply chain.

16           Since the Great Depression, nothing has  
17 stimulated our nation's economy more than the building  
18 of infrastructure. Replacing the Gerald Desmond Bridge  
19 is the right project at the right time for the right  
20 reasons.

21           Finally, I want to recognize the port staff for  
22 all their hard work in bringing the Final EIR here  
23 today. Their team effort is something we should all be  
24 proud of, and I want to personally thank them and hope  
25 they will receive the credit they have earned. Thank

1 you for the opportunity to speak today.

2 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thanks, Rich.

3 Okay. Next.

4 SECRETARY: Elizabeth Warren.

5 MS. WARREN: Good afternoon. My name is  
6 Elizabeth Warren. I'm the executive director of Future  
7 Ports, and I want to thank you, President Sramek,  
8 Commissioners, and port staff for the opportunity to  
9 speak this afternoon. We applaud the port's efforts on  
10 this document and also echo our sentiment to the port  
11 staff. We are all eager to move forward to the  
12 construction process.

13 Finally there's a lot of folks here today that  
14 are going to speak, so I'm going to keep my comments  
15 very brief and just to say we are very pleased with the  
16 port staff on this work on the EIR and find no  
17 additional comments. Therefore, on behalf of Future  
18 Ports and its members, I am pleased to express our  
19 support for the final EIR for the Gerald Desmond Bridge,  
20 and we urge your approval of the resolution today. And  
21 thank you again for this opportunity.

22 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Great. Thanks, Ms. Warren.

23 Next.

24 SECRETARY: Ken Fredrickson.

25 MR. FREDRICKSON: Thank you, Commissioners. I

1 appreciate this opportunity to speak. Ken Fredrickson.  
2 I'm a San Pedro resident and frequent bridge user.

3 As Mr. Cameron has indicated, this has been a  
4 long time in coming. I've been following the  
5 development of this EIR for many, many years. I think  
6 it is a very thorough document. I think it reflects the  
7 concerns of the community and make sure that the job  
8 that goes forward reflects not only for the ports but  
9 Long Beach and the community. I think it definitely is  
10 a continuing progress with your very successful attempts  
11 to improve the air, improve the quality of life in the  
12 area.

13 As we see more cargo move forward, as we see  
14 the port continue to grow, it's very important that this  
15 bridge is coming so that we can move transfer, can move  
16 containers more effectively and more efficiently, and  
17 continue to make this a great place to live and work.  
18 So I encourage the approval of this EIR. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Fredrickson.  
20 Next.

21 SECRETARY: Tracy Rafter.

22 MS. RAFTER: Thank you, Commissioners, for  
23 allowing our comment. I'm Tracy Rafter, and I'm the CEO  
24 of the L.A. County Business Federation, or BusFed for  
25 short. We are a grass roots alliance of all the top

1 business associations throughout the county. We have  
2 organized about 70 of the top business groups in this  
3 region. You'll recognize L.A., the Long Beach --  
4 Jessica was here -- the Long Beach Chamber, San Pedro  
5 Chamber, Wilmington Chamber. Dan Hoffman was here.  
6 Lakewood Chamber, the Regional Hispanic Chamber, and  
7 then the trade associations such as the car dealers, the  
8 architects, the Realtors, the restaurant owners, the  
9 building owners, and the petroleum association. All are  
10 a sampling of the members that have come together in the  
11 BusFed.

12 When we invited Dr. Kanter in to give us an  
13 analysis and review of the bridge project, of which he  
14 was kind enough to do so and spent quite a bit of time  
15 because we had a lot of questions and we vetted the  
16 issue, our board came to the conclusion that the need  
17 for the replacement is readily apparent.

18 About 15 percent of the nation's imports need  
19 to cross the bridge. The traffic is becoming  
20 increasingly and significantly and frustratingly  
21 clogged. The bridge clearly needs improvements.  
22 Protective netting is needed to catch pieces of concrete  
23 that fall from the deteriorating bridge. There are no  
24 safety lanes for emergency vehicles. And competition is  
25 heating up. Improvements are urgently needed to ensure



1 the port remains competitive in an increasingly fierce  
2 global trading market that will soon include an expanded  
3 Panama Canal.

4 Replacement will help ensure the safety of  
5 commuters and truck drivers. It will generate thousands  
6 of well-paying construction jobs as we've heard from all  
7 the trades that are speaking today. In the near term in  
8 a time of desperate economic need, it will help protect  
9 Southern California's important role as the nation's  
10 second busiest seaport, providing more than 315,000  
11 high-quality regional jobs and moving more than 100  
12 billion in goods in a year.

13 The Port of Long Beach's move to replace the  
14 bridge is backed by a successful track record and  
15 continuing commitment to responsible economic and  
16 environmental stewardship. We strongly, wholeheartedly  
17 recommend your support and adoption of the resolution  
18 today. Thank you very much.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Ms. Rafter.

20 Okay. Next.

21 SECRETARY: Adrian Martinez.

22 MR. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, members of the  
23 Harbor Commission. My name is Adrian Martinez, and I'm  
24 here on behalf of the Natural Resources Defense Council.  
25 I'm -- I guess, as you all are aware, we submitted two

1 comment letters, and I think Rick provided some  
2 responses to those. I just want to focus on two issues  
3 and just clarify a couple points.

4 First, I'd like to talk a little bit about the  
5 community mitigation grant programs. I think perhaps  
6 the comments were misinterpreted, I think. We are very  
7 happy that the progress on the school-related mitigation  
8 grant program have proceeded to date. I think all the  
9 members on the selection committee including staff need  
10 to be applauded for movement on that program. It's a  
11 very important program as we try to move forward with  
12 port operations and reduce air quality. But in the  
13 meantime children and other people are still breathing  
14 polluted air.

15 I think the point we want to make sure is that  
16 if infrastructure expansion project moves forward, there  
17 is a continued commitment to expeditiously move forward  
18 on mitigations programs that are associated with it and  
19 that they don't get delayed unduly. I think the senior  
20 and health care facility program and the greenhouse gas  
21 mitigation programs -- we'd encourage that they be --  
22 that they be expeditiously implemented because those  
23 dollars should be spent right now. The impacts are  
24 there now, and also there's no reason that there  
25 shouldn't be job creation with mitigation programs.

1 Every dollar spent on mitigation programs also creates  
2 jobs that are important.

3 The second issue I want to address is the zero  
4 emission container movement system, and I was here for  
5 part of the board meeting, and I reviewed it again  
6 online, and I reviewed the Port of L.A.'s board meeting.  
7 I think it's key moving forward that any project that  
8 doesn't move forward on a zero emission container system  
9 or some type of zero emission system be tied with the  
10 traditional infrastructure projects that have been in  
11 the queue for a long time. We want to make sure that  
12 the continued progress is moving forward. Our hope is  
13 that these projects will move forward, and we really  
14 took it to heart what the Commission -- what both  
15 Commissions said in the 2006 Clean Air Action Plan when  
16 they said we need to start within the next five years;  
17 otherwise we would be 20 years off over and over again.  
18 With that, I think our comments are pretty  
19 self-explanatory. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Great. Thank you,  
21 Mr. Martinez. And we're trying. Thank you.

22 Next.

23 SECRETARY: Isella Ramirez.

24 MS. RAMIREZ: Good afternoon. My name is  
25 Isella Ramirez. I'm here with Southeast Communities for

1 Environmental Justice. We are a community-based  
2 organization, and we seek to reduce the levels of toxic  
3 air pollution in our community in Southeast Los Angeles.  
4 And today I'm here to express our disappointment with a  
5 couple of parts on this EIR and EA in question. I echo  
6 the comments submitted by NRDC and wanted to make a  
7 couple of more detailed points.

8 First, this EIR does not detail how the  
9 project, you know, the particular focus on the bridge's  
10 height increase will negatively impact air quality. And  
11 while the EIR argues that there isn't a need to detail  
12 on the effects, additional effects of trucks, trains,  
13 ships, and cargo-handling equipment because it claims  
14 that these are speculative, we know that the in-port  
15 growth productions for the port complex are very present  
16 not only because of the several pending infrastructure  
17 expansion projects like the 710 freeway and SR47, so on  
18 and so forth, but then also just from the comments that  
19 you heard from the L.A. Chamber of Commerce, the FTA,  
20 and several other speakers that talked about this bridge  
21 as an important gateway for goods movement. And so by  
22 not detailing the effects of future capacity growth on  
23 the bridge and the surrounding communities, we're not  
24 getting enough accurate information regarding this  
25 costly project.

1           Secondly, we are astonished that the EIR does  
2 not consider what impacts the project would have on the  
3 I-710 freeway. This bridge ends at the mouth of the 710  
4 freeway which we all know carries an estimated 47,000  
5 trucks every single day. And so to pretend that any  
6 changes or expansion to this bridge wouldn't impact the  
7 710 freeway is simply irresponsible.

8           Finally, the EIR makes opposing claims when it  
9 comes to the project's pollution impacts. On the one  
10 hand it claims that the project -- it will spread  
11 pollution, but then it talks about how only the  
12 immediate vicinity will be impacted. And so given the  
13 confusing and contradictory information on parts of the  
14 EIR, I urge the Commission to send back staff and  
15 entertain those two things regarding all impacts of this  
16 project. Thank you.

17           CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Ms. Ramirez.  
18           Next.

19           SECRETARY: Jesse Marquez.

20           MR. MARQUEZ: President and Commissioners,  
21 thank you very much for the opportunity. My name is  
22 Jesse Marquez. I'll be speaking as the executive  
23 director of the Coalition for a Safe Environment. I'm  
24 also speaking as a private resident of Wilmington, and  
25 also on behalf of Gale Avenue Homeowners Association who

1 cannot make it because they're all working today.

2 We ask that you not approve the EIR on the  
3 project as proposed. We do support the building and  
4 replacement of a new bridge. We do support the creation  
5 of a thousand temporary jobs that would be as a result  
6 of this project. What we oppose is how it is being  
7 proposed to the public. There is a public injustice.  
8 There is a taxpayer injustice, an environmental  
9 community injustice about to take place and borderline  
10 fraud as far as we're concerned. And that is what was  
11 not disclosed to the public.

12 In fact, only two lines in the EIR really  
13 address this issue out of the thousand-page document,  
14 and that is, Who is the owner of the bridge? The bridge  
15 is owned by the Port of Long Beach and the City of Long  
16 Beach. And it was paid 100 percent by the Port of Long  
17 Beach from its revenues of the tenants. What we believe  
18 is the fraudulent part to take place now is that the  
19 port and its tenants do not want to contribute to this  
20 bridge, and they're now volunteering it to be  
21 transferred to Caltrans.

22 So what happens in this transfer to Caltrans  
23 which is now the second line that we object to is that  
24 they're proposing to use local funds, regional funds,  
25 state funds, and federal funds to pay for it. So

1 instead of the port and its tenants paying 100 percent  
2 for it, now 80 to 90 percent of it is going to be dumped  
3 onto the public to pay for, which means that about out  
4 of 983 million, about 800 to 900 million is going to be  
5 paid by the public, not the port and its tenants who are  
6 going to be the predominant user of the bridge.

7           And even though you gave the impression that so  
8 much percentage is going to be by the trucks and the  
9 rest by the public, you should have also divided that  
10 public up a little bit so that it -- the port workers  
11 and contractors -- so that the public is actually  
12 representing about less than 30 percent of the current  
13 and future usage of it. But nonetheless, even if the  
14 funds we're referring to getting our transportation  
15 funds and infrastructure funds, you are now depriving  
16 the public of using those funds for other local  
17 infrastructure and transportation needs.

18           And that is one of the assessments that we have  
19 asked for, because again, it's going to have a negative  
20 effect on the environmental justice community because  
21 monies are coming from taxes predominantly that go into  
22 those funds. And environmental justice community and  
23 also low-income communities, whereas the cost of taxes  
24 means that we pay a higher percentage of our income  
25 compared to other non-EJ communities. Therefore, there

1 should have been a socioeconomic study and analysis  
2 done.

3 We had also asked at the previous meeting, and  
4 at every previous Port of Los Angeles meeting for every  
5 project, that there be a 90-day public comment period.  
6 Because of the depth of information of these documents,  
7 we did not have enough time to provide public comment.  
8 I could have written four times as much more public  
9 comment had we had the time. And again, we ask you for  
10 extension.

11 I did submit written comments that addresses  
12 these issues, and we ask that you not approve the  
13 project and that you reissue the document to include the  
14 things that we have asked and pointed out to you. Thank  
15 you.

16 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Mr. Marquez.

17 Is there any others? Is there anybody else who  
18 wants to make comments here? Thank you. Just invite  
19 you up. How many are there? Two?

20 MR. SANDIDGE: I'm sorry. I didn't see any  
21 sign-up sheet going around. But my name is Clay  
22 Sandidge up here today representing three hats. The  
23 first one is Future Ports, and I'm the current president  
24 of Future Ports. I don't want to elaborate on what  
25 Elizabeth Warren stated earlier, but we are absolutely



1 in favor of this EIR moving forward and this bridge  
2 moving forward.

3 Secondly, I want to take that hat off and put  
4 on my Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce hat  
5 where I'm past president and current board member, and I  
6 want to make sure we go on record as supporting this EIR  
7 document and want to thank the Commission for their hard  
8 work here and certainly the staff for the tremendous  
9 effort that they put into it.

10 And thirdly and probably most important,  
11 putting on the Sandidge hat. Projects like this  
12 absolutely support me and my family and put bread on my  
13 table. I like seeing projects that I'm going to be  
14 involved with. If I'm going to pay taxes to help that  
15 project go through, and I see some return on my  
16 investment, I'm all for it. And I strongly urge you,  
17 the Commission, to approve this project. And thank you  
18 all very much for your time.

19 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you for your comments.

20 Next.

21 MS. WICKS: Hi, I'm Gabrielle Wicks, a resident  
22 of the city of Long Beach. I'd like to echo the  
23 questions and concerns of both Jesse Marquez and Adrian  
24 Martinez. I want to make sure that we get a good  
25 complete EIR because if there's any facts that haven't

1 been taken into account, the port will lose in a  
2 lawsuit, just as the Port of L.A. did recently --  
3 recently, a couple of years ago. They lost a really,  
4 really large lawsuit because they had a less than  
5 complete EIR and had -- and you know, we've also had  
6 Riverside say they're going to sue Port of Long Beach  
7 because they weren't taken into consideration for the  
8 Middle Harbor expansion. Let's be sure to get this  
9 right because of legal fees that could be very  
10 expensive.

11           Also I'm concerned about using tax dollars to  
12 subsidize goods movement. This port is very big; it's  
13 not fledgling, so we need to not transfer ownership of  
14 the Gerald Desmond Bridge to Caltrans, even if they are  
15 willing to accept it because I think that this -- the  
16 port needs to pay for its own goods movement and not  
17 rely on tax dollars that are desperately needed around  
18 here for other projects. If the money is siphoned off  
19 from all the other local projects, the Caltrans budget  
20 for this, then that's going to cut the other jobs that  
21 these guys need. They're talking about the jobs to  
22 build our infrastructure, so we need to invest in our  
23 infrastructure.

24           So please keep the bridge and keep it under  
25 your ownership the way it has been since the '60s so

1 that we can have the money to do all the other  
2 infrastructure projects we need because, as you all  
3 know, we need grade separation for safety, for the  
4 trains we need a lot of our freeways and the bridges to  
5 be replaced and maintained. So let's not -- let's not  
6 transfer ownership of this bridge to Caltrans. We need  
7 to have the port take care of its own structures. Thank  
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Ms. Wicks.

10 Next.

11 MS. JONES: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

12 Thank you for this opportunity. My name is  
13 Stacey Jones, and I'm a resident of San Pedro, and I  
14 drive over the bridge twice a day to work here in the  
15 city of Long Beach as part of the general motoring  
16 public.

17 And I'm here today to support this project and  
18 urge you to vote yes on the resolution developed by port  
19 staff on the basis of the safety enhancement that this  
20 project will provide. The proposed additional lanes,  
21 the new shoulders, and the flattening of the slopes, the  
22 grades along the bridge, will not only provide  
23 additional capacity, but it will provide for  
24 enhancements for the general motoring public such as  
25 myself as well as the commercial trucks, and provide for

1 a higher level of capacity.

2 The project as proposed will also provide for a  
3 bridge that will be built with new seismic standards and  
4 meet those standards. It will also provide for a  
5 hundred-year life, and it will also address the current  
6 poor deficiency rating that was discussed earlier as 43,  
7 making it again a much safer structure, and I suspect  
8 will reduce your short overall life cycle cost for this  
9 bridge over the next hundred years.

10 And lastly, it will provide for safe navigation  
11 under this bridge and having foresight into looking into  
12 the life of this bridge and assurance that will address  
13 a transit under the bridge and address the vertical  
14 clearance. As our country's infrastructure continues to  
15 degrade, this project will be a testament to the  
16 commitment of this port in the infrastructure of our  
17 country. It will also be a commitment to the continued  
18 success of this port, a commitment to jobs, not only  
19 created by the construction of this bridge, but also  
20 continuing jobs being created by the operation, and also  
21 it is a commitment to the continued economic growth of  
22 this region and our nation. The bridge is old; it is  
23 beyond its useful life. And thus, I strongly urge its  
24 replacement. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Great. Thank you for your

1 comments.

2 Real quickly, Mr. Cameron or Mr. Kanter,  
3 Dr. Kanter, isn't it about 70 or 75 percent of the  
4 traffic over the bridge commuter?

5 DR. KANTER: That's absolutely correct.

6 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: That's what I thought. It's  
7 mostly commuter traffic? Thank you for your comments.

8 Okay. Sorry. Next.

9 MR. PADILLO: Good afternoon, Commissioners,  
10 staff and the community here of Long Beach. I'm your  
11 friendly neighbor here from Carson, Rich Padillo, and  
12 also with the Coalition for a Safe Environment. I, too,  
13 echo what some of my colleagues and some of my friends  
14 have said from the EJ community earlier, but  
15 specifically I think as Commissioner Cordero said  
16 succinctly earlier, we need a change order for the  
17 mitigation grants, and I would say to submit to you  
18 maybe triple what you have proposed here today would be  
19 more in line for the next hundred years, if you will,  
20 and if not, even more than that because our schools, our  
21 seniors, and specifically all of our health issues out  
22 there need to be addressed now.

23 You are the authority as it's said earlier on  
24 your charter authority -- I think Commissioner said 1207  
25 or thereabouts; I might be wrong -- that's a good point.

1 You have the authority. We are your constituents. We  
2 are here to make sure you use your authority in that  
3 proper manner. And I submit to you on that point that  
4 we as community would be very happy, and I think we  
5 would be very well said if Long Beach leads for the  
6 next -- this twenty-first century how great you're  
7 doing. And today all this, you know, the moneys that  
8 you gave to the different groups that are doing great  
9 jobs in our community at large. We, too, would like to  
10 see that get extended in mitigation grants, so please,  
11 let's discuss that as we do today in our -- you know, in  
12 your deliberations.

13 Secondly, I would propose to you that we  
14 postpone this, as my colleague said, because we are in  
15 favor of the bridge. We need it; we love it. We see  
16 that vision, but we have to be cognizant and take the  
17 time that you've taken so far and not rush. Give the 90  
18 days that was needed instead of 45. NRDC -- read their  
19 letter, so there's no lawsuit, God forbid. But if there  
20 is, it's just because we didn't take a little more time  
21 to sit down and mitigate, you know, come to an amiable  
22 agreement here. And most of yous [sic] could probably  
23 speak the legal jargon better than I can, would agree  
24 that sometimes a couple meeting of the minds will get a  
25 lot more done than just the go ahead and go with staff's

1 report, as you will. You have that authority to change  
2 to give a little more time, whatever time you would  
3 give, we would appreciate it.

4 And next, the jobs. As you heard, we are in  
5 favor of PLAs. I'm a union man all my life. My mom  
6 said, you're a union man till the end. You'll always be  
7 a union man, and that's the way I stand. So you know  
8 where I'm coming from. I believe we can come to a  
9 succinct movement with the building councils and with  
10 all the businesses to get a happy medium with those  
11 4,000 jobs, but make sure that our folks here are local  
12 hires that we said earlier are taken care of. I know  
13 they will be.

14 And if I could have a couple more minutes,  
15 there's a couple points I'd like to make.

16 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Summarize.

17 MR. PADILLO: Okay. You know, we believe,  
18 Commissioners, that, you know, that you have to realize  
19 on the 710 freeway, it impacts Carson. All my neighbors  
20 in Old Dominguez and all my friends over here in Carson  
21 asked me to come out and please -- the association, the  
22 homeowners associations -- to have you realize that that  
23 Desmond bridge is great, but it's going to bring more  
24 traffic to us, and that's why we need to have  
25 demonstration projects like you talked about the zero

1 emissions, maglev, and stuff that will help our  
2 environment and Mother Earth.

3 So I submit to you, please, and I ask you very  
4 -- as a man here with a family with seven children, to,  
5 you know, postpone this, and give yourself a little more  
6 time and deliberations. You've heard our comments  
7 today. Work with us, and we'll work with you. Thank  
8 you very much for your consideration, and God bless you  
9 and Long Beach.

10 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you for your comments.

11 Okay. What I'd like to do is see if  
12 Mr. Cameron or Dr. Kanter would like to address any of  
13 the comments that were made first, and then we'll go to  
14 the Commissioners.

15 MR. CAMERON: Commissioners, there's no one  
16 else, right, is that it? Okay. I do.

17 First and foremost, one of the big things I  
18 heard in the last few speakers, I think it's important  
19 for everybody to reminded of, is one, the Green Port  
20 policy; two, the Clean Air Action Plan. The last four  
21 years of commitment by this Board to do things outside  
22 of the context of CEQA or any type of redevelopment.  
23 The clean truck program comes to mind. Cold ironing  
24 comes to mind. ESR incentive programs come to mind.  
25 Fuel incentives come to mind. Technology development,



1 pushing technology development comes to mind.

2 Those are all items and investments that go  
3 well beyond this project and any other future project.  
4 The Clean Air Action Plan and the updated Clean Air  
5 Action Plan clearly lays out the long-term goals through  
6 the San Pedro Bay watch standard. Take this project out  
7 of that -- we still achieve overall benefits for the  
8 local communities we impact as well as the region. And  
9 it's clearly stated.

10 So as relates back to the mitigation programs,  
11 once again, these are not new comments that you've heard  
12 related to the mitigation program, and we have clearly  
13 stated the methodology, the objectives of those  
14 programs, as well as the contribution of this project to  
15 those programs. That's one.

16 I'd also like to remind the Board when it comes  
17 to larger ships in the Clean Air Action Plan and the  
18 update, we clearly understand the challenges. We also  
19 know that certain things have taken place in terms of  
20 international regulations and federal regulations that  
21 recently have come out for cleaner ships, larger ships.  
22 We supported that in line with other stakeholders such  
23 as the AQMD as well as EPA.

24 From the international level I know this board  
25 has, I believe, has had a resolution in support of IMO

1 and X6 which clearly states clean vessels, standards for  
2 clean vessels and addresses a lot of these items. That  
3 once again goes back to this point about larger ships  
4 crossing this bridge and my statements earlier about the  
5 analysis. These are not new comments. We clearly  
6 identified -- these comments are not new. They were  
7 handed to us during the comment period. They were  
8 reflected in our response to comments in the final  
9 document, and I wanted to add clarification to the  
10 Board.

11           There was the mention of the I-710 in the  
12 analysis, and I would refer the commenters as it relates  
13 to the I-710 and in looking at the bridge, the bridge is  
14 just that. It is an infrastructure project that's part  
15 of a system, a state system: The SR47, connection to  
16 the I-710. Guess what the connector is? It's the  
17 bridge.

18           This has already been designated by the state.  
19 This is not new. We may have ownership of it, but it  
20 falls in a state system, just as we as a port are part  
21 of a state port system. That can be identified actually  
22 in how we respond to that comment and particularly the  
23 analysis of the bridge-related traffic and air quality  
24 in NRDC-2, part of the final response to comments. So I  
25 want to make note of those.

1           I think the President also -- I was going to  
2 add this, but I am going to add it again. This is not a  
3 port drayage bridge. It's part of a system. 75 percent  
4 of the traffic is commuter. I know growth -- we've done  
5 our growth projections for cargo, part of our analysis  
6 in this document. We know that population is going to  
7 grow. We have done a socioeconomic analysis. We have  
8 an EJ analysis that's part of this document, a community  
9 impact analysis that's part of this document. And that  
10 takes into consideration future growth. That's all part  
11 of the underlying analysis, so once again I want to make  
12 note of that.

13           Lastly, the response to the letters from NRDC,  
14 that the board has will be made to the public as well as  
15 to the NRDC, and we've made note of the receipt of the  
16 August 9th letter. And then I'd also like to put into  
17 the record the resumés of the consultants who have  
18 prepared the environmental analysis to the Board.

19           And before the Board has -- and before I turn  
20 it back over to the Board, I would like to show my  
21 appreciation to executive management, my boss,  
22 Dr. Kanter, more importantly staff who has really  
23 focused in on this. This is not a six-month type of a  
24 project where we have not been transparent and gone  
25 through multiple meetings and had this dialogue on the

1 analysis within the bridge and the need for the bridge  
2 replacement.

3 Staff -- Stacey Crouch has been project  
4 manager. She's done an outstanding job. She's been the  
5 original project manager on this, and she's done a  
6 really good job with all the changes and all the moving  
7 parts associated with this to get it to this point. I  
8 think it follows the Green Port Policy; it follows the  
9 commitments we've made in moving forward with the  
10 environmental documentation.

11 Thomas Jelenic -- he's done a great job of  
12 assisting her and getting this completed as well as her  
13 manager in addition to many divisions. This has been a  
14 team effort; the city attorney's office with  
15 Barbara McTigue. This is not a one-person show; this is  
16 a team effort. And I believe we followed the process  
17 that is under our authority, and we had a very clear,  
18 concise, and accurate analysis of the replacement of the  
19 Gerald Desmond Bridge. With that, I'll conclude.

20 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you.

21 Dr. Kanter.

22 DR. KANTER: Mr. President, just let me ask  
23 Eric Shen to just clarify with regard to the origin of  
24 funds that will be used to pay for this bridge, just for  
25 clarity sake in terms of taxpayer and port funds and so

1 on. Go ahead.

2 MR. SHEN: Thank you. Eric Shen, director of  
3 transportation planning. Some comments made earlier  
4 regarding where the money will be used to fund this  
5 project -- let me just clarify with the following:  
6 Number one, the project -- the bridge itself has been  
7 included as part of the national highway system. In the  
8 safety group the federal transportation authorization a  
9 few years back -- the replacement project was also  
10 designated as a project with national significance.

11 With those designations, the port was able to  
12 secure up to about a hundred million dollars from the  
13 safety group, and additionally the project is also  
14 programmed for Proposition 1B trade corridor improvement  
15 funds for up to \$300 million. So clearly just by the  
16 traffic volume that the bridge carries, about 75 percent  
17 of the traffic volume is related to commuters.

18 This project really is a regional bridge that  
19 will become -- will be funded through, not only federal,  
20 but state and also Los Angeles County different fund  
21 sources to get this project built. So the reference  
22 made earlier regarding private citizens may contribute  
23 to this fund -- it's not exactly accurate. In fact,  
24 it's contributed through all of us through our fuel tax,  
25 and that goes to federal and the state and the

1 eventually it is reappropriated -- reapportioned back to  
2 this project because of its significance to this  
3 country.

4 Thanks.

5 DR. KANTER: Thank you, Mr. Shen.

6 That's it, Mr. President, back to the Board.

7 (Simultaneous talking.)

8 MR. JELENIC: Just one other thing, there has  
9 been some questions about how bridge height in the  
10 future might accommodate larger vessels and what that  
11 might mean. I think it's important to remember that  
12 larger vessels for the same amount of cargo generally  
13 will mean less emissions in the future because we get to  
14 take advantage of a couple of things. One is newer  
15 ships generally mean cleaner ships, and newer ships take  
16 advantage of the economies of scales. We've seen with  
17 the work that we've done in the emissions inventory that  
18 I presented to this Board several years in a row that  
19 when we see cargo -- when cargo rises, we see emissions  
20 per TEU actually decline. And we saw in 2009 -- when  
21 cargo declines, we saw emissions per TEU rise. And  
22 that's where we're taking advantage of the economy of  
23 scale, so simply the biggest ships do not simply mean  
24 larger -- more emissions. It's based on through-put of  
25 efficiencies and how clean those vessels are, so I

1 wanted to state that for the record. Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Great. Thank you. Okay.  
3 Before it goes to the Commissioners, I'd like to just  
4 thank the staff, Dr. Kanter, Mr. Cameron, your entire  
5 staff. Everybody's worked on this because I know this  
6 has been a multiyear project, every aspect of it. So I  
7 do want to thank you before we go on.

8 Do you have some more comments?

9 Okay. Commissioners, who would like to start?  
10 (Simultaneous talking.)

11 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Look, first of all, I'd  
12 like to thank everyone that came this afternoon. I  
13 think you need to realize that what you have to say --  
14 it's important to all of us. It is our responsibility  
15 as commissioners to listen to you, and we try to listen  
16 to all of you, and I think that you realize as you come  
17 before us, we don't argue with you in any way. If we  
18 ask questions, it's for clarification. And I think this  
19 is just an example of a democratic society. We are  
20 supposed to listen, and we do. And we consider your  
21 comments, and they're very good, and all get evaluated  
22 eventually, and many selected. So that's just kind of  
23 an overview of that to thank you.

24 There are a number of reasons to move forward  
25 with this bridge, and we've heard them. So I'll just

1 mention very briefly some that stand out to me, that  
2 even though they have been mentioned, safety is clearly  
3 number one issue, I think. And I think the bridge is  
4 rated at a 43 where 50 is -- it should be replaced.  
5 Those are the experts. Those are the engineers that do  
6 that. I accept what experts and professionals say. We  
7 need to move forward to replace the bridge if for no  
8 other reason, just safety.

9           The improved competitiveness is extremely  
10 important to the success of this region and this port.  
11 We improve our competitiveness; we get more business.  
12 That creates a number of new jobs for everyone, and the  
13 bridge itself creates about, what, 4,000 jobs in  
14 construction of that.

15           And I think that we need to realize that our  
16 country is in a very serious situation now, and there  
17 are many, many people -- millions of people are  
18 unemployed. Jobs are important. Our state is in a very  
19 bad situation. Our city isn't far behind, not being  
20 able to balance its budget, that the state in  
21 particular. And so it's crucial that we move forward  
22 here, and I think that the impact of just constructing a  
23 bridge something like \$2.8 billion -- I have heard that  
24 number. It is certainly needed, and if we move forward  
25 now in addition to creating jobs that are so necessary



1 for this country and this region and the state, and we  
2 can save 10, 20 percent on the cost probably, the cost  
3 of building.

4 More importantly, there are so many people but,  
5 in fact, really good people. We will probably really  
6 get the best people to work on the bridge. They're  
7 available now, and these people are dedicated and  
8 committed, and we've got a lot of good union jobs and  
9 everything. And I think this is a win-win-win for  
10 everyone in this area. I think the bridge serves the  
11 entire country.

12 There was a point mentioned about who pays for  
13 the bridge and things like that, and it's standard  
14 economic theory that there are many projects that need  
15 to be made for the community for the citizens as a whole  
16 in a country where public/private partnerships are the  
17 only way to get certain projects done. The private  
18 industry cannot afford certain things and neither can  
19 the public alone, so we have to have public/private  
20 partnerships to make them work, and I see that as just  
21 one of these things in the bridge.

22 Anyone that's in favor of reducing pollution,  
23 cleaning up the environment will support this bridge if  
24 for no other reason a reduction in pollution, and it was  
25 mentioned by a couple of people here the concern that

1 the commissioners might backtrack a little bit on our  
2 commitment to reducing pollution, and I think I can  
3 speak for all of us on that, that we're solidly  
4 committed to reducing pollution. We have spent millions  
5 and millions of dollars on that.

6 It's just a part of our DNA. It's also part of  
7 the DNA of the entire staff. Everyone thinks about it.  
8 Hey, does this pollute? Years ago we didn't think about  
9 pollution. It wasn't necessary, but we've all learned a  
10 lot since then. And we have to. It's the right thing  
11 to do to reduce pollution, and I think failure to  
12 support this project would just be irresponsible in  
13 today's economy in the competitiveness where we are and  
14 just to be straightforward about we talked with  
15 customers.

16 I recently went a year and a half ago or two  
17 with members of the staff here and other commissioners,  
18 and some of our customers said, if you don't replace  
19 that bridge so that we can get our bigger ships  
20 underneath, we'll go someplace else. That's pretty  
21 powerful, and they meant that. We were meeting with the  
22 chairman and the president of a very major shipping  
23 company, and so it's important to listen to respond to  
24 that, but this is a major investment; it's an investment  
25 in America; it's an investment in California; it's an

1 investment in Long Beach; and it's also an investment in  
2 all of the people in the Greater Long Beach area.

3 So those are just a few of the reasons that I'm  
4 going to support, and I would say we cannot move rapidly  
5 enough to get this. We really need to move this. The  
6 Panama Canal will be completed before we get our bridge  
7 built, even if we started tomorrow. The competitiveness  
8 is going to be a very severe issue as we move forward  
9 here.

10 Replacing this bridge is simply the right thing  
11 to do. We need to do it. We need to make this  
12 investment, and we need to all work together for that.  
13 We've got good people here in need of good jobs. We  
14 have good jobs. We can create a good job. Our federal  
15 government is having difficulty creating good jobs, and  
16 so has the state. They're not in a position to create  
17 good jobs. In fact, if you look at the state, you look  
18 at the city reducing the number of jobs. We can create  
19 jobs; we can put people back to work and helping  
20 families and getting people to work. That's the right  
21 thing to do. The jobs that are created here are good,  
22 solid jobs. They're not going to go away in the short  
23 term.

24 So I'm solidly behind this. This is a very  
25 good project.

1 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Dr. Walter.

2 Yes, Susan.

3 COMMISSIONER WISE: I have one question for the  
4 city attorney and maybe for the other counsel that have  
5 been involved in this. I know that one of the first  
6 things that we are asked to do in the resolution is  
7 certify that all the procedures have been followed, and  
8 from what I can tell, that would appear to be so, but I  
9 would like confirmation of that.

10 MR. HOLZHAUS: Yes, we're comfortable that they  
11 have and comfortable recommending that you can proceed  
12 on that basis.

13 COMMISSIONER WISE: Okay. And there was one  
14 point raised again today about the need for EIS, and the  
15 view I assume here, it is not necessary here.

16 MR. HOLZHAUS: Correct. The federal statute  
17 and the state statute are very similar, but they are  
18 different in some respects. And the federal agencies'  
19 responsibilities with respect to this project are  
20 clearly different. Caltrans' responsibilities with  
21 respect to this project are clearly different from those  
22 of the port at the state level.

23 So it's not surprising that a different  
24 conclusion could be reached on the level of document  
25 necessary for federal and state purposes. And in any

1 event that issue is not before the board today. That  
2 would be an issue that they need to raise with Caltrans.

3 COMMISSIONER WISE: Well, I appreciate all the  
4 input that we've had today and also -- did you want to  
5 address that item?

6 MS. JENSON: I was just going to say I'm  
7 Katherine Jenson with Rutan and Tucker. I'm the chair  
8 of the land use natural resource practice group, and  
9 I've been doing this for 28 years now, and I've worked  
10 very closely with the staff on this project, and they've  
11 followed all of the requirements.

12 COMMISSIONER WISE: Okay. Thank you.

13 I had one -- just sort of one detail question I  
14 wanted to ask, and that had to do with -- it's actually  
15 Section -- I think it's 3.3.3. It has to do with public  
16 safety and a terrorism assessment that would be done or  
17 provided as we went along.

18 Could you just real briefly kind of tell me  
19 what that's likely to -- what kind of a report that's  
20 going to be, or what that's likely to look like?

21 MR. CAMERON: Kevin, our engineering -- Kevin,  
22 do you want to handle this one, Kevin? Kevin Haboian,  
23 who is the project manager for the EIR, who is going to  
24 have to address this.

25 MR. HABOIAN: Thank you, Rick, members of the

1 Board. The purpose of the terrorist vulnerability  
2 assessment which has been partly done is going to be  
3 continued into the design phase of the project is  
4 looking at ways of introducing hardening measures into  
5 the bridge to help protect the bridge from some sort of  
6 terrorist act.

7 COMMISSIONER WISE: What sort of measures? I'm  
8 sorry.

9 MR. HABOIAN: Hardening measures. So for  
10 instance, we're looking at ways to make sure that a  
11 truck could not go through a barrier and have an  
12 explosion occur by the tower, so preventing that from  
13 the likelihood of an occurrence. So we're looking at  
14 limiting access to the bridge and various access  
15 openings so that a potential terrorist couldn't easily  
16 get into the bridge to put some sort of a device that  
17 could cause harm. So to get ways, preventive ways of  
18 making sure that some type of act of that magnitude --  
19 preventing that from occurring.

20 COMMISSIONER WISE: Okay. Thank you for the  
21 explanation. Anyway, as I was saying, I appreciate all  
22 the comments that were made here today. I have spent a  
23 considerable time reviewing the document, and I think  
24 it's very comprehensive, and my thanks to all of you  
25 that have been working on it since 2002 or whenever this

1 began.

2 In my mind the things that are the most  
3 important here are, first of all, the safety of the  
4 bridge, both in terms of traffic and seismically. And  
5 second, the importance of it as an improved structure in  
6 order that we can keep the port competitive.

7 I also am impressed by what I think is really  
8 going to be an opportunity for us to improve the  
9 environment, and this is not a point that I think has  
10 been talked about today. But just as an example, what I  
11 read as runoff is something that this bridge will  
12 address and control. And right now the Gerald Desmond  
13 Bridge doesn't address that, and that's important to  
14 water quality issues. That's another issue that is on  
15 our plate here.

16 So I will be supporting this. It is important  
17 to me that we keep moving forward. All the technology  
18 advancement projects including zero emissions container  
19 movement system -- and it's very, very important to me  
20 that as quickly as possible the grant programs go into  
21 effect. So from the reports that I have gotten, I  
22 believe those things are underway, and we will continue  
23 to make sure that those things happen. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Just a comment on that to add  
25 some clarity to the commenters as well. As we're

1 reviewing -- the advisory committee is reviewing those  
2 applications, we're also preparing for the next  
3 solicitation which is the health care, and then behind  
4 that would be the greenhouse gases. And we've been  
5 pretty clear about our process to a lot of different  
6 stakeholders in the last six months and how we were  
7 going to be moving that out, so there is a schedule to  
8 move forward even with the other programs, even when the  
9 Board will be considering the first program of the  
10 school. I just wanted to add clarity to that.

11 COMMISSIONER WISE: Well, I think also part of  
12 the time has been taken up by the establishment of the  
13 process and getting the people -- getting the mayor to  
14 appoint the people and that sort of thing. But I would  
15 expect and I would hope that now that those pieces are  
16 in place, that this selection process can move forward  
17 more quickly with each round that we go through, if you  
18 will.

19 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER WISE: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Mr. Cameron, just real  
22 quickly, what was your separation from between each  
23 mitigation section from the schools to the medical  
24 facilities to that -- separation so you could make sure  
25 you did one right and then move onto the next?



1           MR. CAMERON: That was part of it. Just there  
2 are three individual programs, and so as we started to  
3 move forward with the creation of the advisory group,  
4 and once the advisory group was up and running -- it's  
5 really the same advisory group; it's really the same  
6 advisory group that's going to be looking at all of the  
7 different programs.

8           And so we felt as if the schools was one of the  
9 priorities, one of the most important for us to move  
10 forward with. The advisory committee concurred with  
11 that. And that was the direction partly by the advisory  
12 committee to move forward with that, get the  
13 solicitation running, and then right behind it as that  
14 solicitation is up and running, then we'd be working on  
15 the guidelines. We want to make sure that they're not  
16 overwhelmed, so part of that kind of phasing in was the  
17 rationale that was, you know, one laid out by staff,  
18 concurred with the advisory group.

19           And we've made it very clear to a lot of the  
20 different interested parties and the communities how  
21 we're moving forward with that. We made it very clear  
22 actually in a few public workshops that we had during  
23 that solicitation process.

24           But I understand what the board and what  
25 Commissioner Wise has indicated, and I think it's

1 staff's personal goal that we want to make it a very  
2 successful program. It's unique, something we haven't  
3 done, and I think we've done a good job of getting the  
4 first one out, and we will be moving accordingly with  
5 the others.

6 And I'd have to say that this type of a  
7 program, at least to my knowledge from a port  
8 prospective, has not been run anywhere. We are the  
9 first port to have done something like this. I call it  
10 almost like a third tier mitigation program that's going  
11 outside of the port complex, and I will leave it like  
12 that.

13 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you.

14 Commissioner Cordero.

15 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Yes, thank you,  
16 Mr. President. Let me, first of all, in terms of time  
17 period that it has taken with this and to put this into  
18 context, that there was a gentleman here earlier,  
19 Tom Moxley, who referenced his father was part of  
20 building the bridge, the existing bridge in 1968. And  
21 at the rate we're going, it may be his kids who will be  
22 building the next bridge.

23 So you know, I think time is of the essence  
24 with regard to it, and that's why I think we need to  
25 move forward. But I want to also emphasize that we need

1 to move forward and also continue the dialogue with the  
2 various interest groups including NRDC. I think in  
3 reference to their letter, earlier I made the comment  
4 that the mitigation issues are very important. We need  
5 to kind of move that forward and do everything we can.

6 I wanted to make sure that people in the  
7 neighborhood and environmental community know that, and  
8 the issue is the zero emission system, another very  
9 important infrastructure project. Again, I refer to the  
10 discussions of last week. This Board is very serious in  
11 moving that issue forward. And I think we need to be  
12 cognizant to keep what our representations regarding our  
13 commitment to that.

14 And I think with those of you witnessed the  
15 last meeting, it seems fair to say, that we're on the  
16 road to now moving forward with some type of  
17 demonstration project. Suffice it to say, that's not  
18 going to be on the shelf, not going to be delayed.  
19 We're placing every effort to make sure that this vision  
20 is pushed forward.

21 Commissioner Wise asked a very good question  
22 with regard to the procedure issue as to whether or not  
23 the environmental assessment is part that's required as  
24 opposed to an additional EIS. I think again whether  
25 that's a gray area in terms of what needs to be done if

1 we continue our dialogue and our partnership and,  
2 hopefully, working with NRDC, we may avoid that gray  
3 area question and move forward to make sure this thing  
4 gets moving, and all our concerns be addressed in a  
5 reasonable fashion.

6 One of the aspects about this bridge -- I think  
7 some of us termed the bridge to everywhere -- if we're  
8 not careful this bridge is going to be a bridge to  
9 nowhere again. You know, we're not going to move  
10 forward on this thing.

11 But as far as the taxpayer question, I myself,  
12 having been discussing this issue since 2003, a year  
13 after that Notice of Proposal, you know, this  
14 infrastructure should be paid by taxpayer money,  
15 government money. Government should be proactive in  
16 this administration that you have, we've seen -- and  
17 Congress to be proactive with us in having this built.  
18 It's already a project of national significance. So I  
19 think the taxpayer money to me is an honest assessment  
20 that one of the problems of this country regarding  
21 infrastructure, there's not enough money. For us to be  
22 competitive in the global world, we need to make sure --  
23 and this port has made every effort -- to attempt to  
24 obtain every dollar we can from governments via grants  
25 and other questions.

1           In terms of the aesthetics of the bridge, be  
2 assured the City Council has also weighed in on this  
3 one. You know, we have Mayor Foster who's been very  
4 much of a proponent for this bridge, noting that the  
5 realities that Long Beach is a port city. This is the  
6 gateway to the Pacific, and we need to move forward in  
7 order to be competitive and continue to be the gateway.  
8 This translates to the economic engine, not only for  
9 this region, but for this city.

10           Now having said that, I'd probably be a little  
11 more reserved or hesitant to move forward if, in fact,  
12 our record for the last five years was one of which we  
13 ignored the environmental community or did something  
14 less than being this disingenuous with regard to the  
15 environmental agenda. Given what we've done, I would  
16 hope the environmental committee sees this is an issue  
17 which we're moving forward, we're continuing with  
18 environmental discussion and again, hopefully, continue  
19 with dialogue in terms with how we can make this as  
20 environmentally friendly as possible.

21           One footnote to that, I understand also that  
22 the mayor is also looking to the fact that maybe you can  
23 put through a bike path on this bridge. So you know,  
24 there's a lot of possibilities. Other council people  
25 are talking about the study in terms, you know, not just

1 being a bridge, you know, kind of a futuristic lighting  
2 of the bridge.

3 But I think, suffice to say, it's more than  
4 just a bridge that's being built for transportation. I  
5 think reference has been made -- it's very much of a  
6 commuter bridge. And I think with that certainly there  
7 is some questions regarding the EIR which has addressed  
8 which is the purpose of the EIR to address. What are  
9 the environmental impacts -- to inform the public? And  
10 suffice to say, that I think that the mitigation that's  
11 being proposed is something that is cutting edge,  
12 beginning with the community mitigation thing.

13 So I hope that with regard to some of the  
14 issues that have been addressed, that going forward, we  
15 don't ignore these issues, but we continue to dialogue  
16 to see if we can have some reasonable meeting of the  
17 minds to make sure that we address these concerns in the  
18 best way that we can. Because I think, again, the fact  
19 of the matter is this is the second biggest port in the  
20 nation, and together with L.A. it's one port complex,  
21 the biggest port complex in America. So I'm satisfied  
22 that we -- we've addressed the matter and in which we  
23 have partnered with the community, the neighborhoods,  
24 and the elected officials to move this forward.

25 And lastly, I just want to emphasize we should

1 continue to do so, so I want to acknowledge NRDC's  
2 letter, and I want to acknowledge it with the emphasis  
3 that let's talk about these issues to see if there is  
4 some way we can come to a meeting of the minds so we  
5 don't approach these gray areas involved.

6 So with that, I am supporting it. We need this  
7 bridge as soon as we can. Because again we started the  
8 discussions back in 2000, and 2002 there was a Notice of  
9 Proposal, and here we are eight years later, and I want  
10 to make sure that Mr. Moxley's grandkids don't start  
11 working on this bridge. That they use the bridge, not  
12 work on the bridge. So with that, those are my  
13 comments.

14 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you, Commissioner  
15 Cordero.

16 I'm just going to make some very, very short  
17 comments because I guess I echo all the comments of my  
18 fellow commissioners here. And the EIR, I think, is  
19 probably as thorough -- you know, you've gone through --  
20 you've gone through it twice now. And like the first  
21 time was a trial. We've been through it a second time  
22 now, and I think you've really gone all out to really  
23 make sure, you know, everything is included in there,  
24 you know, from all sides. I think you've been able to  
25 answer every question, and I think an excellent job on

1 the information and the data behind and the answering of  
2 all of these questions and issues.

3 One thing I just want to make a point of, and I  
4 don't know -- there really hasn't been much talk about  
5 it -- but you know, the shoulders. I was actually going  
6 to ask a question on the shoulders earlier, but I really  
7 don't need to ask the question.

8 From a pollution standpoint one of the biggest  
9 pollution sources is when trucks and cars stop, okay,  
10 and have to sit there for half an hour, hour, two or  
11 three hours. When you have an accident or something  
12 happening on that bridge, they line up deep. I know  
13 that from the TI freeway when trucks are lined up over  
14 there, they just idle, and the emissions from those  
15 things are just killers to everybody. And that's the  
16 highest emission time, you know, from the truck  
17 standpoint is if it's not moving.

18 So just from having a new bridge with shoulders  
19 on it, that if there is an accident, hopefully, we can  
20 keep traffic moving much easier. The grade's less. I  
21 agree from the ship standpoint, once you get a little  
22 bit higher and you get these new ships in, they're very,  
23 very reduced pollution, you know, ships total, and per  
24 container, it's very reduced. So I think from a number  
25 of standpoints, like that alone from a pollution



1 reduction standpoint, this bridge is the way to go.

2 I think our mitigation programs -- I do have a  
3 quick question on mitigation programs. The programs  
4 that have been suggested -- are we oversubscribed on  
5 those things because we're adding \$1 million to it, for  
6 instance, to the schools and the health organizations?  
7 Are we oversubscribed that we'll need more money in the  
8 future? We're wanting to look at that, but do we need  
9 it with this program or any other programs right now?

10 DR. KANTER: Well, now again just to be clear,  
11 when the Board established the mitigation grant program,  
12 they were a structure into which we would place  
13 mitigation funds depending on what was needed to  
14 mitigate the impacts from this specific project. So on  
15 Middle Harbor, which is a terminal project, \$5 million  
16 into each one, and that figure was large because of all  
17 the mobile sources. This was an infrastructure project.  
18 We're recommending a million dollars in the two programs  
19 and \$400,000 in the third. When the program is  
20 implemented, we put out a solicitation. As Rick has  
21 indicated -- and Thomas -- that our first solicitation  
22 went out, we received, I think, about \$5.3 million worth  
23 of applications for the money in this school program.  
24 Now, the committee will evaluate those applications and  
25 eventually recommend awards to the Board for approval.

1 It may come out -- so right now it's ostensibly  
2 oversubscribed for the first set of applications.  
3 That's not including any of the mitigation grants that  
4 are recommended that would be from this project.

5 So as we go forward, we will put out future  
6 solicitations in the same area and pick up additional  
7 applicants, and so at this point, yes. To answer your  
8 question is yes, we are oversubscribed, but I presume  
9 once the committee comes and looks, some of those  
10 applications will fall out because they may not be valid  
11 for one reason or another. And so I think, certainly  
12 under the first wave, we will probably meet those needs,  
13 and subsequent solicitations will be put out as  
14 additional grant funds are put in there.

15 MR. CAMERON: And I would add that if in the  
16 first round there is -- that pot of money would stay --  
17 for instance if the only fund -- if the Board only funds  
18 up to 4.5 million, additional \$500,000 would stay in the  
19 pot for the next round, in addition to whatever  
20 contributions comes such as the bridge and future  
21 projects. It's not as if it . . .

22 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: No, no. I just want to make  
23 sure we aren't -- make sure we're not oversubscribed and  
24 we need to raise -- relook at that amount of money that  
25 we are doing. Right now it doesn't look like you need

1 to. If down the road, you know, from this, I think if  
2 something you need to bring back to the Board.

3 DR. KANTER: Absolutely, and I should emphasize  
4 that there is a basis for the staff's recommendation.

5 MR. STEINKE: To get to your point,  
6 Mr. President, that was the concept behind the community  
7 mitigation fund. If there was a further need after the  
8 solicitation, staff would come back and would recommend  
9 a supplement to those funds, with or without additional  
10 projects coming in determining the need of the community  
11 for additional mitigation if it's not specifically and  
12 only project-relevant.

13 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you very much. That's  
14 it.

15 Okay. So I don't know. This is such a high  
16 priority project, nationally all the way through very  
17 locally, and just the traffic over it, it allows traffic  
18 between San Pedro and Long Beach and this whole area to  
19 -- from a commuter standpoint, if nothing else. So I  
20 just see it as a worthwhile project, a very needed  
21 project, and I think we just need to move forward with  
22 it as expeditiously as possible. So I am going to  
23 support this.

24 Any other comments by Commissioners?

25 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Yes, so just one last

1 comment. As you know, this year there's an issue  
2 regarding the AB32 legislation, and I would suggest that  
3 absent that type of legislation which would support it  
4 not only by the legislator but proposed by the governor  
5 who supported -- again supported by the legislature.  
6 Here is an example of what that legislation does. It  
7 really puts, not only the private sector, but public  
8 entities like ourselves to be cognizant of the need to  
9 reduce greenhouse gases. So I think that the -- and I'm  
10 not proposing to do that -- do this this afternoon, but  
11 as a further step to further what we intend to do in  
12 terms of the greenhouses gases should be a part of this.  
13 I understand you're going to put \$400,000 into the  
14 greenhouse gas program; right? Is that . . .

15 MR. CAMERON: Yes, that's specific to CEQA  
16 mitigation. But I think if I hear you correctly -- and  
17 I know you've mentioned this to staff before -- is how  
18 we are addressing the bigger context of the --

19 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Right.

20 MR. CAMERON: -- and so that is a little bit  
21 separate from those funds per se because we're working,  
22 you know, at a staff level and that's per the direction  
23 of the Board through a resolution a couple years ago in  
24 support of AB32 or the implementation of AB32 here at  
25 the port complex. So we are working on the greenhouse

1 gas emissions plan. We're also working with our city as  
2 a city partner as part of the CEQA, and we'll -- it's a  
3 separate program. And as I've indicated earlier to you  
4 before, we'll be providing the Board with an update on  
5 where we are with that.

6 Now, the programs that this project and the  
7 Middle Harbor participated into are separate and  
8 distinct, and that is those are associated to mitigation  
9 of impacts associated with the particular project. And  
10 so at this point in time, if AB32 -- whatever happens in  
11 the near future, if anything ever happens with it, we  
12 still have an obligation under CEQA to move forward, to  
13 evaluate it accordingly under AB -- under the law, and  
14 we've identified the appropriate mitigation, and that's  
15 what is in here. So I don't know if there will be any  
16 disruption of the mitigation programs. I just wanted to  
17 make that clarification.

18 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Well, I think the point  
19 is, whether it's the building of a bridge or the  
20 terminal or of our present operations in terms of  
21 machinery heavy equipment, this has been a guide for us  
22 to take the Green Port Policy to another level. And I  
23 think what we -- I would suggest at some point we do as  
24 part of this whole environmental discussion is that we  
25 need to make sure that this port is proactive with

1 regard to the benefit of that type of legislation and to  
2 the point of view of opposing any ballot measure that  
3 assumes to reduce the impact of AB32.

4 And I mention this project, and so that the  
5 relevance to so that is it again, as I said earlier, in  
6 the last five years if you had not placed subsequent  
7 efforts to address environmental issues, greenhouse  
8 gases, then believe me, I would be the first to say  
9 look, I think we need to revisit this because I don't  
10 believe we need another Pier J here. And by that I  
11 mean, this port learned its lesson at the Pier J EIR,  
12 and we've gone a long ways from that in a positive way.  
13 And I think that for me it would be a mistake to try to  
14 go into a gray area of the law to forestall a project  
15 when, in fact, you should be able to work together, not  
16 only in terms of some of the issues that have been  
17 raised to make sure we have a reasonable agreement or  
18 resolution, but more importantly keep furthering what  
19 this port has been known to do, and that is support  
20 these environmental initiatives and oppose, in this  
21 case, propositions that seem to want to reduce the  
22 impact of the issues that have been -- AB32, which I  
23 have been referencing which was proposed by the governor  
24 and supported by the legislature.

25 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Thank you.

1           Okay. Commissioners, we have a motion and  
2 second. All in favor of the motion, say aye.

3           BOARD MEMBERS: Aye (Walter, Sramek, Wise,  
4 Cordero).

5           CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Any opposed? Okay. Motion  
6 passes.

7           Thank you. Thank you, everybody, for coming  
8 down and contributing.

9           Okay. We will go to public comments, nonagenda  
10 items. Any speakers wish to make any public comments on  
11 nonagenda items?

12           Seeing none, we will go to new business. Any  
13 new business? Commissioners? Staff? Boy, are you guys  
14 worn down a little bit?

15           Okay, just a quick question for Mr. Holzhaus.  
16 On our special meeting, do we need to adjourn and start  
17 up a special meeting, or can we just go to . . .

18           MR. HOLZHAUS: Yes, since it is agendized as a  
19 special meeting, the appropriate action would be to open  
20 that meeting and ask if there are any members of the  
21 public here to address the Board on the subject of the  
22 special meeting, and then since the special meeting is  
23 in closed session, you could then adjourn to closed  
24 session.

25           CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Right. It sounded like it,

1 but I wanted to double-check. We need a motion to  
2 adjourn -- motion to adjourn first of all.

3 COMMISSIONER WALTER: Motion to adjourn.

4 COMMISSIONER CORDERO: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Okay. We have a motion to  
6 adjourn. We will be adjourned from our regular board  
7 meeting without objection, and we will begin our special  
8 meeting.

9 COMMISSIONER WALTER: We have to take a vote.  
10 You didn't take a vote. We have to vote.

11 CHAIRMAN SRAMEK: Without objection. Okay.

12 We'll begin our Board of Harbors Commission  
13 special meeting.

14 Is there any public comment? Seeing none, we  
15 will adjourn the Board's regular meeting.

16 Thank you, everybody.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25