

Comprehensive Annual Financial Report
Year ended September 30, 2011
(With Independent Auditors' Report Thereon)

J. Christopher Lytle

**Executive Director** 

Sam Joumblat

Chief Financial Officer

# Comprehensive Annual Financial Report

Year ended September 30, 2011

# **Table of Contents**

			Page(s)
Introductory Section			
Letter of Transmittal			1 - 17
GFOA Certificate of Achievement			18
Organizational Chart			19
Board of Harbor Commissioners and Senior Management			20
Financial Section			
Independent Auditors' Report			21 - 22
Management's Discussion and Analysis			23 - 32
Financial Statements:			
Statements of Net Assets			33 - 34
Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Fund Net Assets			35
Statements of Cash Flows			36
Notes to Financial Statements			37 - 79
Statistical Section			
Financial Trends Information:			
Statement of Net Assets – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	1	81
Changes in Fund Net Assets – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	2	82
Revenue Capacity Information:			
Operating Revenues by Type – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	3	83
Ten Leading Commodities – Last Two Fiscal Years	Exhibit	4	84
Ten Leading Trading Partners by Tonnage – Last Two Fiscal Years	Exhibit	5	85
Principal Customers – Fiscal Year 2009	Exhibit	6	86
Debt Capacity Information:			
Revenue Bonds Debt Service Coverage – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	7	87
Operating Information:			
Tonnage Summary – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	8	88
Tonnage by Commodity Group – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	9	89
Container Count – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	10	90
Other Information:			
Number of Vessel Arrivals – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	11	91
Number of Employees – Last Ten Fiscal Years	Exhibit	12	92



March 26, 2012

The Board of Harbor Commissioners
The Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach
Long Beach, California

Members of the Board of Harbor Commissioners:

State law requires that all general-purpose local governments publish within six months of the close of each fiscal year a complete set of financial statements presented in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP) and audited in accordance with U.S. generally accepted auditing standards (GAAS) by a firm of licensed certified public accountants. Pursuant to that requirement, we hereby issue the comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR) of the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach (the Department), an enterprise fund of the City of Long Beach, California (the City), for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011. The Department's operations are included in the City's reporting entity as an enterprise fund.

This report consists of management's representations concerning the finances of the Department. Management is responsible for the completeness and reliability of all of the information presented in this report. To provide a reasonable basis for making these representations, management has established a comprehensive internal control framework that is designed to protect assets from loss, theft, or misuse, and to compile sufficient reliable information for the preparation of the financial statements in conformity with GAAP. The costs of internal controls should not exceed their benefits; therefore, the comprehensive framework of internal controls has been designed to provide reasonable rather than absolute assurance that the financial statements will be free from material misstatement. Management asserts that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, this financial report is complete and reliable in all material aspects.

The Department's basic financial statements have been audited by KPMG LLP, a firm of licensed certified public accountants. The goal of the independent audit is to provide reasonable assurance that the Department's financial statements for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011 are free of material misstatement. The independent audit entails examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements; assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management; and evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. The independent auditors concluded, based upon the audit performed, that there was a reasonable basis for rendering an unqualified opinion, and that the Department's financial statements for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011 are fairly presented, in conformity with GAAP. The independent auditors' report is presented as the first component of the financial section of this CAFR.

GAAP requires that management provide a narrative introduction, overview, and analysis to accompany the financial statements in the form of Management's Discussion and Analysis (MD&A). This letter of transmittal is intended to complement the MD&A, and should be read in conjunction with it. The Department's MD&A immediately follows the report of the independent auditors.

#### **Profile of the Department**

The State of California has conveyed, in trust, to the City certain tidal and submerged lands for the establishment and maintenance of the Harbor District (which includes the Port of Long Beach). Consistent with this grant, the City Charter confers on the Board of Harbor Commissioners (the Board) exclusive

control and management of the Department (or the Port). The Board has authority, on behalf of the City, to provide for the needs of commerce, navigation, recreation, and fishery; to develop and maintain all waterfront properties; to dredge and reclaim land; and to construct and operate terminals, railroad tracks, and other facilities both inside and outside the Department's jurisdiction.

The City Charter provides for the establishment of the Harbor Revenue Fund to account for the administration of the Harbor District by the Department. The Department generates funds through leases, tariffs, and other assessments to its customers. It can disburse these funds only for activities attributable to the trust.

The Department maintains a financial and cost accounting system independent of other City departments. The focus of the statement of activities is on inflows and outflows of economic resources using the accrual basis of accounting. Changes in net assets are recognized as soon as the cause of the change occurs, regardless of the timing of related cash flows; that is, revenues are recognized as soon as they are earned, and expenses are recognized as soon as a liability is incurred. All the assets and liabilities associated with the Department's operations are included in the statement of net assets. Net assets are segregated into invested in capital assets, net of related debt, restricted, and unrestricted. The City, through some of its departments, provides police, fire protection, and other administrative services to the Department, which, in turn, reimburses the provider for the cost of the services received.

#### **Summary of Operations**

#### **Operating Revenues**

Gross operating revenue improved from previous year showing an increase of 7.4% to \$345.4 million. This is a positive trend that has remained as such for two years in a row and may indicate a reversal in the negative cargo trends experienced in previous years. Containerized cargo increased 8.5% to \$267.5 million; dry bulk facilities increased 14.7% to \$22.2 million; steel terminals increased 25.8% to \$8.2 million; lumber terminals increased 50.9% to \$1.5 million; petroleum and liquid bulk terminals decreased 5.1% to \$16.5 million; vehicle terminals decreased 1.0% to \$10.2 million; and other terminals decreased 4% to \$3.0 million. Rental properties decreased 1.0% to \$14.1 million and miscellaneous revenues decreased 32.7% to \$2.3 million.

#### Cargo Volumes

In terms of cargo volumes, measured in metric revenue tons (MRTs), cargo handled by Port terminals increased 4.8% to 154.4 million this year, in tune with this increase and maintaining the positive trend, containerized cargo measured in Twenty-Foot Equivalent Units (TEUs), traffic increased 6.1% to \$6.3 million.


#### Cargo Highlights

	September 30		Percentage	
	 2011	2010	change	
	(In thousands)			
Container revenue (\$)	\$ 267,470	246,419	8.5%	
Total tonnage (MRTs)	154,417	147,357	4.8	
Container tonnage (MRTs)	113,104	107,309	5.4	
Containers (TEUs)	6,299	5,936	6.1	

#### Net Income

Net income, shown in the financial statements as decrease in net assets, decreased 13.9% to \$103.5 million. The oil fields and their operations were transferred to the Gas and Oil Department of the City of Long Beach, consequently the oil operation revenue was reduced by 94% to \$3.2 million; interest expense was reduced by 10% to \$36.4 million; the reduction was the result of the restructuring of the long-term debt executed during fiscal year 2010. The chart below depicts operating revenue, income from operations, and net income for the last 10 fiscal years.

#### Operating Revenue, Income from Operations, and Net Income



#### Operating Expense, Oil Operations, and Other Income and Expense

Port operating expenses include facilities and infrastructure maintenance, fire and safety, indirect terminal operation, and general and administration expenses. These expenses decreased by 16.9%, or \$16.6 million, to \$81.4 million. The department has embarked on a major terminal realignment; capital expenses have increased while operating expenses such as facility and infrastructure maintenance experienced a sizable reduction. Only the fire and safety category increased 7.5% to \$27.9 million.

Depreciation expense for the year decreased 1.8%, or \$1.6 million, to \$85.0 million. This expense varies in proportion to the completion of capital projects, the acquisition/retirement of operating assets, and the number of years that operating assets have been in service.

Interest expense and other borrowing costs declined by 10.1% to \$36.4 million. This reduction was primarily caused by the 2010 restructuring of the long-term debt.

Gross oil operation revenue was reduced due to the transfer of the oil fields to the Gas and Oil Department of the City of Long Beach. Gross oil revenue was reduced by 94.0% from \$54.2 to \$3.2 million.

Interest income earned by the Department's pooled-cash accounts and held by the City decreased by 37.0% to \$5.0 million. The reduction on interest earnings is attributable to market conditions prevailing in the financial sector during the year and to a reduction of the cash balance of the 2010A bond construction fund.

During 2011, Ballot Measure D was passed by a simple majority changing the formula for calculation of the Tidelands Operating Fund (TOF) transfer. Measure D amended the Long Beach City Charter by changing the formula from 10% of net income to 5% of gross revenues for the transfer of funds from Harbor Department revenues to the TOF. The City Council, by authority of City Charter Chapter XII, Section 1209 (c) (4), as amended, and with the approval of the Board, adopted a resolution in 2011 to transfer \$17,269,465 –5% of the Department's operating revenues for fiscal year 2011. During fiscal year 2010, at the request of the City Council, the Board approved transfers to the TOF of two amounts: \$12,018,776 – 10% of the Department's net income for fiscal year 2010 and \$12,423,706 – 10% of the Department's net income for fiscal year 2009.

The transfer to the TOF is reported as part of the Due to City of Long Beach account in statement of net assets and as a transfer to the City in the statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net assets. The total transfer recognized to the City during fiscal year 2011 was \$22,874,938, which includes the \$17,269,465 discussed above plus \$5,578,473 for Aquarium of the Pacific debt service assistance requested by the City manager. The total transfer recognized to the City during fiscal year 2010 was \$30,451,161, which includes the \$24,442,482 (\$12,018,776 + \$12,423,706) discussed above plus \$6,008,679 for Aquarium of the Pacific debt service assistance requested by the City manager.


Also, during fiscal year 2011, the Department made the first payment towards the projected Shortfall Advance to the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (the ACTA), under the ACTA Use and Operating Agreement. The agreement was executed by the Department, the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles (Port of Los Angeles), the ACTA, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific Railroads. Any shortfall advance made by the Department and the Port of Los Angeles is reimbursable, with interest, by ACTA; reimbursements could begin as soon as 2018. The Department is funding a cash reserve to satisfy claims related to the shortfall advance potential obligation. The balances of the reserve as of September 30, 2011 and 2010 were \$46,045,000 each year. The payment made during fiscal year 2011 was \$2,950,000.

The following table summarizes financial and cargo highlights:

#### **Financial Highlights**

	September 30			Percentage
		2011	2010	change
		(In thous	sands)	
Port operating revenue	\$	345,390	321,639	7.4%
Operating expenses		81,423	98,026	(16.9)
Depreciation		85,005	86,619	(1.9)
Income from operations		178,962	136,993	30.6
Increase in net fund assets		103,517	120,188	(13.9)
Harbor oil operations income		1,525	19,034	(92.0)
Clean Air Action Plan		(3,573)	3,553	(200.6)
Capital grants		7,444	18,663	(60.1)
Transfers to the City		(17,269)	(24,442)	(29.3)
Other transfers to the City		(5,578)	(6,009)	(7.2)
Other nonoperating (expenses) income		(30,922)	(27,605)	12.0
Loss on long-term receivable		(27,000)	<del>-</del>	(100.0)

#### **Operating Revenue by Type**




#### Annual Budget

The budget constitutes an appropriation covering expected revenues and expenditures of the Department; Section 1210 of the City Charter requires the Board to adopt a budget not later than 60 days before the beginning of each fiscal year. The City Charter also provides that the City Council may approve or amend the Department's budget before the first day of the fiscal year.

#### Revenues Budget to Actual

Fiscal year 2011 is the second straight year in which operating revenues have exceeded budget revenues. Operating revenues exceeded the budget and reached 104.2% of the budgeted amount. In general terms, the U.S. economy has been struggling to recover; the increase in operating revenue is a reflection of this effort. Cargo volumes increased by 7.1 million metric revenue tons when compared to last fiscal year. Capital grant revenues, a part of the nonoperating income, were lower than those recognized last year; as projects near their completion; the reimbursable portion of funded projects decreases. Interest earnings were lower because of declining interest rates obtained from financial markets paired with the utilization and consequent reduction in the balance of the 2010A bond construction fund.

#### Fiscal Year 2011 Budgetary Sources of Funds



The following table shows revenues budgetary performance for fiscal year 2011:

#### **Actual to Budget Comparison for Fiscal Year 2011**


	Actual	Budget	Percentage of budget
	 (In thou	sands)	
Operating revenues	\$ 345,390	331,417	104.2%
Clean Air Action Plan	5,046	2,200	229.4
Harbor oil operations	3,240	3,397	95.4
Interest income	4,994	6,000	83.2
Infrastructure grants	· —	15,600	
Security grants	7,444	31,067	24.0
Caltrans reimbursements		· —	
ICTF	 	3,000	
Total revenues	\$ 366,114	392,681	93.2%

# Expenses Budget to Actual

The following table shows expenditures and employee headcount budgetary performance for fiscal year 2011:

# **Actual to Budget Comparison for Fiscal Year 2011**

	 Actual	Budget	Percentage of Budget
Expenditures:			
Capital outlay	\$ 228,060	401,907	56.74%
CAAP and infrastructure	8,615	13,146	65.53
Debt service	76,328	112,136	68.07
Personal services (benefits included)	41,669	43,488	95.82
Nonpersonal	29,250	35,497	82.40
Oil operations	201	_	100.00
Interdepartmental charges	15,188	23,155	65.59
Transfers to the City	22,848	24,424	93.48
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	 9,122	1,724	529.12
Total expenditures	\$ 431,281	655,477	65.80%
Employee headcount:			
Regular	417.00	453.00	92.05%
Part time/temporary	 19.00	22.40	84.82
Total employees	436.00	475.40	91.71%



The Department moved to increase the number of permanent positions and reduced the part time/temporary positions. Actual figures reflect the change and show an increase of 2.8% in the number of positions filled from 424 in 2010 to 436 in 2011; the increase was not sufficient to reach the staffing levels proposed in the budget. Nonpersonal expenses were lower than budget because of the shifting geared more towards the reconfiguration of cargo terminals as opposed to maintaining them.

Debt service expenses, including principal and interest, were lower than budget because the 2011 budget included the payment of the \$31,400,000 outstanding at the time when the budget was being prepared. The balance was fully paid before the end of the fiscal year. Interest expense and amortization of debt issuance-related items amounted to \$33,611,085, a reduction of \$6,498,516, or 16.2% when compared to prior year.

Capital outlay continued at a steady, but lightly slower pace, than that of previous year. It went from \$273,008,000 to \$228,060,000 for a decrease of \$44,948,000, or 16.46%. The port is committed to an ambitious realignment of cargo terminals in order to improve cargo operations and to contribute to an overall cleaner environment around the port complex. At the same time, it is anticipated that this realignment will bring an increase in operational revenue in the years to come.

Oil operations revenue and expense continued its transition to the Department of Gas and Oil of the City of Long Beach; accordingly revenues and expenses related to this activity were significantly reduced. Revenues went from \$54,206,644 to \$3,239,842; expenses went from \$33,412,454 to \$1,702,882.

#### **Debt Administration**

The following table shows bond issuance information and long-term changes (exclusive of unamortized bond premium or discount). Note 8 to the financial statements provides additional information related to the Department's long-term debt program.

	_	<b>1998</b>	2000 In thousands, excep		dates of is	2004 suance
Original issue Date of issue Original coupon rate	\$	206,3 02/01/9 6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	00 06/	144,240 (26/02 % - 5.5%	113,410 03/10/04 4.0% - 5.0%
Beginning balance Fiscal year 2011 redemptions	\$	119,0 (10,4		<u> </u>	57,815 (4,560)	61,500 (7,715)
Ending balance	\$_	109,2	250		53,255	53,785
			2005	2010A		2010B
Original issue Date of issue Original coupon rate		\$	257,975 03/23/05 5.0%	200, 03/31/20, 0.04% - 5		158,085 04/29/2010 3.0% - 5.0%
Beginning balance Fiscal year 2011 redemptions		\$	137,765 (10,035)		,835 325)	158,085 (130)
Ending balance		\$	127,730	191	,510	157,955

The underlying ratings assigned to the Department's bond issues are as follows: Standard & Poor's: AA, stable outlook; Moody's Investors Service: Aa2, stable outlook; and Fitch Ratings: AA, stable outlook. A high credit rating recognizes good financial management by the port and lowers the cost of borrowing in the future.

In May 2011, Fitch Ratings affirmed the AA rating on the Port's outstanding debt; in accordance to the Fitch report: "following the downturn in maritime trade between fiscal years 2008 and 2010, the port has more recently experienced a healthy return in cargo volumes; the port's terminal facilities are modern and contiguous, and have excellent access to intermodal transportation facilities, rail networks, and interstate highways. The port benefits from a strong financial profile; management at the port is experienced and has been proactive in addressing economic, financial, environmental, and community challenges."

In July 2011, Standard & Poor's affirmed the AA port bonds' rating, and also affirmed an A-1 rating for the port's short-term commercial paper. "The stable outlook reflects our expectation that financial metrics will remain strong and liquidity will remain good" the rating firm said.

In March 2010, Moody's Investors Service affirmed its Aa2 ratings on the Port's debt. The Moody's report states as the Port's strengths the following: "Strong market position as the second largest port in the United States by TEUs (twenty-foot equivalent units count; the benefits it derives from a naturally deep harbor (50-foot channel depth); its state-of-the-art facilities and good road access and intermodal connectivity


through the Alameda Corridor and the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility. A robust local market contributes to the Port's competitive position, giving it a large, relatively stable demand base for imports and by generating "backhaul" cargo to partially balance the large import operations. Track record of well-maintained and stable finances with debt service coverage averaging 3.1 times in recent years and ample operating cash reserves equivalent to over seven years of operations. Revenue stability is enhanced by long-term contracts with the Port's major tenants (these tenants contribute 95% of revenues) that include minimum annual guarantees (MAGs) amounting to \$223 million in fiscal year 2009. MAG alone provided 1.5x debt service coverage (net of operating expenditures).

Since 1994, the Department continuously carried a commercial paper program; at its highest point, the Department issued \$148,000,000 of Series A notes to pay for acquisition costs of property, facilities, and oil rights on the North Harbor District; historically, all the notes matured not later than 270 days after date of issuance. The commercial paper and related interest obligations were fully paid during the 2010 fiscal year.

#### Responsible Growth

The Port's revenue derived from cargo facilities increased by 54.2% between 2002 and 2011 from \$224.0 million to \$345.4 million; cargo volumes measured in metric revenue tons grew by 22.9% during the same period of time from 125.6 million tons to 154.4 million tons.

#### **Tonnage by Commodity Group**



The port's operating revenue and cargo volumes have been growing slowly but steadily since 2010 after experiencing a noticeable drop in fiscal year 2009. This change in trends was stimulated by increasing volumes of cargo coming from Asia fueled by a positive reaction of final consumers to a recovering American economy. The Port continues the realignment of its cargo terminals to take advantage of anticipated growth in trade volumes. Its terminals and installations continue to provide the best alternative for shipping lines to move cargo in and out of the continental United States.

#### Economic Outlook

In 1911, the State of California established the Long Beach tidelands area as a State Trust and designated the City of Long Beach as a trustee for the people of the State of California. The Port of Long Beach, located in the Tidelands Trust, has been a successful landlord port providing the region, state, and nation with state-of-the-art seaport facilities and serving as a safe international gateway for trade.

The Department generates revenues through leases, tariffs, and other charges assessed to its tenants. No local, state, or federal taxes support Port operations. The Department does not fund general governmental activities, but compensates the City of Long Beach for services such as public safety, human resources,

civil service, and centralized financial, legal, and audit services. The expansion or contraction of foreign trade directly affects local, regional, and national economies, and the Port, as a local economic engine needs to modify its approaches to face the economic challenges or to seize opportunities to continue to be the preferred destination of goods produced abroad.


The long-term international trade trend has increased steadily, except for setbacks in 2008 and 2009. Fiscal years 2010 and 2011 have reversed the negative trend and returned to positive growth. Economic forecasts and cargo projections suggest that positive growth will become the norm again and will continue at a moderate pace over the coming years.

In 2011, Port's terminals moved nearly 6.3 million TEUs, an increase of 6.1% from 2010, which went along with a 7.4% increase in operating revenue. The Port's net income, before grants and operating transfers, increased by 1.1%.

Gross operating revenue increased by 7.4% to \$345.4 million. Changes from prior year on the revenue for the various cargo categories are as follows: containerized cargo increased by 8.5% to \$267.5 million; lumber increased by 50.9% to \$1.5 million; dry bulk increased by 14.7% to \$22.2 million; steel increased by 25.8% to \$8.2 million; liquid bulk decreased by 5.1% to \$16.5 million; vehicles decreased by 0.6% \$10.2 million; and other facilities decreased 4.0% to \$3.0 million. Rental and miscellaneous revenues decreased by 0.7% to \$16.4 million.

Cargo volumes, measured in metric revenue tons, passing through the Port, when compared to last year, increased by 4.8% to 154.4 million. Containerized cargo terminals increased by 5.4% to 113.1 million; steel increased by 31.5% to 1.2 million; lumber increased 4.1% to 0.17 million; dry bulk volume increased by 20.9% to 7.9 million; vehicles decreased by 20.5% to 0.2 million; and liquid bulk decreased by 1.1% to 31.8 million.

**Inbound – Outbound and Total Metric Revenue Tons** 



#### Trade and Commerce

Throughout its 100-year history the Port has provided state-of-the-art seaport facilities for its customers. Maintaining and improving its infrastructure is critical in today's competitive operating environment. Investing in modern facilities and transportation infrastructure is conducive to significant increases in goods movement efficiency. Increased efficiency leads to greater regional economic benefits as well as a safer and cleaner Port environment.

Economic forecasts predict that cargo passing through the Port of Long Beach will maintain a moderate-increase trend in the immediate future. Factors contributing to this increase are the continued U.S. consumer demand for products manufactured in Asia and increased vessel capacity supplied by the new generation of container ships, which are expected to reach 12,500 TEUs as soon as this year. As a landlord, the Port has the leading responsibility to maintain much of the infrastructure within the Long Beach Harbor District. Building modern facilities and infrastructure and providing proper maintenance for such assets is essential to the Port's financial success, and key to meeting the environmental protection needs of the surrounding communities. The Port is committed to facilitating and promoting international

goods movement, to build modern, secure and efficient facilities and infrastructure, to reduce negative impacts on the environment, and to be a good partner with the community.

To accommodate the increase in trade volume expected during the next 20 years, the Port will continue to seek innovative solutions for developing facilities and related infrastructure while ensuring that air, water, and soil quality continue to improve.

Projects underway that will increase cargo capacity and/or improve Port infrastructure include:

- Gerald Desmond Bridge Replacement: A \$950 million project to build a new bridge to span the Port's Main Channel. The new bridge will be higher, to allow additional clearance for ships, and will also be wider, to ease the flow of cars and trucks that use the bridge. Construction is expected to begin in early 2013.
- Middle Harbor Redevelopment Project: A modernization of two aging shipping terminals. The
  program will add on-dock rail capacity, shore power hookups, and allow the new terminal to move
  twice the cargo with half the air pollution. Phase 1 construction began in 2011.
- Pier G modernization: A multiyear, \$470 million renovation of the ITS container terminal. Construction of a new terminal administration and operations complex, new maintenance, and repair facility and an expanded on-dock rail yard is underway. Shore power facilities and additional dock space are also being added.
- Long Beach Harbor dredging: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Port have commenced a \$40 million dredging project to aid navigation in and around the Port, safely contain contaminated sediments and recycle the dredge material as fill in the Pier G modernization project.
- Pier S container terminal: The Port is conducting environmental studies on a proposal to build a new terminal at the Port of Long Beach on existing vacant land in the Port. The terminal would cost about \$650 million to construct, and would be built with the latest in clean-air technology and cargo-movement efficiencies.

#### **Environmental Protection**

The optimal utilization of Port resources brings environmental issues that need to be addressed to guarantee economic growth with responsible stewardship of the environment.

In December 2006, in a historic joint board session of the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles (the Ports), the San Pedro Bay Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) was approved. This ambitious plan addresses all port-related emission sources. The CAAP has led to major air-quality successes at the Ports. Diesel particulate matter, for example, has been reduced by 72% from 2005 levels, based on 2010 emissions studies. As landlords, the Ports do not operate terminals, ships, yard equipment, trucks, or trains. Nor do the Ports have legal powers to mandate new regulations. However, the Ports will continue to exert all efforts in order to reduce air pollution derived from goods movement activities by maximizing the utilization of all available means. The Port of Long Beach has established itself as a world leader in sustainable industrial development by adopting the industry-leading Green Port Policy. This policy will substantially reduce emissions from vessels calling at the Port.

In other environmental accomplishments, the Port:

- Cut diesel particulates by 72%, sulfur oxides by 73%, smog-forming nitrogen oxides by 46%, and greenhouse gases by 18% from 2005 levels, based on a 2010 emissions study. The improvements occurred during a period when cargo volume declined, however, cargo volumes were only down by 7% and, therefore, only account for a small portion of the pollution reductions.
- Uses lower-sulfur, cleaner fuels in all waterfront equipment, especially the ocean-going ships.
- Completed a successful change-over of the truck fleet through the landmark Clean Trucks Program, which has achieved a 90% reducing in pollution from the truck fleet.
- Expanded the Green Flag Vessel Speed Reduction Program (where most ships slow down to reduce air pollution) from 20 nautical miles to 40 miles of the Port, for additional air quality benefits.
- Continued a changeover of yard equipment and the Pacific Harbor Line locomotive fleet, also contributed to air quality gains.
- Expanded the number of shipping terminals capable of delivering electricity to ships, under the shore-power air quality program.

The Port has developed and is managing a comprehensive, all hazard Business Continuity Plan that facilitates the efficient and environmentally sound movement of cargo by maintaining the land and water infrastructure; maintains a safe and secure Port environment, and meets legal, regulatory, and financial requirements. The primary purpose of the Business Continuity Plan is to ensure Port business partners have available infrastructure and resources necessary to continue business operations prior to, during, and following a Portwide incident.

#### **Security**

The Port of Long Beach continues its commitment to safety and security and is dedicated to being the safest, most secured Port in the world. The Port takes an above the water, on the water, and below the water approach to Maritime Domain Awareness using various sensor technologies to maintain vigilance and share data with the many agencies responsible for Port Security. More than 130 surveillance cameras are deployed throughout the port complex, including long-range and night-vision units. Strategically deployed underwater sonar machines monitor the waters as well. And the Port of Long Beach is the only port in the United States with its own deepwater dive team capable of performing heavy duty underwater salvage and rescue operations.

Since 2001, the Port has secured more than \$120 million in grants to aid in those efforts. The Port is protected by multiple layers of security, including the U.S. Coast Guard; U.S. Customs; and Border Protection, federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies; and the Port's Harbor Patrol, a cadre of 60-plus trained, armed, public officers who are responsible for security, and public safety on the property owned by the Port and any public roadways within its boundaries 24/7. The Port also maintains a close relationship with the Long Beach Police Department, an important partner in the daily monitoring of the Harbor District.

The Port's Joint Command and Control Center (JCCC) is a state-of-the-art communications and command center, which brings together Federal and local agencies to coordinate security measures. It brings together

security related information from across the port complex and allows sharing by a variety of stakeholders and partner agencies including the Coast Guard, FBI, and Long Beach Police Department.

The Port is now finalizing the implementation of an Emergency Management system, which includes a business continuity plan to ensure uninterrupted key Port operations in the event of an emergency.

#### **Awards and Acknowledgements**

The Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada (GFOA) awarded a Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting to the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach, California, for its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2010. This was the 28th consecutive year that the Department has received this prestigious award. In order to be awarded a Certificate of Achievement, the Department must publish an easily readable and efficiently organized Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. This report must satisfy both generally accepted accounting principles and applicable legal requirements.

A Certificate of Achievement is valid for a period of one year only. We believe that our current Comprehensive Annual Financial Report continues to meet the Certificate of Achievement Program's requirements, and we are submitting it to the GFOA to determine its eligibility for another certificate.

We would like to acknowledge the dedicated service of the Finance Division staff members, through whose efforts the timely preparation of this report was made possible. Additionally, we would like to thank the Communications Division for providing artwork and editing services.

J. Christopher Lytle

Sam Joumblat

# Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting

Presented to

# The Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach

# California

For its Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year Ended September 30, 2010


A Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting is presented by the Government Finance Officers Association of the United States and Canada to government units and public employee retirement systems whose comprehensive annual financial reports (CAFRs) achieve the highest standards in government accounting and financial reporting.

UNITED STATES AND CORPORATION SEAL OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONT

tinda C. Hand

President

**Executive Director** 



# Board of Harbor Commissioners and Senior Management September 30, 2011

#### **Board of Harbor Commissioners**

Susan E. Anderson Wise, President Thomas Fields, Vice President Nick Sramek, Secretary Rich Dines, Commissioner Doug Drummond, Commissioner

Executive Officer to the Board Noel Hacegaba

**Executive Offices** 

Executive Director Richard D. Steinke
Deputy Executive Director J. Christopher Lytle
Government Affairs Division Samara Ashley, Director

Finance and Support Services Bureau

Managing Director Steven B. Rubin
Sam Joumblet Chief Finan

Finance Division

Sam Joumblat, Chief Financial Officer

Human Resources Division

Information Management Division

Margaret Huebner, Director

Douglas L. Albrecht, Director

Real Estate Division

Risk Management Division

Risk Management Division

Risk Management Division

Richard S. Baratta, Director

Trade Relations and Port Operations Bureau

Managing Director Sean Strawbridge Communications and Community Relations

Division Heather C. Morris, Director

Maintenance Division Randy Rich, Director

Security Division Vacant
Trade Relations Division Donald B. Snyder, Director

Environmental Affairs and Planning Bureau

Managing Director Dr. Robert G. Kanter

Environmental Planning Division Richard D. Cameron, Director

Master Planning Division

Larry Cottrill, Director

Transportation Planning Division

Eric Shen, Director

Engineering Bureau

Managing Director Douglas A. Thiessen

Engineering Administration Division Albert J. Moro, Chief Harbor Engineer Construction Management Division Gary J. Cardamone, Director

Engineering Design Division
Program Management Division
Program Management Division
Program Management Division
Douglas Sereno, Director



**KPMG LLP** Suite 700 20 Pacifica Irvine, CA 92618-3391

#### **Independent Auditors' Report**

The Honorable Mayor and City Council The Honorable Members of the Board of Harbor Commissioners:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach (the Department), an enterprise fund of the City of Long Beach, California, as of and for the years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010, as listed in the table of contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the Department's management. Our responsibility is to express an opinion on these financial statements based on our audits.

We conducted our audits in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Department's internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audits provide a reasonable basis for our opinion.

As discussed in note 1 to the financial statements, the financial statements of the Department are intended to present the financial position, and the changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows of only that portion of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the City of Long Beach, California, that are attributable to the transactions of the Department. They do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the City of Long Beach, California, as of September 30, 2011 and 2010, and the changes in its financial position, or where applicable, its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the financial position of the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach, California, as of September 30, 2011 and 2010, and the changes in its financial position and its cash flows for the years then ended, in conformity with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

In accordance with Government Auditing Standards, we have also issued our report dated March 26, 2012 on our consideration of the Department's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with Government Auditing Standards and should be considered in assessing the results of our audit.



Management's discussion and analysis on pages 23 through 32 is not a required part of the basic financial statements but is supplementary information required by accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming opinions on the financial statements that collectively comprise the Department's basic financial statements. The accompanying introductory section and the statistical section as listed in the table of contents are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the basic financial statements. The introductory section and statistical section have not been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the basic financial statements, and accordingly, we express no opinion on them.



March 26, 2012

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

The management of the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach, California (the Department), offers readers of the financial statements this discussion and analysis of the financial activities for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010.

#### **Overview of the Financial Statements**

The Department's financial statements include the statements of net assets, the statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net assets, the statements of cash flows, and the notes to the financial statements. This discussion is intended to serve as an introduction to the Department's financial statements.

#### **Condensed Financial Position Information**

The Statements of Net Assets present information concerning the Department's assets, liabilities, and net assets.

The following condensed financial information provides an overview of the Department's financial position as of September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009:

#### **Summary of Net Assets**

September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009

	2011	2010	2009
Assets:			
Capital assets, net	\$ 2,498,946,250	2,400,332,581	2,249,767,809
Other assets	993,141,143	1,063,299,555	1,159,161,353
Total assets	3,492,087,393	3,463,632,136	3,408,929,162
Liabilities:			
Long-term obligations, net of current portion	678,427,147	751,112,610	790,507,145
Current liabilities	162,138,602	164,514,493	190,604,744
Total liabilities	840,565,749	915,627,103	981,111,889
Net assets:			
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt	1,929,398,050	1,859,165,959	1,486,879,059
Restricted	177,536,448	207,843,531	196,848,657
Unrestricted	544,587,146	480,995,543	744,089,557
Total net assets	\$ 2,651,521,644	2,548,005,033	2,427,817,273

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2011

At the end of fiscal year 2011, the assets of the Department exceeded its liabilities by \$2,651,521,644 (net assets). Total net assets increased by \$103,516,611. This change consists mainly of \$178,961,744 current year operating income, \$7,443,539 income derived from grants received from federal and state governments, \$1,525,061 profit from oil operations, gains of \$12,468,504 on oil operations assets transferred to the City; less \$96,956,696 from other nonoperating expenses, including financing costs, transfers to the City's Tidelands

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

Operating Fund of \$22,847,938 and loss of \$27,000,000 on long-term receivables from the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach, California a result of Assembly Bill X1 26 which eliminated these receivables.

The Department's investment in capital assets (land; structures and facilities; furniture, fixtures, and equipment; construction in progress; and rights-of-way) less any related debt is \$1,929,398,050 or 73% of the aggregate net assets. This is the result of the increase in Port construction projects during the year. Capital assets facilitate tenants' cargo operations and the Department does not intend to liquidate them to fund ongoing port operations.

The Department holds \$177,536,448 of net assets subject to restrictions, a decrease of \$30,307,083 from last year. The decrease consists mostly of recomputing the third-party obligations – nonrelated-entity debt service contingency and matching contribution to agree to current conditions. Restricted net assets are thus identified in the Statements of Net Assets and represent 7% of the Department's total net assets.

At the end of fiscal year 2011, the Department reported unrestricted net assets of \$544,587,146, an increase of \$63,591,603 when compared to 2010. This is primarily the result of \$141,806,683 increase in operating cash offset by a; \$17,370,882 reduction in the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers prepayment, \$12,476,923 reduction in Accounts Receivable, \$4,449,492 reductions in grants receivable, a \$23,554,672 increase in Accounts Payable and loss on receivables of \$27,000,000.

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2010

At the end of fiscal year 2010, the assets of the Department exceeded its liabilities by \$2,548,005,033 (net assets). Total net assets increased by \$120,187,760. This change consists mainly of \$136,993,222 current year operating income, \$2,270,274 income from equity in the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility Joint Powers Authority (ICTF) joint venture, \$18,663,468 income derived from grants received from federal and state governments, and \$19,034,471 profit from oil operations; less \$56,773,675 from other net nonoperating expenses, including financing costs, and transfers to the City's Tidelands Operating Fund, of \$30,451,161.

The Department's investment in capital assets (land; structures and facilities; furniture, fixtures, and equipment; construction in progress; and rights-of-way) less any related debt is \$1,859,165,959 or 73% of the aggregate net assets. This is the result of the increase in Port construction projects during the year. Capital assets facilitate tenants' cargo operations and the Department does not intend to liquidate them to fund ongoing port operations.

The Department holds \$207,843,531 of net assets subject to restrictions, a decrease of \$10,994,874 from last year. The decrease is the result of amounts required to service the long-term debt. Restricted net assets are thus identified in the Statements of Net Assets and represent 8% of the Department's total net assets.

At the end of fiscal year 2010, the Department reported unrestricted net assets of \$480,995,543, a decrease of \$263,094,014 when compared to 2009. This decrease is mostly the result of reductions in the operating cash and cash equivalents of \$257,079,886 (including the pay down of the Port's Commercial Paper outstanding of \$31,400,000) primarily to fund capital activities.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

#### Summary of Operations and Changes in Fund Net Assets

The Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Fund Net Assets illustrate the Department's change in net assets from prior to current fiscal year. These changes are reported as soon as the underlying event giving rise to the change occurs, regardless of the timing of related cash flows. Thus, some revenues and expenses reported in this statement will only affect future period cash flows; for example: uncollected receivables and earned, but unused, vacation leave. The table below summarizes the operations for fiscal years 2011, 2010, and 2009.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

#### **Changes in Fund Net Assets**

Years ended September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009

	2011	2010	2009
Operating revenues:  Berth and special facilities Miscellaneous	\$ 328,986,839 16,402,867	303,995,596 17,643,389	291,451,794 19,899,788
Total operating revenues	345,389,706	321,638,985	311,351,582
Operating expenses: Facility and infrastructure General and administrative Depreciation and amortization	(50,671,577) (30,751,029) (85,005,356)	(62,044,262) (35,982,062) (86,619,439)	(58,416,295) (39,463,931) (85,857,712)
Total operating expenses	(166,427,962)	(184,645,763)	(183,737,938)
Operating income	178,961,744	136,993,222	127,613,644
Nonoperating revenues (expenses): Intergovernmental transfer Oil operations transfer to City Investment expense, net of income Income from oil operations Gain (loss) on sale of capital assets Income from equity in joint venture Income (loss) from Clean Trucks Program Other income, net Loss on long-term receivables from the Redevelopment Agency	(22,847,938) 12,468,504 (15,556,686) 1,525,061 74,459 — (3,572,859) (27,979,213) (27,000,000)	(30,451,161) — (25,121,094) 19,034,471 (2,033) 2,270,274 3,552,857 (4,752,244) —	(18,587,376) — (22,250,685) 923,137 8,248 2,994,375 13,323,357 8,772,821 —
Net nonoperating expenses	(82,888,672)	(35,468,930)	(14,816,123)
Income before capital grants	96,073,072	101,524,292	112,797,521
Capital grants	7,443,539	18,663,468	11,439,537
Change in net assets	103,516,611	120,187,760	124,237,058
Total net assets – beginning	2,548,005,033	2,427,817,273	2,303,580,215
Total net assets – ending	\$ 2,651,521,644	2,548,005,033	2,427,817,273

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2011

A comparison of the operating revenues for fiscal years 2011 and 2010 shows an overall increase of 7%. The following revenue categories experienced increases: containerized 9%, dry bulk 15%, steel/break-bulk 26%, lumber terminals 51%; the following categories experienced decreases: petroleum and liquid bulk 5%, vehicle 1%, other terminals 4%, and miscellaneous income 33%.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

In terms of volume (measured in metric revenue tons), the following categories experienced increases from last year: containerized 5%, steel/break-bulk 32%, lumber 4%, dry bulk 21%; the following types of cargo decreased during fiscal year 2011: vehicles 21%, liquid bulk 1%.

Operating expenses (excluding depreciation and amortization) decreased \$16,603,718. Cargo facilities expense decreased \$2,339,279 due to major terminal reconfiguration projects are being conducted and consequently less maintenance is required; Infrastructure Maintenance that includes bridges, freeways, streets and utilities maintenance and expenses related to environmental control decreased \$11,825,121; Fire and Safety increased by \$1,951,710 due to higher city allocated charges; and general and administrative expenses decreased by \$5,231,033 primarily a reduction in legal cost.

Depreciation expense is affected by acquisition/retirement of long-term assets, their useful lives, and the dates when such assets are placed in service. Depreciation expense for fiscal year 2011 was \$1,614,083 lower than that of 2010. The reason for this change is the reduction in assets placed into service during 2011.

Intergovernmental transfer decreased by \$7,603,223 in fiscal year 2011. During the current fiscal year, the Department netted a gain of \$12,468,504 on the transfer of assets and liabilities related to the oil operations expenses of \$5,578,453 of Aquarium debt assistance and \$17,269,485 regular operating transfer from the Department to the City of Long Beach.

Investment expense, net of income decreased by \$9,564,408 in fiscal year 2011. Investment income was lower due to lower earning rates resulting from the overall downturn in the economy in addition to lower average investment balance. Interest expense was lower because of the replacement of some of the bonds with debt with more favorable rates; the principal reductions in long-term debt balances due to the annual debt service, and the continuation of the capitalization of interest policy that allocates some of the interest expense to capital projects.

Oil operations net revenues decreased to \$1,525,061 from \$19,034,471. The decrease is due to the measure D ballot initiative approved by voters in November 2010, by which the oil operations, assets, liabilities, revenues, and expenses were transferred from the Harbor Department to the City's Tidelands Fund. The implementation of the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) and its related projects experienced a negative change of \$7,125,716 from \$3,552,857 net revenue in 2010 to a net loss of \$3,572,859. The reduction is the result of lower revenue generated by the Clean Truck Program as it winds down into its final stage.

Loss on long-term receivables from the Redevelopment Agency of the City of Long Beach, California (the Agency) increased \$27,000,000, or 100%, due to the passage of Assembly Bill X1 26. The legislation guarantees tax funding for all Agency external debt, but does not provide for the repayment of most loans between the Harbor Department and the Agency.

Other expense, decreased as a result of writing off of expenses incurred in preparation of the potential construction of a new administration building.

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2010

A comparison of the operating revenues for fiscal years 2010 and 2009 shows an overall increase of 3%. The following revenue categories experienced increases: containerized 6% and other terminals 36%; the following

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

categories experienced decreases: petroleum and liquid bulk 6%, dry bulk 5%, steel 5%, rental 11%, and miscellaneous income 15%.

In terms of volume (measured in metric revenue tons), the following categories experienced increases from last year: containerized 14% and vehicles 12%, the following types of cargo decreased during fiscal year 2010: liquid bulk 2%, dry bulk 2%, steel 17%, and lumber 12%.

Operating expenses (excluding depreciation and amortization) increased \$146,098. Cargo facilities expense decreased \$397,379; Infrastructure Maintenance that includes bridges and freeways maintenance and expenses related to environmental control increased \$2,110,817 as a result of several major projects incurred during the year; Fire and Safety increased by \$1,877,622 due to higher city allocated charges; and general and administrative expenses decreased by \$3,481,868 primarily as a reduction in legal cost.

Depreciation expense is affected by acquisition/retirement of long-term assets, their useful lives, and the dates when such assets are placed in service. Depreciation expense for fiscal year 2010 was \$761,727 higher than that of 2009. The reason for this change is the increase in assets placed into service during 2010.

Intergovernmental transfer increased by \$11,863,785 in fiscal year 2010. The City of Long Beach requested, in addition to the historical 10% net income from the fiscal year 2009 operations, an additional transfer based on 10% net income of the fiscal year 2010 operations.

Investment expense, net of income increased by \$2,870,409 in fiscal year 2010. Investment income was lower due to lower earning rates resulting from the overall downturn in the economy in addition to lower average investment balance. Interest expense was lower because of the replacement of some of the bonds with debt with more favorable rates; the principal reductions in long-term debt balances due to the annual debt service, and the continuation of the capitalization of interest policy that allocates some of the interest expense to capital projects.

Oil operations net revenues increased to \$19,034,471 from \$923,137. The increase is due to the rise in oil prices and lower environmental remediation expenses during the 2010 fiscal year. The implementation of the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) and its related projects generated net income of \$3,552,857, which is a reduction from the \$13,323,357 net income generated during fiscal year 2009. The reduction is the result of lower revenue generated by the programs as a result of fewer noncompliant trucks paying fees to call at the Port.

Other income, net decreased as a result of the impact of a onetime settlement of \$6,008,679 received in fiscal year 2009 and the payment during fiscal year 2010 for the Aquarium of the Pacific Debt Service Assistance requested by the City Manager.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

#### **Capital Assets and Debt Administration**

#### Capital Assets

The Department's investments in capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation, as of September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009 are as follows:

#### Capital Assets, Net

September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009

	2011	2010	2009
Nondepreciable capital assets:			
Land	\$ 867,894,358	859,887,738	859,833,899
Construction in progress	489,936,597	373,062,744	180,699,622
Rights-of-way	207,823,264	207,823,264	207,823,264
Total nondepreciable capital			
assets	1,565,654,219	1,440,773,746	1,248,356,785
Depreciable capital assets (net):			
Structures and facilities	921,213,659	947,218,015	990,471,192
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	12,078,372	12,340,820	10,939,832
Total depreciable capital assets			
(net)	933,292,031	959,558,835	1,001,411,024
Total capital assets, net	\$ 2,498,946,250	2,400,332,581	2,249,767,809

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2011

The Department's investments in capital assets include land; structures and facilities; furniture, fixtures, and equipment; construction in progress; and rights-of-way. The net effect on the capital asset accounts was an increase of \$98,613,669 from 2010 primarily due to asset acquisitions offset by depreciation. Information regarding the Department's capital assets can be found in note 6 of the financial statements.

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2010

The Department's investments in capital assets include land; structures and facilities; furniture, fixtures, and equipment; construction in progress; and rights-of-way. The net effect on the capital asset accounts was an increase of \$150,564,772 from 2009 primarily due to asset acquisitions offset by depreciation. Information regarding the Department's capital assets can be found in note 6 of the financial statements.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

#### **Debt Administration**

The following table summarizes the Department's debt, originally incurred as long term, as of September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009. For consistency purposes, this schedule includes the current portion.

#### Debt Originally Incurred as Long-Term Debt

September 30, 2011, 2010, and 2009

	_	2011	2010	2009
Bond debt (principal and net premiums) Commercial paper outstanding	\$	723,242,147	768,287,610	802,927,145 31,400,000
Total long-term debt	\$	723,242,147	768,287,610	834,327,145

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2011

The Department's total long-term debt decreased by \$45,045,463, or 6.0%. The decrease was primarily the result of scheduled principal reductions on the bond debt.

The underlying ratings assigned to the Department's bond issues are as follows: Standard & Poor's: AA, stable outlook; Moody's Investors Services: Aa2, stable outlook; and Fitch Ratings: AA, stable outlook. In May 2011, Fitch Ratings affirmed the AA with a stable outlook rating on the Port's outstanding debt. The Fitch report states, "The Port's terminal facilities are modern and contiguous, and have excellent access to intermodal transportation facilities, including on-dock rail, near-dock rail, and direct connections to the national rail network through the Alameda Corridor, and the Southern California system of freeways. The Port benefits from a strong financial profile, with a healthy liquidity position (fiscal 2010 liquidity of \$407 million, representing 1,518 days cash on hand): strong and stable revenue sources through long-term lease agreements with most tenants (minimum annual lease payments represent approximately 67% of total operation revenues at the port, 2.7 times (x) 2010 debt service obligations); and strong debt service coverage levels over 2.8x. Management at the port is experienced and has been proactive in addressing economic, financial, environmental, and community challenges..."

In July 2011, Standard & Poor's Ratings Services affirmed it is AA with a stable outlook rating on the Port's debt. The S&P report states "The long-term ratings reflect our view of the following credit strengths: Strong historical financial performance, with debt service coverage of 2.8x in fiscal 2010 (year ended September 30, 2010); Excellent liquidity of about \$478 million in unrestricted cash, representing 1,779 days' operation funds on hand, based on fiscal 2010 operation expenses; substantial cargo-handling facilities and surface transportation connections, which support the port's position as the second-busiest container port in the United States; and an experienced management team that implements conservative financial practices."

The debt service coverage ratio for both fiscal years ended 2011 and 2010 was 3.4 and 2.8, respectively. The minimum rate required by the Department's various bond indenture documents is 1.25. Additional information on the Department's long-term debt can be found in notes 7 and 8, on pages 52 - 61 of this report.

Management's Discussion and Analysis September 30, 2011 and 2010 (Unaudited)

#### Analysis of Fiscal Year 2010

The Department's total long-term debt decreased by \$66,039,535, or 7.92%. The decrease was the result of scheduled principal reductions on the bond debt, the payoff of the 2000A revenue bonds; the issuance of the 2010A (new debt), and the issuance of the 2010B issued to partially redeem the 2002B, 2004A, and the 2005A bonds; and the retirement of the outstanding commercial paper.

In March 2010, 2010A Harbor Revenue Bonds were sold in the par amount of \$200,835,000 at a premium of \$17,616,844 for a total sale amount of \$218,451,844. The all-in-true interest cost (TIC) of the new 2010A Bonds was 3.7375%.

In April 2010, 2010B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds were sold in the par amount of \$158,085,000 at a premium of \$15,459,114 for a total sale amount of \$173,544,114. The refunding was the result of a tender solicitation of Bond Series 2002B, 2004A, and 2005A that was launched on March 24, 2010. After careful evaluation of the offers received by the April 27, 2010 deadline, and in consultation with the Department's financial advisor and underwriters, the Department accepted \$153,575,000 in par amount, which was about 51% of the bonds targeted for tender. The TIC of the new 2010B Bonds was 3.8939%.

In May 2010, the Department redeemed, with available moneys, the \$214,770,000 outstanding balance of the Series 2000A Bonds after making the scheduled principal payment of \$9,010,000 on that date. These bonds were callable on May 15, 2010, or thereafter and set to mature from May 15, 2011 through and including May 15, 2025. The redemption price was equal to 101% of the principal amount, plus accrued interest as of the date of the redemption.

The above-mentioned bond restructuring resulted in a present value savings of \$24.4 million net of all expense and cost of issuance.

The underlying ratings assigned to the Department's bond issues are as follows: Standard & Poor's: AA, stable outlook; Moody's Investors Services: Aa2, stable outlook; and Fitch Ratings: AA, stable outlook. During 2010, Fitch Ratings affirmed the AA rating on the Port's outstanding debt. The Fitch report states, "'AA' rating reflects the Port's dominant position as the nation's second largest container port; its geographic proximity to a very large population base with 50% of cargo destined for the greater Los Angeles metropolitan area; excellent intermodal access to rail networks and interstate highways; the Port's history of maintaining a healthy balance sheet and liquidity position, with 2,479 days cash on hand for fiscal 2009; prudent management of long-term lease agreements to stabilize operating revenues, mitigate market volatility, and limit downside financial risk; the Port's modern and contiguous facilities; and the presence of diverse terminal operators and shippers in operation at the Port."

Management's Discussion and Analysis
September 30, 2011 and 2010
(Unaudited)

In March 2010, Moody's Investors Service affirmed its Aa2 rating on the Port's debt. The Moody's report states the Port's strengths include: "Strong market position as the second largest port in the U.S. by TEU (twenty-foot equivalent units) count, Port also benefits from a naturally deep harbor, 50-foot channel depth, state-of-the-art facilities, and good road access and intermodal connectivity through the Alameda Corridor and Intermodal Container Transport Facility. A robust local market contributes to the Port's competitive position, giving it a large, relatively stable demand base for imports and by generating 'backhaul' cargo to partially balance the large import operations. Track record of well-maintained and stable finances with debt service coverage averaging 3.1 times in recent years and ample operating cash reserves equivalent to over seven years of operations. Revenue stability is enhanced by long-term contracts with the Port's major tenants (that contribute 95% of revenues) that include minimum annual guarantees (MAGS) amounting to \$223 million in FY 2009. MAGS alone provided 1.5x debt service coverage (net of operating expenditures)."

The debt service coverage ratio for both fiscal years ended 2010 and 2009 was 2.8. The minimum rate required by the Department's various bond indenture documents is 1.25. Additional information on the Department's long-term debt can be found in notes 7 and 8, on pages 52-61 of this report.

#### Notes to Financial Statements

The notes to the Department's financial statements can be found on pages 37-79 of this report. These notes provide additional information that is essential to a full understanding of the financial statements.

#### Requests for Information

This financial report is designed to provide a general overview of the Department's finances for people or entities interested in the financial aspects of the Port. Questions concerning any of the information provided in this report or requests for additional financial information should be addressed to the Chief Financial Officer, 925 Harbor Plaza, Long Beach, CA 90802.

#### Statements of Net Assets

# September 30, 2011 and 2010

Assets	2011	2010
Current assets: Pooled cash and cash equivalents (note 2) Trade accounts receivable, net of allowance (note 3) Interest receivable Nonperforming investments Due from other governmental agencies (note 3) Prepaid – dredging services (note 4) Inventories of supplies	40,418,940 201,374 2,228,927 5,537,874 6,122,866 501,906	407,713,313 52,895,863 199,926 2,228,927 9,987,366 23,493,748 575,601
Subtotal	604,531,883	497,094,744
Harbor Revenue Bond Funds and other funds restricted as to use (notes 2 and 8):  Pooled cash and cash equivalents	99,058,000	82,516,235
Total current assets	703,589,883	579,610,979
Noncurrent assets: Capital assets (notes 6 and 10): Land: Purchased Constructed	448,936,517 418,957,841	440,929,897 418,957,841
Total land	867,894,358	859,887,738
Structures and facilities Less accumulated depreciation	2,105,748,451 (1,184,534,792)	2,051,109,151 (1,103,891,136)
Net structures and facilities	921,213,659	947,218,015
Furniture, fixtures, and equipment Less accumulated depreciation	36,415,502 (24,337,130)	33,049,108 (20,708,288)
Net furniture, fixtures, and equipment	12,078,372	12,340,820
Construction in progress Right-of-way (note 5)	489,936,597 207,823,264	373,062,744 207,823,264
Net capital assets	2,498,946,250	2,400,332,581
Other assets:  Long-term receivables (note 3)  Oil facilities (net of accumulated depletion of \$0 and	1,300,000	28,300,000
\$68,592,461, respectively) Environmental mitigation credits (note 15) Investment in joint venture (note 11) Restricted pooled cash and cash equivalents (notes 2 and 8) Restricted nonpooled cash and cash equivalents (note 2) Restricted nonpooled investments (note 2) Other noncurrent assets	44,278,068 6,167,925 170,281,150 208,731 63,449,448 3,865,938	12,543,393 44,278,068 9,167,925 324,936,417 312,100 63,328,523 822,150
Total other assets	289,551,260	483,688,576
Total noncurrent assets	2,788,497,510	2,884,021,157
Total assets \$	3,492,087,393	3,463,632,136

Statements of Net Assets (continued)

September 30, 2011 and 2010

Liabilities	_	2011	2010
Current liabilities payable from current assets: Accounts payable and accrued expenses Liability claims (note 12) Deferred credits and unearned revenue Due to City of Long Beach (note 14) Current portion of environmental remediation (note 13)	\$	67,165,464 5,000,000 14,691,278 17,269,485	43,610,792 11,300,000 14,981,339 25,322,459 12,500,546
Total current liabilities payable from current assets	_	104,126,227	107,715,136
Current liabilities payable from restricted assets: Current portion of bonds indebtedness (note 8) Accrued interest – bonds	_	44,815,000 13,197,375	42,175,000 14,624,357
Total current liabilities payable from restricted assets	_	58,012,375	56,799,357
Total current liabilities	_	162,138,602	164,514,493
Long-term obligations net of current portion: Bonded indebtedness (note 8) Oil wells abandonment (note 12)	_	678,427,147	726,112,610 25,000,000
Total noncurrent liabilities	_	678,427,147	751,112,610
Total liabilities		840,565,749	915,627,103
Net Assets (Note 16)			
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt Restricted – nonrelated-party debt service contingency and		1,929,398,050	1,859,165,959
matching contribution for federally funded projects (note 12) Restricted – capital projects Restricted – debt service Unrestricted	_	116,452,755 44,278,068 16,805,625 544,587,146	147,301,520 44,278,068 16,263,942 480,995,544
Total net assets	\$ _2	2,651,521,644	2,548,005,033

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

Statements of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Fund Assets Years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010

	_	2011	2010
Port operating revenues (note 10): Berths and special facilities Rental properties Miscellaneous	\$	328,986,839 14,137,546 2,265,321	303,995,596 14,278,731 3,364,658
Total Port operating revenues	_	345,389,706	321,638,985
Port operating expenses: Facility maintenance Infrastructure maintenance Fire and safety Other indirect operating General and administrative		2,964,027 12,584,887 27,866,007 7,256,656 30,751,029	5,303,306 24,410,008 25,914,297 6,416,651 35,982,062
Total Port operating expenses before depreciation and amortization		81,422,606	98,026,324
Depreciation and amortization	_	85,005,356	86,619,439
Total Port operating expenses	<u>-</u>	166,427,962	184,645,763
Income from Port operations	-	178,961,744	136,993,222
Nonoperating revenues (expenses): Investment income, net Interest expense Income from oil operations Gain (loss) on disposition of capital assets Income from equity in joint venture (note 11) Clean Trucks Program (net) Other income (expense)	_	4,993,947 (20,550,633) 1,525,061 74,459 — (3,572,859) (27,979,213)	7,930,634 (33,051,728) 19,034,471 (2,033) 2,270,274 3,552,857 (4,752,244)
Total nonoperating revenues (expenses)	_	(45,509,238)	(5,017,769)
Income before capital grants and transfers		133,452,506	131,975,453
Capital grants Operating transfers to City (note 14) Oil operations transfer to City (note 1(h)) Loss on long-term receivables from the Redevelopment Agency	-	7,443,539 (22,847,938) 12,468,504 (27,000,000)	18,663,468 (30,451,161) ———————————————————————————————————
Increase in net assets		103,516,611	120,187,760
Total net assets – beginning of year	-	2,548,005,033	2,427,817,273
Total net assets – end of year	\$	2,651,521,644	2,548,005,033

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

## Statements of Cash Flows

Years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010

	-	2011	2010
Cash flows from operating activities: Cash received from customers Cash paid to employees net of capitalized labor of \$7,691,389 and \$6,045,870 million in 2011	\$	352,901,232	311,787,989
and 2010 Cash paid to suppliers		(42,119,746) (49,836,049)	(40,078,172) (61,103,144)
Net cash provided by operating activities	_	260,945,437	210,606,673
Cash flows from investing activities: Harbor oil operations Interest received Distribution from joint venture	_	8,404,083 4,982,266 3,000,000	29,792,303 9,286,006 4,000,000
Net cash provided by investing activities	_	16,386,349	43,078,309
Cash flows from noncapital/financing activities: ACTA shortfall advance Clean Air Action Plan Operating transfers to Tidelands and other funds	<u>.</u>	(2,950,000) (3,530,628) (30,900,911)	139,830 (22,092,651)
Net cash (used in) noncapital financing activities	-	(37,381,539)	(21,952,821)
Cash flows from capital and related financing activities: Grants (used) provided Interest paid, net of capitalized interest Payments for capital acquisitions Principal payment-commercial paper Principal payments-bond Proceeds from bonds Proceeds from sales of capital assets		390,264 (37,885,884) (156,764,274) — (42,175,000) — 74,459	(1,002,177) (41,188,776) (214,875,278) (31,400,000) (408,465,000) 373,825,465
Net cash (used) by capital and related financing activities	<del>-</del>	(236,360,435)	(323,105,766)
Net increase (decrease) in cash and cash equivalents	<del>-</del>	3,589,812	(91,373,605)
Cash and cash equivalents, October 1	_	815,478,065	906,851,670
Cash and cash equivalents, September 30	\$	819,067,877	815,478,065
Unrestricted pooled cash and cash equivalents Restricted pooled cash and cash equivalents 2000 bond reserve held by the City Treasurer	\$	549,519,996 269,339,150 208,731	407,713,313 407,452,652 312,100
	\$	819,067,877	815,478,065
Reconciliation of income from Port operations to net cash provided by operating activities: Income from Port operations Adjustments to reconcile income from Port operations to net cash provided by operating activities:	\$_	178,961,744	136,993,222
Depreciation and amortization Bad debt expense Decrease (Increase) in accounts receivable Decrease in inventory Decrease in accounts payable (Decrease) Increase in deferred revenues (Decrease) Increase in customer deposits (Decrease) Increase in environmental remediation (Decrease) Increase in due to other funds	_	85,005,356 (2,226,747) 7,801,587 73,692 (1,434,794) (290,061) (13,901) (6,931,439)	86,619,439 2,421,714 (9,860,484) 51,115 (2,927,795) 4,743,314 19,591 (6,573,466) (879,977)
Total adjustments	<u>-</u>	81,983,693	73,613,451
Net cash provided by operating activities	\$	260,945,437	210,606,673
Supplemental schedule of noncash transactions:  Change in accrued capital asset costs (purchased but unpaid at year-end) Oil operation transfers to the City Capitalized interest Capitalized dredging expenses Adjustment for reimbursement from the City Amortization of Bond Premium Other	\$	18,060,835 12,468,504 13,060,601 ————————————————————————————————————	1,980,860 

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (1) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

### (a) The Reporting Entity

Article XII of the City Charter of the City of Long Beach, California (the City) created the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach (the Department) to promote and develop the Port of Long Beach (the Port). The Department's operations are included in the City's reporting entity as an enterprise fund; its activities are conducted in the Tidelands Trust area of the City and are subject to coastal area laws of the State of California and to the terms of the trust agreement between the City and the State of California.

The Harbor Facilities Corporation (the Corporation), a nonprofit public benefit corporation, has been inactive since 1995 and did not have any activity during the 2011 and 2010 fiscal years. If the Corporation would have any transactions with financial implications, they would be included in the Department's financial statements.

The Department, together with the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles, formed a joint venture to finance the construction of the Intermodal Container Transfer Facility (ICTF). The ICTF venture has been recorded as an investment under the equity method of accounting in the accompanying financial statements (see note 11).

In 1989, the cities of Los Angeles and Long Beach entered into a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement to create the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority (ACTA). This agreement was amended and restated in 1996. The purpose of ACTA was to acquire, construct, finance, and operate the Alameda Corridor. The Alameda Corridor consists of a 20-mile-long rail cargo expressway connecting the ports in San Pedro Bay to the transcontinental rail yards near downtown Los Angeles and it began operating in April 2004. ACTA prepares its own financial statements, and its transactions are not included as part of the Department's financial statements.

## (b) Basis of Accounting and Measurement Focus

Disbursement of funds derived from the Department's operations is restricted to Harbor Trust Agreement purposes. The costs of providing port services are recovered entirely through leases, tariffs, and other charges assessed to Department's tenants. Consistent with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles for enterprise funds, the accounting policies of the Department conform to the accrual basis of accounting. The measurement focus of the accompanying financial statements is on the determination of changes in net assets and changes in financial position. Operating revenues and expenses are generated and incurred through cargo activities performed by port tenants; operating expenses include maintenance of facilities and infrastructure, security, and payments to other City departments for services provided to the Port. Administration and depreciation expenses are also considered operating expenses. Other revenues and expenses not included in the above categories are reported as nonoperating income (expense). The Department applies all applicable Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) pronouncements and all Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB) statements and interpretations issued on or before November 30, 1989, except for those that conflict with or contradict GASB pronouncements.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

The Department recognizes operating revenues when they are earned. Proceeds from federal or state grants are considered as nonoperating revenues, recognized as such when reimbursable expenses are incurred, and are identified as capital grants in the statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net assets. Operating revenues or capital grant funds that have either been billed or received but not earned are identified as deferred credits and unearned revenue in the statements of net assets.

## (c) Pooled Cash and Cash Equivalents

In accordance with City Charter requirements, the Department pools its available cash with that of the City. The City's cash management pool is used essentially as a demand deposit account by the participating City organizational units. For purposes of the statements of cash flows, the Department defines cash and cash equivalents as pooled cash and investments, including restricted pooled cash and investments and short-term, easily convertible to cash, nonpooled investments. Investment decisions are made by the City Treasurer and approved by an investment committee whose membership includes members of the Department's management ranks.

Investment income and gains/losses arising from such pooled cash and investments are apportioned to each participating unit based on the relationship of the unit's average daily cash balances to the aggregate pooled cash and investments. The Department's share of pooled cash and investments, as of September 30, 2011 and 2010, is stated at fair value (see note 2).

### (d) Nonpooled Cash and Cash Equivalents

The Department considers all highly liquid investments with an original maturity date of three months or less to be cash and cash equivalents.

#### (e) Investments

Investments are reflected at fair value using quoted market prices. Realized and unrealized gains and losses are included in the accompanying statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net assets as investment income, net.

## (f) Inventories

Inventories of supplies are valued at the lower of average cost or market.

### (g) Capital Assets

An asset is classified as a capital asset if it is a nonconsumable, tangible item, valued at a single amount greater than \$5,000, and with a useful life of more than one year. Capital assets are valued at historical costs. The historical cost of acquiring an asset includes the cost necessarily incurred to bring it to the condition and location necessary for its intended use. If an asset requires a period of time in which to carry out the activities necessary to bring it to that condition and location, the interest cost incurred during that period as a result of expenditures is a part of the historical cost of acquiring the asset. Depreciation is determined using the straight-line method with no allowance for salvage values. Identifiable intangible assets are recognized as such if they are separable or when they arise from contractual or other legal right, regardless of whether those rights are transferable or separable from the entity, or from other rights and obligations. An intangible asset will be capitalized if the asset has a useful life of more than one year and an acquisition cost exceeding the

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

capitalization threshold of \$100,000. Amortization of intangible assets will follow the policies set for tangible assets with the following additional considerations: there is no mandated maximum amortization period; intangible assets with indefinite useful life should not be amortized; and the carrying value of the intangible asset, if any, following the recognition of any impairment loss should be amortized in subsequent reporting periods over the remaining estimated useful life of the asset. When appropriate, provision for obsolescence is recognized by charging depreciation at an accelerated rate on specific assets. The estimated economic lives used to determine annual rates of depreciation are subject to periodic review and revision, if appropriate, to assure that the cost of the respective assets will be written off over their economic lives. Estimated useful lives used in the computation of depreciation of capital assets are as follows:

α.		1	c	1
V fmi	ctures	and	1 201	lifiac.
v) uu	CLUI Co	anu	Iaci	mucs.

50 - 75 years
40 years
20 - 50 years
10 - 50 years
5-50 years
3 - 30 years
2-30 years

The Harbor Department incurred interest cost in fiscal year 2011 of \$33,611,085 of which \$13,060,452 was capitalized. The Harbor Department incurred interest cost in fiscal year 2010 of \$40,109,601 of which \$7,057,873 was capitalized.

## (h) Oil Operation

Oil facilities are valued at historical cost plus estimated future oil facilities abandonment costs. Abandonment costs are separately recorded as a liability. Oil field depletion is determined using the number of units produced in the fiscal year divided by future unit production of the oil field. In 2011, as a result of the measure D ballot initiative, the Department transferred all oil assets and liabilities to the City's Tidelands Fund. The transfer resulted in a onetime gain of \$12,468,504, which was reported as nonoperating income.

### (i) Investments in Joint Ventures

Investments in joint power authorities are accounted for using the equity method.

## (j) Compensated Absences

The Department records all accrued employee benefits, including accumulated vacation and sick leave, as a liability in the period when the benefits are earned. Accrued employee benefits are treated as a current liability for financial statement presentation.

### (k) Pension Plan and Postretirement Benefits

All full-time Department employees are members of the State of California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS). The Department's policy is to fund all accrued pension costs. These costs are determined annually as of October 1 by CalPERS and are incorporated into the payroll

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

burden rate reimbursable to the City's Employee Benefits Internal Service Fund. The Department participates in the City's Retired Employee Health Insurance Program. This program is a single-employer defined benefit healthcare plan.

### (l) Allowance for Doubtful Accounts Receivable

The allowance for doubtful accounts (allowance) is estimated at a level to absorb expected accounts receivable losses. Allowance is established to reflect the amount of the Department's receivables that management estimates will be uncollectible. The allowance is set at the greater of: (1) one half of one percent (0.5%) of estimated annual operating revenues or (2) the sum of 75% of aged receivable amounts over 120 days delinquent, plus 50% of amounts over 90 days delinquent, plus 25% of amounts over 60 days delinquent, plus 10% of amounts over 30 days delinquent. In addition, management reviews the adequacy of the allowance on a monthly basis by reviewing the aging report and assesses whether any further adjustment is necessary.

To determine uncollectibility, the Department's Finance Division reviews all delinquent accounts in August of each year. Amounts deemed uncollectible are proposed to be written off. The balances of the allowance for uncollectible accounts receivable for the fiscal years 2011 and 2010 were \$1,726,948 and \$3,949,707, respectively (see note 3).

## (m) Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amount of assets and liabilities and the disclosure of contingent assets and liabilities as of the date of the financial statements. Actual results could differ from those estimates.

## (n) Reclassifications

Certain amounts reported in fiscal year 2010 have been reclassified to conform to the fiscal year 2011 presentation. Such reclassifications have no effect on the previously reported change in net assets.

## (o) Net Assets

The Department has adopted a policy of generally utilizing restricted funds, prior to unrestricted funds, when an expense is incurred for purposes for which both are available.

The Department's net assets are classified into the following net asset categories:

Invested in Capital Assets, Net of Related Debt – Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and outstanding principal balances of debt attributable to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of those assets.

Restricted – Expendable – Net assets subject to externally imposed conditions or constraints that can be fulfilled by the actions of the Department or by the passage of time. The restrictions are externally imposed by creditors, grantors, contributors, laws or regulations of other governments, or by law through constitutional provisions or enabling legislation.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Unrestricted – All other categories of net assets. Additionally, unrestricted net assets may be designated for use by management of the Department. These requirements limit the area of operations for which expenditures of net assets may be made and require that unrestricted net assets be designated to support future operations in these areas. The future funding commitments of the Department related to the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) are a primary example of unrestricted net assets with designated uses (see note 12).

## (2) Cash, Cash Equivalents, and Other Investments

The Department's cash and cash equivalents and investments as of September 30, 2011 and 2010 are classified in the accompanying statements of net assets as follows:

	2011	2010
Pooled cash and cash equivalents Pooled cash and cash equivalents, restricted	\$ 549,519,996 269,339,150	407,713,313 407,452,652
Total pooled cash and cash equivalents	818,859,146	815,165,965
Bond reserves held by fiscal agents: Nonpooled cash and cash equivalents Nonpooled investments	208,731 63,449,448	312,100 63,328,523
Total bond reserves held by fiscal agents	63,658,179	63,640,623
Total pooled cash and cash equivalents and bond reserves held by fiscal agents	\$ 882,517,325	878,806,588

The majority of the Department's cash and investments, including restricted cash and investments, are pooled with other City funds and maintained by the City Treasurer. The City Charter requires the Department to participate in the City Treasurer's pool. The Department's portion of the City's total pooled cash and cash equivalents amount as of September 30, 2011 and 2010 was \$818,859,146 or 46.67% and \$815,165,965 or 50.21%, respectively. The Department's bond reserves held by fiscal agents, as of September 30, 2011, were \$63,658,179; for the 2004, 2005, 2010A, and 2010B bonds. As of September 30, 2010 bond reserves were \$63,640,623 and pertained to the 2004, 2005, 2010A and 2010B. The City's investment policy authorizes the pool to invest in obligations issued or guaranteed by the federal government and its agencies and instrumentalities as well as in commercial paper rated A-1 by Standard & Poor's Corporation or P-1 by Moody's Commercial Paper Record, bankers' acceptances, repurchase agreements, reverse repurchase agreements, bank certificate of deposits, the State Treasurer's Local Agency Investment Fund, and shares of beneficial interest (mutual funds) issued by diversified management companies.

It is the policy of the City Treasurer to invest funds in a manner that will provide the highest investment return with the maximum security while meeting the daily cash flow demands of the City and its Departments and to conform to all state and local statutes governing the investment of public funds, using the "prudent person" standard for managing the overall portfolio. The primary objective of the policy is safety of principal, liquidity, yield, and maintaining the public trust. Individual departmental cash deposits and investments within this pool cannot be specifically identified among the participating units. Interest

41

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

income and gains and losses earned on pooled cash and investments are allocated monthly to the various pool participants based on their average daily cash balances.

## (a) Investments Authorized by the California Government Code and the City's Investment Policy

The table below identifies the investment types that are authorized for the City by the City's investment policy. The table also identifies certain provisions of the City's investment policy that address interest rate risk, credit risk, and concentration of credit risk. This table does not address debt proceeds held by bond trustee, which are governed by the provisions of debt agreements of the City, rather than the general provision of the California Government Code or the City's investment policy.

Authorized investment type	Maximum maturity	Maximum percentage of portfolio	Maximum investment in one issuer
Bonds issued by the City	5 years *	30%	None
U.S. Treasury notes, bonds, or bills	5 years *	None	None
Registered state warrants or			
treasury notes or bonds of the			
State of California	5 years *	30%	None
Local agency bonds	5 years *	30	None
Federal agency securities	5 years *	40	None
Banker's acceptances	180 days	40	30%
Commercial paper	270 days	25	10
Negotiable certificates of deposit	5 years *	30	10
Time certificates of deposit	5 years *	100	10
Repurchase agreements	90 days	100	None
Reverse repurchase agreements	92 days	20	None
Securities lending program	92 days	20	None
Medium-term notes	5 years *	30	10%
Money market funds	N/A	20	10
Local agency investment			\$40 million per
fund (LAIF)	N/A	None	account
Asset-backed securities	5 years	20%	None
Mortgage-backed securities	5 years	20	None

<sup>\*</sup> Maximum maturity of 5 years unless a longer maturity is approved by the City Council, either specifically or as part of an investment program, at least 3 months prior to purchase.

## (b) Investments Authorized by Debt Agreement

Investment of debt proceeds held by bond trustee is governed by provisions of the debt agreements.

### (c) Interest Rate Risk

Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in market interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. Generally, the longer the maturity of an investment, the greater the sensitivity of its fair value to changes in market interest rates. One of the ways that the City manages its exposure to

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

interest rate risk is by purchasing a combination of shorter term and longer term investments, and by timing cash flows from maturities so that a portion of the portfolio is maturing or coming closer to maturing evenly over time as necessary to provide cash flow and liquidity need for operations. The following schedule indicates the interest rate risk of the City's investments, which includes the amount the fund has invested with the City as of September 30 (in thousands):

		201	1		201	0
Investment type		Fair value	Weighted average maturity (in years)		Fair value	Weighted average maturity (in years)
Cash and investments in City						
pool:						
Interdepartment loan						
(Health SAVERS)	\$	2,111	7.564	\$	2,383	8.600
U.S. Treasury notes		224,058	1.020		333,400	0.510
Federal agency securities		1,199,476	1.090		1,136,278	1.040
Money Market Accounts		704	0.003		137	0.003
LAIF		150,096	0.003		50,116	0.003
Government managed rate						
account	_			_	219	0.003
Subtotal		1,576,445			1,522,533	
Cash and deposits		192,012			113,126	
Outstanding checks		(14,303)			(12,168)	
oustaining theories	_	(1.,000)		-	(12,100)	
Total	\$_	1,754,154		\$_	1,623,491	
Nonperforming short-term	_			_		
investment	\$	3,962		\$	3,962	

43

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

The following schedule indicates the interest rate risk of the Department's cash held by fiscal agent:

		201	11		201	10
	_	Fair value (000's)	Weighted average maturity (in years)	_	Fair value (000's)	Weighted average maturity (in years)
Nonpooled investments – Fiscal Agent: 2004 Reserve: Federal Agency						
Securities					_	
AIG Matched Funding	\$_	11,373	6.62	\$_	11,373	7.62
	_	11,373		_	11,373	
2005 Reserve: Federal Agency						
Securities		5,184	2.29		3,130	2.00
U.S. Treasury Notes	_	11,812	1.59	_	13,826	1.54
	_	16,996		_	16,956	
2010A Reserve: Federal Agency						
Securities	_	19,216	2.68	_	19,200	2.90
2010B Reserve: Federal Agency						
Securities	_	15,864	2.68	_	15,800	2.90
Total	\$	63,449		\$_	63,329	

## (d) Investments with Fair Values Highly Sensitive to Interest Rate Risk

The City had no investments with values that were highly sensitive to interest rate risk as of September 30, 2011 and 2010. Highly sensitive investments are investments whose sensitivity to market interest rate fluctuations are not fully addressed by use of one of the five methods for reporting interest rate risk.

### (e) Risks and Uncertainties

The City may invest in various types of investment securities. Investment securities are exposed to various risks, such as interest rate, market, and credit risks. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities, it is at least reasonably possible that changes in the values of investment securities will occur in the near term and that such changes could materially affect the amounts reported in the statements of financial position.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

The City invests in securities with contractual cash flows, such as asset-backed securities and mortgage-backed securities. The value, liquidity, and related income of these securities are sensitive to change in economic conditions, including real estate value, delinquencies or defaults, or both, and may be adversely affected by shifts in the market's perception of the issuers and changes in interest rates.

## (f) Disclosures Relating to Credit Risk

Generally, credit risk is the risk that an issuer of an investment will not fulfill its obligation to the holder of the investment. This is measured by the assignment of a rating by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization. The minimum rating requirements for commercial paper, asset-backed securities, and medium-term notes is an A rating. Mortgage-backed security issues must have a minimum AAA rating. State warrants, state treasury notes, or bonds of the State are to be rated at a minimum of A1/Sp-1 for short-term investments and Aa/AA for long-term investments.

Presented on the following page is the minimum rating required by the California Government Code, the City's investment policy, and the actual rating as of year-end for each investment type (in thousands):

Dating as of year and 2011

	Rating as of year-end 2011							
City's pooled investments investment type	Minimum legal rating	_		Not required to be rated	AAA	<b>AA</b> +	Unrated	
Cash and investments in city pool:  Interdepartment loan								
(Health SAVERS)	N/A	\$	2,111	2,111	_	_	_	
U.S. Treasury notes	N/A		224,058	224,058	_	_		
Federal agency securities Money market	N/A		1,199,476	_	_	1,199,476	_	
account	N/A		704	_	704	_	_	
LAIF	N/A		150,096				150,096	
Subtotal			1,576,445	226,169	704	1,199,476	150,096	
Cash and deposits			192,012	_	_	_	192,012	
Outstanding checks			(14,303)				(14,303)	
Total		\$_	1,754,154	226,169	704	1,199,476	327,805	
Nonperforming short-term investment	N/A	\$	3,962	_	_	_	3,962	

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

	Rating as of year-end 2010							
City's pooled investments investment type	Minimun legal rating	n _	No require be ra	ed to	A-1	AAA	AA-	Unrated
Cash and investments in city pool:  Interdepartment loan								
(Health SAVERS)	N/A	\$ 2,	383 2,3	383 —	_	_	_	_
U.S. Treasury notes	N/A	333,	400 333,4	400 —		_	_	_
Federal agency								
securities	N/A	1,136,	278		_	1,136,278	_	_
Money market								
account	N/A		137		_	137	_	_
LAIF	N/A	50,	116 50,1	l 16 —	_	_	_	_
Government-managed								
rate account	N/A		219 2	219 —	<u> </u>			
Subtotal		1,522,	533 386,1		_	1,136,415	_	_
Cash and deposits		113,	126		_	_	_	113,126
Outstanding checks		(12,1						(12,168)
outstanding eneems		(12,1			_			(12,100)
Total		\$ 1,623,	491 386,1			1,136,415		100,958
Nonperforming short-term investment		\$ 3,	962		_	_	_	3,962

# (g) Concentration of Credit Risk

The investment policy of the City contains no limitations on the amount that can be invested in any one issuer beyond that stipulated by the California Government Code. Investments in any one issuer that represents 5% or more of the City's total pooled investments are as follows (in thousands):

		Reported amount				
Issuer	<b>Investment type</b>	 2011	2010			
Federal Farm Credit Bank Federal Home Loan Bank Federal Home Loan	Federal agency securities Federal agency securities	\$ 241,381 365,100	195,234 329,561			
Corporation Federal National	Federal agency securities	292,853	318,718			
Mortgage Association U.S. Treasury	Federal agency securities U.S. Treasury notes and	300,142	292,765			
Local Agency Investment	bonds	224,058	333,400			
Fund	State pool investment	150,096	50,116			

### (h) Custodial Credit Risk

Custodial credit risk for deposits is the risk that, in the event of failure of a depository financial institution, a government will not be able to recover its deposits or will not be able to recover collateral securities that are in the possession of an outside party. The custodial credit risk for investments is the risk that, in the event of the failure of the counterparty (e.g., broker/dealer) to a

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

transaction, a government will not be able to recover the value of its investment or collateral securities that are in the possession of another party. The California Government Code and the City's investment policy do not contain legal or policy requirements that would limit the exposure to custodial credit risk for deposits or investments, other than the following provision for deposits. The California Government Code requires that a financial institution secure deposits made by state or local government units by pledging securities in an undivided collateral pool held by a depository regulated under the state law (unless so waived by the governmental unit). The market value of the pledged securities in the collateral pool must equal at least 110% of the total amount deposited by the public agencies. California law also allows financial institutions to secure the City's deposits by pledging first trust deed mortgage notes having a value of 150% of the secured public deposits.

All securities owned by the City are deposited in trust for safekeeping with a custodial bank different from the City's primary bank except for one City-issued bond and investment in the State of California's Local Agency Investment Fund (LAIF).

As of September 30, 2011, the City reported deposits of \$192,012,000 less \$14,303,000 for checks outstanding. As of September 30, 2010, the City reported deposits of \$113,126,000 less \$12,168,000 for checks outstanding.

## (i) Investment in State Investment Pool

The City is a voluntary participant in the LAIF that is regulated by California Government Code Section 16429 under the oversight of the treasurer of the State of California. The fair value of the City's investment in this pool is reported in the City's financial statements at amounts based upon the City's pro rata share of the fair value provided by LAIF for the entire LAIF portfolio (in relation to the amortized cost of that portfolio). The balance available for withdrawal is based on the accounting records maintained by LAIF, which are recorded on an amortized-cost basis. Included in LAIF's investment portfolio are mortgage-backed securities, loans to certain state funds, securities with interest rates that vary according to changes in rates greater than a one-for-one basis, and structured basis.

### (j) Reverse Repurchase Agreements

There were no transactions involving reverse repurchase agreements during the fiscal years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010.

## (k) Securities Lending

The City did not engage in any securities lending programs for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010. Accordingly, in accordance with GASB Statement No. 28, *Accounting and Financial Reporting for Securities Lending Transactions*, no assets or liabilities have been recorded in the accompanying financial statements. However, from time to time, the City engages in limited securities lending activities. These activities are governed by formal agreement with the City's contract bank. This agreement limits the nature and amount of the transactions and provides for full collateralization of each transaction.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (3) Accounts Receivable and Other Receivables

Accounts receivable as of September 30 included the following:

		2011	2010
Trade accounts receivable Less allowance for doubtful accounts	\$	42,145,888 (1,726,948)	56,845,570 (3,949,707)
Accounts receivable, net	\$	40,418,940	52,895,863
Other receivables as of September 30 included the following:		2011	2010
Due from other governmental agencies: Current: Federal and state grants Federal Grants Port Security – 2002	\$	5,037,874 500,000	9,987,366
Total current	_	5,537,874	9,987,366
Long-term: Department of gas and oil Tidelands – Beaches and Waterways Redevelopment Agency – Convention Center	_	1,300,000	1,300,000 — 27,000,000
Total long-term		1,300,000	28,300,000
Total due from other governmental agencies	\$ _	6,837,874	38,287,366

# (a) Redevelopment Agency – Convention Center

In 1993, the Department advanced \$30,000,000 to the Long Beach Redevelopment Agency (the Agency) to fund construction costs related to the Long Beach Convention Center expansion project. Such advance was part of an amended agreement with the Agency to fund \$90,000,000 of the Long Beach Convention Center project and was to be repaid from revenue sources arising from future City transient occupancy tax revenues, payable in equal amounts over 17 years beginning October 1, 1997.

The agreement has been amended on several occasions. Most recently, during 2009, the Board of Harbor Commissioners approved to replace the existing \$27,435,000 balance due from the Agency with another loan payable by the Agency. The new loan agreement stipulated that on October 1, 2009, \$435,000 of the Agency's debt, plus any interest owed on the Agency's debt shall be forgiven. The remaining balance of \$27,000,000 was converted to a new (RDA – 2009 West Long Beach Industrial Project Area) loan upon expenditure by the Harbor Department on government-purpose projects. The loan balance of \$27,000,000 has been written off as of September 30, 2011 as the result of Assembly Bill 1X 26 which is discussed below in item (c).

48 (Continued)

2011

2010

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (b) Redevelopment Agency – Aquarium

During 2009, the Board of Harbor Commissioners approved the Long Beach City Manager's request for assistance with \$8.1 million of the Aquarium debt service. An agreement was entered into between the Agency and the Board of Harbor Commissioners whereby repayment of the \$8.1 million will be payable from "Middle Harbor Additional Tax Increment" received by the Agency. The reimbursement from the Redevelopment Agency is contingent upon the Department developing port terminal and related facilities referred to as "the Middle Harbor Project," which incorporates Piers D, E, and F and certain infill areas that reside within the North Long Beach Redevelopment Project Area. \$2 million was recognized and paid as a transfer out to the City in fiscal year 2009. The remaining amount of \$6.1 million was recognized and paid in fiscal year 2010.

During 2010, the Board approved a request from the City Manager for a similar debt service assistance for fiscal year 2011 in the amount of \$5.6 million. This amount will be reimbursed by the RDA in a similar manner as the amounts paid in 2009 and 2010. This brings the total amount that will be due from the RDA North Long Beach project area to \$13.7 million after the Harbor Department incurs expenditures on government-purpose projects in that amount. Eligible expenditures of \$262,058 were incurred in the project area during 2011.

## (c) California Supreme Court Decision on Redevelopment Agencies

On December 29, 2011, the California Supreme Court (Court) upheld legislation that will result in the termination of redevelopment agencies statewide. Per the Court's decision, the Agency ceased to exist as of February 1, 2012. Consistent with the legislation, the City of Long Beach, California (the City) will become the successor agency for the Agency. The legislation guarantees tax funding for all Agency external debt, but does not provide for the repayment of most loans between the Department and the Agency, as a result, the Department has written off all amounts receivable from the Agency as of September 30, 2011.

## (4) Long Beach Harbor Dredging

The Harbor Department is undertaking an approximately \$54 million dredging project to improve navigation in harbor waters. The project began in 2010. Although there are four separate locations involved in the dredging project, the primary focus is deepening the inner turning basin south of the BP oil terminal to 76 feet, the same depth as the main channel. The project will be funded with approximately \$5.9 million of federal stimulus moneys and approximately \$48.1 million of revenues of the Harbor Department. During 2009, the Harbor Department advanced \$43.5 million to the Army Corps of Engineers as prepayment for the dredging costs of which \$3.6 million was subsequently refunded back to the Harbor Department; \$16.4 million of the advanced money was used during fiscal year 2010, \$17.4 was used during fiscal year 2011, thus leaving a remaining balance of \$6.1 million, which is recorded as a prepaid expenses at September 30, 2011.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (5) Alameda Corridor Right-of-Way Purchase

In December 1994, the Department and the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles (collectively, the Ports) executed the purchase of the rights-of-way needed for the development of the Alameda Corridor Project (the Project), which is a comprehensive transportation corridor between the Ports and the central Los Angeles area. The Ports purchased these rights, sharing the cost on a 50/50 basis, from the three railroad companies then serving the Ports: Union Pacific Railroad Company (Union Pacific), Southern Pacific Railroad Company (Southern Pacific), and Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad Companies (Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe). After the purchase, Southern Pacific merged into Union Pacific and Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe merged with Burlington Northern to form the Burlington Northern Santa Fe.

The total purchase comprised the right-of-way property from the three former railroad companies and a drill track from Southern Pacific to provide an additional right-of-way to access local businesses along the Project. As of September 30, 2011 and 2010, total costs to the Department related to the rights-of-way purchase amounted to \$207.8 million for both years.

Construction of the Project began in 1997 and it was completed in April 2002. Funding for the Project came from federal, state, and local sources, and from issuance of debt.

Repayment to the Ports for their investments in the right-of-way and for any advances provided to the Project will occur only after the Project has generated revenues sufficient to retire all debt and to fund a maintenance reserve (see note 12).

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# (6) Capital Assets

Description		Balance, October 1, 2010	Additions	Disposals	Transfers	Balance, September 30, 2011
Nondepreciable capital assets:						
Purchased land	\$	440,929,897	8,006,620	_	_	448,936,517
Constructed land		418,957,841	_	_	_	418,957,841
Construction in progress		373,062,744	174,332,922	_	(57,459,069)	489,936,597
Rights-of-way (note 5)		207,823,264				207,823,264
Subtotal		1,440,773,746	182,339,542		(57,459,069)	1,565,654,219
Depreciable capital assets:						
Structures and facilities		2,051,109,151	_	(615)	54,639,915	2,105,748,451
Furniture, fixtures, and		22 040 100	1 271 660	(924 420)	2 010 154	26 415 502
equipment		33,049,108	1,371,669	(824,429)	2,819,154	36,415,502
Subtotal		2,084,158,259	1,371,669	(825,044)	57,459,069	2,142,163,953
Total capital assets	\$	3,524,932,005	183,711,211	(825,044)		3,707,818,172
		Balance, October 1,				Balance, September 30,
Description	_	,	Additions	Disposals	Transfers	,
	_	October 1,	Additions	Disposals	Transfers	September 30,
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land	-	October 1, 2009	Additions	Disposals	27,950	September 30, 2010 440,929,897
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land	-	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952		Disposals	27,950 25,889	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622	Additions	Disposals ———————————————————————————————————	27,950	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952		Disposals	27,950 25,889	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622		Disposals ———————————————————————————————————	27,950 25,889	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5) Subtotal	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264	236,567,890	Disposals  — — — — — — —	27,950 25,889 (44,204,768)	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5)	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264	236,567,890	Disposals	27,950 25,889 (44,204,768)	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5) Subtotal  Depreciable capital assets: Structures and facilities Furniture, fixtures, and	<u> </u>	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264 1,248,356,785 2,011,291,995	236,567,890 236,567,890	(2,599)	27,950 25,889 (44,204,768) — (44,150,929) 39,819,755	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264 1,440,773,746 2,051,109,151
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5) Subtotal  Depreciable capital assets: Structures and facilities	\$	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264 1,248,356,785	236,567,890		27,950 25,889 (44,204,768) — (44,150,929)	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264 1,440,773,746
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5) Subtotal  Depreciable capital assets: Structures and facilities Furniture, fixtures, and	<b>-</b>	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264 1,248,356,785 2,011,291,995	236,567,890 236,567,890	(2,599)	27,950 25,889 (44,204,768) — (44,150,929) 39,819,755	September 30, 2010 440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264 1,440,773,746 2,051,109,151
Nondepreciable capital assets: Purchased land Constructed land Construction in progress Rights-of-way (note 5) Subtotal  Depreciable capital assets: Structures and facilities Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	•	October 1, 2009 440,901,947 418,931,952 180,699,622 207,823,264 1,248,356,785 2,011,291,995 28,193,907	236,567,890 236,567,890 — 1,029,278	(2,599)	27,950 25,889 (44,204,768) — (44,150,929) 39,819,755 4,331,174	September 30, 2010  440,929,897 418,957,841 373,062,744 207,823,264  1,440,773,746  2,051,109,151 33,049,108

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Description	Balance, October 1, 2010	Additions	Disposals/ Transfers	Balance, September 30, 2011
Structures and facilities Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	\$ 1,103,891,136 20,708,288	80,643,656 4,374,198	(745,356)	1,184,534,792 24,337,130
Total accumulated depreciation	\$ <u>1,124,599,424</u>	85,017,854	(745,356)	1,208,871,922
Net capital assets	\$ 2,400,332,581	98,693,357	(79,688)	2,498,946,250
	Balance, October 1,		Disposals/	Balance, September 30,
Description	2009	Additions	Transfers	2010
Description  Structures and facilities Furniture, fixtures, and equipment	,	83,070,333 3,549,106	-	•
Structures and facilities	<b>2009</b> \$ 1,020,820,803	83,070,333	Transfers	2010 1,103,891,136

# (7) Commercial Paper Notes

In 1994, the Board of Harbor Commissioners authorized the issuance of up to \$383,500,000 in commercial paper notes of Series A, B, and C, and the Department issued \$148,000,000 of Series A notes to pay for acquisition costs of property, facilities, and oil rights in the North Harbor District. The notes are designated as follows:

Series A – Subject to Internal Revenue Service Code Alternative Minimum Tax (AMT)

Series B – Not subject to AMT

Series C – Taxable

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

The Department's gross revenues secured the notes. The obligation to pay the principal portion of outstanding notes was further supported by a \$175,000,000 revolving line of credit that was terminated by the Department in 2010. The commercial paper and related interest obligations were fully paid during the 2010 fiscal year.

Commercial Paper - Principal Only - Rollforward Schedule

Description	 Balance, October 1, 2009	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2010
Series A: maturity dates January 10, 2009 interest rate: 1.05	\$ 31,400,000	_	(31,400,000)	_

## (8) Bonded Indebtedness

Outstanding bonded indebtedness as of September 30 was as follows:

	_	2011	2010
1998 Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds: Maturing 2011 through 2019 at 6.0% interest Plus unamortized premium, net of refunding charges and cost of issuance	\$	109,250,000 1,239,025	119,660,000 1,401,520
Total 1998 Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds	_	110,489,025	121,061,520
2002B Harbor Revenue Bonds (Fixed rate portion): Maturing 2011 through 2024 at 5.1% to 5.5% interest Plus unamortized premium	_	53,255,000 2,407,089	57,815,000 2,561,142
Total 2002B Harbor Revenue Bonds	_	55,662,089	60,376,142
2004A & B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds: Maturing 2011 through 2018 at 4.0% to 5.0% interest Plus unamortized premium, net of refunding charges and cost of is suance		53,785,000 2,025,902	61,500,000 2,465,520
Total 2004A & B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds	_	55,810,902	63,965,520

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

	_	2011	2010
2005A & B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds: Maturing 2011 through 2025 at 5.0% interest Plus unamortized premium, net of refunding charges and cost of issuance	\$	127,730,000 3,515,953	137,765,000 3,855,775
Total 2005A & B Harbor Revenue Refunding	-	3,313,733	3,033,113
Bonds	_	131,245,953	141,620,775
2010A Harbor Revenue Bonds: Maturing 2011 through 2025 at 0.4 to 5.0% interest Plus unamortized premium, net of refunding charges and		191,510,000	200,835,000
cost of issuance	_	14,301,213	15,561,019
Total 2010A Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds	_	205,811,213	216,396,019
2010B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds: Maturing 2011 through 2027 at 3.0% to 5.0% interest Plus unamortized premium, net of refunding charges and		157,955,000	158,085,000
cost of issuance	_	6,267,965	6,782,634
Total 2010B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds	_	164,222,965	164,867,634
Principal		693,485,000	735,660,000
Net premium		29,757,147	32,627,610
Less current portion	_	(44,815,000)	(42,175,000)
Net long-term bonded indebtedness	\$	678,427,147	726,112,610

Description		Balance, October 1, 2010	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2011	Amounts due within one year
1998	\$	119,660,000	_	10,410,000	109,250,000	11,035,000
2002 B		57,815,000	_	4,560,000	53,255,000	4,800,000
2004 A & B		61,500,000	_	7,715,000	53,785,000	8,100,000
2005 A & B		137,765,000	_	10,035,000	127,730,000	10,530,000
2010A		200,835,000	_	9,325,000	191,510,000	10,155,000
2010B	_	158,085,000		130,000	157,955,000	195,000
	\$	735,660,000		42,175,000	693,485,000	44,815,000

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Description	 Balance, October 1, 2009	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2010	Amounts due within one year
1998	\$ 129,485,000	_	9,825,000	119,660,000	10,410,000
2000 A	223,780,000	_	223,780,000	_	_
2002 B	125,220,000		67,405,000	57,815,000	4,560,000
2004 A & B	80,985,000	_	19,485,000	61,500,000	7,715,000
2005 A & B	225,735,000	_	87,970,000	137,765,000	10,035,000
2010 A	_	200,835,000	_	200,835,000	9,325,000
2010 B		158,085,000		158,085,000	130,000
	\$ 785,205,000	358,920,000	408,465,000	735,660,000	42,175,000

Aggregate debt service requirements on bonded indebtedness to maturity are summarized as follows:

	Principal	Interest	Total
Year(s) ending September 30:			
2012	\$ 44,815,000	35,193,002	80,008,002
2013	46,965,000	33,026,202	79,991,202
2014	49,115,000	30,623,278	79,738,278
2015	51,920,000	28,083,402	80,003,402
2016	54,610,000	25,394,302	80,004,302
2017 - 2021	246,300,000	84,366,564	330,666,564
2022 - 2026	188,980,000	27,591,210	216,571,210
2027 - 2028	10,780,000	486,500	11,266,500
	\$ 693,485,000	264,764,460	958,249,460

Details of each outstanding debt issue are as follows:

## (a) 1998 Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds Series 1998A (the 1998 Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 1998 Bonds, dated February 1, 1998, amounting to \$206,330,000 were issued to current refund all of the City's Harbor Revenue Bonds Series 1989A (the 1989 Bonds). The 1989 Bonds were defeased and the liability for those bonds was removed from the Department's statements of net assets. No amounts remain outstanding as of September 30, 2011 and 2010. Serial bonds aggregating to \$109,250,000 are outstanding and will mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2019 in amounts ranging from \$11,035,000 to \$16,600,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates of 6.0%. The 1998 Bonds are not subject to optional or mandatory redemption before their respective maturity dates.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Funds have been allocated at September 30 to the respective accounts in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	_	2011	2010
Service account (amount reserved to meet current debt service requirements)	\$	6,596,250	6,596,100
Reserve account (amount reserved for maximum annual debt service requirements)	_	17,596,976	17,596,976
	\$	24,193,226	24,193,076

The current refunding resulted in a difference between the reacquisition price and net carrying amount on the old debt of \$8,569,501. This difference, reported in the accompanying financial statements as a deduction from bonds payable, is amortized using the straight-line method over the life of the new bonds.

## (b) 2002B Harbor Revenue Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Bonds Series 2002B (the 2002B Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 2002B Bonds were remarketed in the principal amount of \$144,240,000 and are dated June 26, 2002, the date of delivery of the original bonds.

Serial bonds aggregating to \$45,465,000 will mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2023 in amounts ranging from \$3,415,000 to \$8,460,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates ranging from 5.10% to 5.50%. Bonds maturing on or before May 15, 2014 are not subject to call and redemption prior to maturity; bonds maturing on or after May 2015 will be subject to call and redemption prior to maturity, at the option of the Board of Harbor Commissioners (the Board), as a whole or in part on any date, on or after May 15, 2014, at a redemption price equal to the principal amount of the Series 2002B Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Term bonds amounting to \$7,790,000 will mature on May 15, of each year from 2024 to 2027 in amounts ranging from \$1,800,000 to \$2,100,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates of 5.18%. Term bonds will be subject to call and redemption prior to maturity and redeemed at a redemption price equal to the par amount thereof from Mandatory Sinking Account Payments in amounts from \$1,800,000 to \$2,100,000 from 2024 to 2027, respectively, for the term bonds scheduled to mature on May 15, 2027.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

On May 13, 2010, the Board issued the 2010B Revenue Refunding Bonds and used a portion of the proceeds to redeem \$63,060,000 of the outstanding 2002B bonds. The redeemed bonds due dates and amounts were as follows:

<b>Due date</b>		Amount redeemed
Serial bonds:		
May 15, 2016	\$	2,500,000
May 15, 2019		6,915,000
May 15, 2020		7,280,000
May 15, 2021		7,660,000
May 15, 2022		8,050,000
	_	32,405,000
Term bonds:		
May 15, 2024		7,095,000
May 15, 2025		7,460,000
May 15, 2026		7,845,000
May 15, 2027		8,255,000
	_	30,655,000
Total redemption	\$	63,060,000

The redemption resulted in a difference between the reacquisition price and net carrying amount on the old debt of \$2,134,526. This difference, reported in the accompanying financial statements as a deduction from bonds payable, is amortized using the straight-line method over the life of the new bonds.

Funds have been allocated at September 30 in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	 2011	2010
Service account (amount reserved for maximum annual		
debt service requirements)	\$ 2,855,682	2,855,457

## (c) 2004 Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds Series 2004A & B (the 2004 Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 2004 Bonds, dated March 10, 2004, amounting to \$113,410,000 were issued to current refund and to defease all of the City's Harbor Revenue Bonds Series 1993, to pay the premium for the Bond Insurance Policy, to fund the Series 2004 Reserve Fund, and to finance the costs of issuance of the Series 2004 Bonds. The 1993 Bonds are defeased and the liability for those bonds has been removed from the Department's statements of net assets. No amounts remain outstanding as of September 30, 2011 and 2010.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Serial bonds aggregating to \$53,785,000 are outstanding and set to mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2018 in amounts ranging from \$500,000 to \$10,825,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates ranging from 4.0% to 5.0%. The Series 2004 Bonds maturing on or before May 15, 2014 are not subject to call and redemption prior to maturity.

The Series 2004 Bonds maturing on or after May 15, 2015 will be subject to call and redemption prior to maturity, at the option of the Board of Harbor Commissioner, as a whole or in part on any date, on or after May 15, 2014, at a redemption price equal to the principal amount of the Series 2004 Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

The current refunding resulted in a difference between the reacquisition price and net carrying amount on the old debt of \$1,445,775. This difference, reported in the accompanying financial statements as a deduction from bonds payable, is amortized using the straight-line method over the life of the new bonds.

On May 13, 2010, the Board issued the 2010B Revenue Refunding Bonds and used a portion of the proceeds to redeem \$12,105,000 of the outstanding 2004A bonds. The redeemed bonds due dates and amounts were as follows:

Due date	Amount redeemed
Serial bonds:	
May 15, 2013	\$ 8,005,000
May 15, 2014	2,000,000
May 15, 2015	 2,100,000
Total redemption	\$ 12,105,000

The redemption resulted in a difference between the reacquisition price and net carrying amount on the old debt of \$721,753. This difference, reported in the accompanying financial statements as a deduction from bonds payable, is amortized using the straight-line method over the life of the new bonds.

Funds have been allocated at September 30 to the respective accounts in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	_	2011	2010
Service account (amount reserved to meet current debt service requirements) Reserve account (amount reserved for maximum annual	\$	4,036,519	4,036,800
debt service requirements)		11,372,550	11,372,550
	\$	15,409,069	15,409,350

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (d) 2005 Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds Series 2005A & B (the 2005 Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 2005 Bonds, dated March 23, 2005, amounting to \$257,975,000 were issued to current refund and to defease all of the City's Harbor Revenue Bonds Series 1995 (1995 Bonds), to pay the premium for the Bond Insurance Policies, to fund a repayment reserve for the Series 2005 Bonds, and to finance the costs of issuance of the Series 2005 Bonds. The 1995 Bonds are defeased and the liability for those bonds was removed from the Department's statements of net assets. No amounts remain outstanding as of September 30, 2011 and 2010.

Serial bonds aggregating to \$102,735,000 are outstanding and are set to mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2025 in amounts ranging from \$3,330,000 to \$16,815,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates of 5.0%. Serial bonds aggregating to \$24,995,000 are outstanding and will mature on May 15, 2017 and 2018 with amounts due of \$13,430,000 and \$11,565,000, respectively, with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at 5.0% coupon rate.

The Series 2005 Bonds maturing on or before May 15, 2015 are not subject to call and redemption prior to maturity. The Series 2005 Bonds maturing on or after May 15, 2016 are subject to call and redemption prior to maturity, at the option of the Board, as a whole or in part on any date, on or after May 15, 2015, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the Series 2005 Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

On May 13, 2010, the Board issued the 2010B Revenue Refunding Bonds and used a portion of the proceeds to redeem \$78,410,000 of the outstanding 2005A bonds. The redeemed bonds due dates and amounts were as follows:

Due date	Amount redeemed
Serial bonds:	
May 15, 2013	\$ 11,055,000
May 15, 2016	3,835,000
May 15, 2018	2,535,000
May 15, 2019	8,590,000
May 15, 2020	8,695,000
May 15, 2021	11,480,000
May 15, 2022	2,735,000
May 15, 2023	1,170,000
May 15, 2024	11,860,000
May 15, 2025	 16,455,000
Total redemption	\$ 78,410,000

The redemption resulted in a difference between the reacquisition price and net carrying amount on the old debt of \$3,962,756. This difference, reported in the accompanying financial statements as a

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

deduction from bonds payable, is amortized using the straight-line method over the life of the new bonds.

Funds have been allocated at September 30 to the respective accounts in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	_	2011	2010
Service account (amount reserved to meet current debt service requirements)	\$	6,343,688	6,346,219
Reserve account (amount reserved for maximum annual debt service requirements)	_	17,165,245	17,106,288
	\$	23,508,933	23,452,507

### (e) 2010A Harbor Revenue Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Bonds Series 2010A (the 2010A Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 2010A Bonds, dated March 31, 2010, amounting to \$200,835,000 were issued to finance certain capital improvements at the Port, to fund a reserve fund for the Series 2010A Bonds, and to pay the costs of issuing the Series 2010A Bonds.

Serial bonds aggregating to \$191,510,000 will mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2025 in amounts ranging from \$10,155,000 to \$18,285,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates ranging 1.0% to 5.0%.

The Series 2010A Bonds maturing on or before May 15, 2020 are not subject to redemption prior to maturity. The Series 2010A Bonds maturing on or after May 15, 2021 are subject to redemption prior to maturity, at the option of the Board, as a whole or in part on any date, on or after May 15, 2020, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the Series 2010A Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Funds have been allocated at September 30 to the respective accounts in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	_	2011	2010
Bond construction fund	\$	59,241,419	165,620,856
Service account (amount reserved to meet current debt service requirements)		7,205,869	8,063,420
Reserve account (amount reserved for maximum annual debt service requirements)	_	19,246,704	19,267,818
	\$	85,693,992	192,952,094

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (f) 2010B Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds

The City of Long Beach Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds Series 2010B (the 2010B Bonds) are secured by the Department's gross revenues. The 2010B Bonds, dated April 29, 2010, amounting to \$158,085,000 were issued to purchase \$63,060,000 aggregate principal amount of the City's Harbor Revenue Bonds, Series 2002B, \$12,105,000 aggregate principal amount of the City's Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2004A, and \$78,410,000 aggregate principal amount of the City's Harbor Revenue Refunding Bonds, Series 2005A, from the holders thereof; to fund a reserve fund for the Series 2010B Bonds; and to pay the costs of issuing the Series 2010B Bonds.

Serial bonds aggregating to \$157,955,000 will mature on May 15 of each year from 2012 to 2027 in amounts ranging from \$195,000 to \$24,000,000 with interest payable semiannually on May 15 and November 15 at coupon rates ranging 3.0% to 5%.

The Series 2010B Bonds maturing on or before May 15, 2020 are not subject to redemption prior to maturity. The Series 2010B Bonds maturing on or after May 15, 2021 are subject to redemption prior to maturity, at the option of the Board, as a whole or in part on any date, on or after May 15, 2020, at a redemption price equal to 100% of the principal amount of the Series 2010B Bonds to be redeemed, plus accrued interest thereon to the date fixed for redemption, without premium.

Funds have been allocated at September 30 to the respective accounts in conformity with the bond resolution as follows:

	_	2011	2010
Service account (amount reserved to meet current debt service requirements)	\$	2,964,994	2,990,303
Reserve account (amount reserved for maximum annual debt service requirements)		15,873,680	15,893,967
	\$	18,838,674	18,884,270

## (9) Retirement Programs

#### (a) Pension Plan

The Department participates on a cost-sharing basis with the City in CalPERS, a defined benefit, agent multiple-employer pension system that acts as a common investment and administrative agent for entities in California. The system also provides death and disability benefits.

The Department is billed by the City for its share of pension costs based upon rates established by CalPERS for the City's general employees. CalPERS does not calculate a separate pension obligation for the Department; therefore, no separate Department obligation can be presented herein. The Department paid \$6,074,150, \$5,300,819, and \$5,525,128 to the City, which was equal to its annual required contribution for fiscal years 2011, 2010, and 2009, respectively.

As employees of the City, the Department's full-time employees are eligible to participate in CalPERS, becoming vested in the system after five years of service. Upon vesting, employees on

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

tier 1 (those hired on or before October 20, 1989) and who retire at age 55 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable for life, in an amount not to exceed 2.7% (with up to a 5.0% annual Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) increase) of their highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service. Employees on tier 2 (those hired after October 20, 1989 but before October 1, 2006) and who retire at age 55 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable for life, in an amount not to exceed 2.7% (with up to a 2.0% annual COLA increase) of their highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service. The City created tier 3 for employees hired after October 1, 2006. Vested tier 3 employees who retire at age 55 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable for life, in an amount equal to 2.5% (with up to a 2.0% annual COLA increase) of their highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service.

Further information regarding the City's participation in CalPERS may be found in the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the year ended September 30, 2011.

## Plan Description – Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS)

The City contributes to CalPERS, an agent multiple-employer public employee defined benefit pension plan. CalPERS provides retirement and disability benefits, annual cost-of-living adjustments, and death benefits to plan members and beneficiaries. CalPERS acts as a common investment and administrative agent for participating public entities within the State. Benefit provisions and all other requirements are established by state statute and city ordinance. A copy of CalPERS' annual financial report may be obtained from its executive office at 400 P. Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. Since CalPERS is on a fiscal year ending June 30, all actuarial calculations for the City's retirement plan are made on a fiscal year ending June 30, which differs from the City's September 30 fiscal year-end.

Under the terms of the contract between CalPERS and the City, all full-time employees are eligible to participate in CalPERS and become vested in the system after five years of service. The City has a multiple-tier retirement plan with benefits varying by plan.

Safety: Vested tier 1 and tier 2 safety employees who retire at age 50 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, in an amount equal to 3% of the employee's highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service. Retirees under tier 1 are eligible to receive a maximum annual five percent cost-of-living increase while those under tier 2 are eligible to receive a maximum annual two percent cost-of-living increase.

Miscellaneous: Vested tier 1 and tier 2 nonsafety employees who retire at age 55 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, in an amount equal to 2.7% of their highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service. The City created tier 3 for nonsafety employees hired after October 1, 2006. Vested tier 3 nonsafety employees who retire at age 55 are entitled to receive an annual retirement benefit, payable monthly for life, in an amount equal to 2.5% of their highest paid year of employment for each year of credited service. Retirees under tier 1 are eligible to receive a maximum annual five percent cost-of-living increase while those under the tier 2 and tier 3 are eligible to receive a maximum annual two percent cost-of-living increase. Audited annual financial statements and ten-year trend information are available from CALPERS at P.O. Box 942709, Sacramento, CA 94229-2709.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## **Funding Policy**

For the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011, safety and miscellaneous plan participants were required to contribute nine percent and eight percent of their annual covered salary, respectively. However, as a benefit to employees, the City, in some cases, has elected to pay a portion of the employees' portion of this required contribution. The following table details the contribution rates for the City and its employees as of September 30, 2011.

Bargaining unit	City contributes	Employee contributes	New hires
Unrepresented Management with			
the City Auditor's office	4.0%	4.0%	8.0%
City Attorney's Association	4.0	4.0	8.0
City Prosecutor's Association	4.0	4.0	8.0
Elected Officials and City Clerk:			
City Attorney	4.2	3.8	8.0
City Prosecutor	4.2	3.8	8.0
City Auditor	4.2	3.8	8.0
City Clerk	4.2	3.8	8.0
Mayor	4.2	3.8	8.0
Council Districts $1 - 7$ and $9$	4.2	3.8	8.0
Council District 8	6.0	2.0	8.0
Unrepresented Management and			
nonmanagement	6.0	2.0	8.0
Long Beach Association of			
Engineering Employees	6.0	2.0	8.0
Long Beach Association of			
Confidential Employees	6.0	2.0	8.0
Long Beach Management			
Association	6.0	2.0	8.0
International Association of			
Machinists	6.0	2.0	N/A
Safety Managers	7.0	2.0	9.0
Long Beach Firefighters' Association	7.0	2.0	N/A
Long Beach Police Officers'			
Association	7.0	2.0	N/A
Long Beach Lifeguard Association	7.0	2.0	N/A

In addition, the City is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate applied to annual covered payroll; the current rates are 12.297% for miscellaneous employees and 17.097% for safety employees. For fiscal year 2012, the contribution rates will be 16.072% for miscellaneous employees and 22.687% for safety employees. The contribution requirements of plan members and the City are established and may be amended by CalPERS.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

### **Annual Pension Cost**

For fiscal year 2011, the City's annual pension cost (APC) of \$75.0 million for CalPERS was equal to the City's required contributions (ARC) of \$82.1 million less employees' contributions of \$7.1 million. The ARC was determined as a part of the June 30, 2008 actuarial valuations.

The City's APC, the percentage of APC contributed to the plans, and the net pension obligation for the miscellaneous and safety plans for the fiscal years ended September 30, 2009, 2010, and 2011 are as follows (dollars in thousands):

Fiscal year	 Miscella neo us annual pension cost	Safety annual pension cost		
2009	\$ 40,503	31,512	72,015	100%
2010	37,546	31,530	69,076	100
2011	41,953	33,087	75,040	100

## **Actuarial Methods and Assumptions**

A summary of principal assumptions and methods used to determine the annual required contribution rate for fiscal year 2011 for miscellaneous and safety employees is shown below:

Methods	Assumptions
Valuation Date	June 30, 2008
Actuarial Cost Method	Entry Age Normal Cost Method
Amortization Method	Level Percent of Payroll
Amortization Period	Closed
Average Remaining Period	30 Years as of the Valuation Date
Asset Valuation Method	15 Year Smoothed Market
Actuarial Assumptions:	
Investment Rate of Return	7.75% (net of administrative expenses)
Projected Salary Increases	3.55% to 14.45% depending on age, service, and type of employment
Inflation	3.00%
Payroll Growth	3.25%
Individual Salary Growth	A merit scale varying by duration of employment coupled with an assumed annual inflation component of 3.00% and an annual production growth of 0.25%.

The schedule of funding progress, presented as required supplementary information following the notes to the financial statements, presents multi-year trend information about whether the actuarial value of plan assets is increasing or decreasing over time relative to the actuarial accrued liability for pension benefits.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## **Funded Status and Funding Progress**

As of June 30, 2010, the most recent actuarial valuation date, and the funding status for the miscellaneous and safety plans were as follows (dollars in thousands):

Plan	 Actuarial value of assets (a)	Actuarial accrued liability (AAL) – entry age (b)	Unfunded AAL (UAAL) (excess s of assets over AAL) (b-a)	Funded ratio actuarial value basis (a/b)	Covered payroll (c)	UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll ((b-a)/c)
Mi scellaneous	\$ 1,692,444	1,888,325	195,881	89.6% \$	221,420	88.5%
Safety	1,713,418	1,786,693	73,275	95.9%	133,770	54.8%

Actuarial valuation of an ongoing plan involves estimates of the value of reported amounts and assumptions about the probability of occurrence of events far into the future. Amounts determined regarding the funded status of the plan and the annual required contributions of the employer are subject to continual revision as actual results are compared with the past expectations and new estimates are made about the future. The schedule of funding progress, presented as required supplementary information following the notes to the financial statements, presents multiyear trend information, which shows whether the actuarial value of plan assets is increasing or decreasing over time relative to the actuarial accrued liability for benefits. The initial unfunded actuarial accrued liability (or excess assets) associated with these retirement plans are being amortized as a level percentage of projected payroll on a closed basis.

## Plan Description - Public Agency Retirement System - Defined Benefit Plan

In November 1994, the City established Public Agency Retirement System (PARS) Defined Benefit Plans for Special Status Contractors and Seasonal and Temporary Employees (the Plans). During fiscal year 2003, the Plans were reported under a combined plan (the Plan). The Plan is a defined benefit, single-employer retirement plan. The Plan, which took effect on January 1, 1995, is administered for the City through a third-party administrator. The Plan provides for retirement as well as death and disability benefits to eligible individuals and their beneficiaries.

The Plan benefit is a lifetime monthly annuity equal to 1.50% times the final average of the participant's highest 36 consecutive months' salary times the years of service. The Plan requires employee contributions of 6.20% of earnings (Contractors Special Status) and 3% of earnings (Seasonal and Temporary Employees). All employees enter the Plan upon hire and all benefits are vested after five years of service (Contractors Special Status) or immediately (Seasonal and Temporary Employees) and employees are always vested in their employee contributions. It is assumed that upon termination, employees will choose to receive an actuarially equivalent lump sum (based on the actuarial assumptions described below). Audited annual financial statements are available from PARS Public Agency Retirement Services, 4350 Von Karman Avenue, Ste. 100, Newport Beach, CA 92660.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## **Funding Policy and Annual Pension Cost**

The City's funding policy is to make the contribution as determined by the Plan's actuary as of September 30, 2009 valuation date. The following information describes the calculation methodology:

- The Plan's APC for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011 is based on the period from October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010. The APC for fiscal year ended 2011 is \$105 thousand, the same amount contributed for this period.
- The actuarial liabilities and assets are valued as of September 30, 2009.
- The actuarial cost method used is the projected-unit-credit method. Under this method, the contribution rate is the sum of the normal cost rate plus the unfunded actuarial liability rate. The normal cost is defined as the actuarial present value of benefits allocated to the valuation year, and the actuarial accrued liability is the present value of benefits allocated to all periods prior to the valuation year. The normal cost rate is determined by dividing the normal cost by expected covered payroll.

In determining the Plan's actuarial accrued liability, the projected benefit of each participant must be allocated between past years and future years. This allocation is made by multiplying the projected benefit by a fraction, the numerator of which is the participant's total credited years of service on the valuation date, and the denominator is the participant's total credited years of service at anticipated benefit commencement.

The unfunded actuarial liability is the difference between the actuarial accrued liability and Plan assets. This difference is amortized as a level dollar amount (in the 2010 actuarial valuation used to determine 2010/11 Annual Pension Cost, a 7-year amortization is used for the September 30. 2006 unfunded liability and 10-year amortization is used for all other gains and losses) to determine the unfunded actuarial liability rate. The actuarial value of Plan assets is based on a five-year smoothing of gains and losses. The net pension obligation information below is based on periods from October 1 through September 30 (dollars in thousands):

Fiscal year	 Annual pension costs	Actual contribution	Percentage contribution	Net pension obligation
2009	\$ 16,352	16,352	100% \$	_
2010	97,376	97,376	100	_
2011	105,141	105,141	100	_

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# **Funded Status and Funding Progress**

As of the most recent actuarial valuation date, September 30, 2010, the Plan's funding status was (dollars in thousands):

Plan	Actuarial value of assets (a)	Actuarial accrued liability (AAL) – entry age (b)	Unfunded AAL (UAAL) (excess s of assets over AAL) (b-a)	Funded ratio actuarial value basis (a/b)	Covered payroll (c)	UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll ((b-a)/c)
PARS	\$ 966	1,176	210	82.1% \$	8,369	2.5%

## **Actuarial Methods and Assumptions**

The following is a summary of September 30, 2010 assumptions:

Interest

Rate: 5.25%

Mortality: 1983 Group Annuity Mortality Table

Turnover: Sample rates are:

Age	Turnover	Age	Turnover
25	15.00%	45	10%
30	15.00	50	10
35	15.00	55	5
40	15.00	60	5

Seasonal and Temporary Employees' first five years of service assume the following rates:

Years of service	Turnover	
0	50%	
1	35	
2	30	
3	25	
4	20	

Salary Scale:

Retirement Age: Age 65 or attained age, if older.

Form of Benefit: Participants are assumed to receive a lump sum upon

termination.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (b) Postretirement Healthcare Benefits

### **General Plan Description**

The City's Retired Employees Health Insurance Program is a single-employer defined benefit healthcare plan.

Under the provisions of the City's Personnel Ordinance, upon retirement, the City allows retirees, their spouses, and eligible dependents to use the cash value at retirement of the retiring employee's accumulated unused sick leave to pay for health, dental, and long-term care insurance premiums. Full-time City employees are entitled to receive up to 96 hours of sick leave per year. Unused sick leave may be accumulated until termination or retirement. No sick leave benefits are vested. The City has provided two onetime early retirement incentive programs. The first had a maximum value of \$25,000 for employees, based on age, who retired during calendar year 1996, and the second incentive offered a 16-hour increase in sick leave per year of service to management employees who retired by June 30, 2004. In all cases, once the cash value of the retired employee's unused sick leave is exhausted, the retiree can terminate coverage or elect to continue paying the premiums at the retiree's expense.

At September 30, 2011, there were 557 participants in the City's Retired Employees Health Insurance Program, and the noninterest-bearing cash value equivalent of the remaining unused sick leave totaled \$20.9 million. Total premiums and actual claims paid by the City under the Retired Employees Health Insurance Program for the fiscal year ended September 30, 2011 were \$9.0 million, and are included in the expenses of the Employee Benefits Internal Service Fund.

### **Termination Benefits**

As of September 30, 2011, the City has recorded a liability in the Employee Benefits Internal Service Fund of \$105.7 million based on an actuarial study of current and future retiree accumulated sick leave in accordance with GASB Statement No. 16, *Accounting for Compensated Absences* (GASB 16). The liability takes into account an estimate of future usage, additional leave accumulation, and wage increases for both current retirees and active employees, an additional amount relating to the sick leave incentive for employees who retired during calendar year 1996 and 2009 negotiated public safety health benefit supplements as described below:

## Fire Retirement Supplement Benefit

- The Long Beach Fire Fighter Association agreed to defer an October 1, 2009 general salary adjustment to October 1, 2010 and to extend all other adjustments by one year.
- Supplement eligibility is limited to employees retiring on or before December 31, 2009.
- Benefit formula is equal to the difference between CalPERS retirement had the October 1, 2009 general salary adjustment been made for a full year and actual retirement benefits received by CalPERS.
- Supplement is credited annually to retirees Health account and is adjusted by CalPERS cost of living adjustment (COLA).

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

Account will be adjusted as long as retiree or beneficiaries are receiving CalPERS.

## Police Retirement Supplement Benefit

- The Long Beach Police Officers Association agreed to extend a September 30, 2009 midpoint adjustment of 3.20% for sergeants, 14.80% for lieutenants, and 9.3% for corporals and officers, to a 2% minimum increase per year. The midpoint adjustment is based on the Strategic Plan Cities Survey of salaries in similar cities.
- Supplement eligibility is limited to employees retiring on or after September 30, 2009 and before benefits level reaches what it would have been had the September 30, 2009 adjustment been made.
- Benefit formula is equal to the difference between CalPERS retirement had the September 30, 2009 midpoint adjustment been made and actual retirement benefits received by CalPERS.
- Supplement is credited annually to retirees Health account and is adjusted by CalPERS cost of living adjustment (COLA).
- Account will be adjusted as long as retiree or beneficiaries are receiving CalPERS.

The actuarial study assumes an investment return of 5.0% wage increases of 3.5% per year for miscellaneous and 4.5% per year for safety employees; and insurance premium increases of 4.5%. The estimated current portion of such obligation of \$7.8 million has been fully funded and the long-term portion of the liability of \$97.9 million is being funded, over time, through burden rates charged to the various City funds, applied as a percent of current productive salaries.

## **Other Postemployment Benefits**

As of September 30, 2011, the City has also recorded a liability in the Employee Benefits Internal Service Fund of \$26.1 million based on an actuarial study of the "implicit subsidy" as defined by GASB Statement No. 45, *Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions* (GASB 45). While the City does not directly contribute any funding towards the cost of premiums for retirees, the ability to obtain coverage at an active employees' rate constitutes an economic benefit to the retirees. The inclusion of the retirees in the City's healthcare benefit plans increases the overall health plan rates. The economic benefit is defined as an "implicit subsidy" under GASB 45.

The ability to participate in the City's plan by self-paying the premiums extends for the lifetime of the retiree. However, upon attaining the age of Medicare eligibility, the retiree may enter a plan coordinated by Medicare. Standard actuarial practice assumes that Medicare supplemental plans do not generally give rise to an implicit subsidy, and while the City has included Medicare eligible retirees in this valuation, their liability under GASB 45 and their implicit subsidy are both \$0.

This plan does not issue a separate financial report.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# **Funding Policy**

The contribution requirements of plan members and the City are established and may be amended by the City. The required contribution is based on projected pay-as-you-go financing requirements, with an additional amount to prefund benefits as determined annually by the City Council. As of September 30, 2011, the City has not prefunded the plan.

## **Annual OPEB Cost and Net OPEB Obligation**

The City's annual Other Postemployment Benefit (OPEB) cost (expense) is calculated based on the ARC, an amount that is actuarially determined in accordance with the requirements of GASB 45. The ARC represents the level of funding that, if paid on an ongoing basis, is projected to cover the normal cost each year and amortize any unfunded actuarial liabilities (or funding excess) over a period not to exceed 30 years. The following table shows the components of the City's annual OPEB cost for the year, the amount actually contributed to the plan, and changes in the City's net OPEB obligation (in thousands):

Annual required contribution Interest on net OPEB obligation	\$ 12,739 901
Adjustment to annual required contribution	(1,351)
Annual OPEB cost	12,289
Contribution made	(4,172)
Increase in net OPEB	
obligation	8,117
Net OPEB obligation – beginning	18,022
Net OPEB obligation - end of year	\$ 26,139

The ARC was determined as part of the September 2010 actuarial valuation. For the year ended September 30, 2011, the City's annual OPEB cost, the percentage of annual OPEB cost contributed to the plan, and the net OPEB obligation were as follows (in thousands):

Fiscal year ended	 Annual OPEB cost	Percentage of annual OPEB cost contributed	Annual obligation
September 30, 2008	\$ 8,102	35.2% \$	5,249
September 30, 2009	8,461	39.1	10,404
September 30, 2010	11,472	33.6	18,022
September 30, 2011	12,289	34.0	26,139

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# **Funded Status and Funding Progress**

The funded status of the plan as of September 30, 2011 was as follows (in thousands):

Actuarial accrued liability (AAL) Actuarial value of plan assets	\$ 130,252
Unfunded actuarial accrued liability (UAAL)	\$ 130,252
Funded ratio (actuarial value of plan assets/AAL)	 %
Covered payroll UAAL as a percentage of covered payroll ARC as a percentage of covered payroll	\$ 328,107 39.7% 3.9

Actuarial valuations of an ongoing plan involve estimates of the value of reported amounts and assumptions about the probability of occurrence of events far into the future. Examples include assumptions about future employment, mortality, and the healthcare cost trend. Amounts determined regarding the funded status of the plan and the ARC of the employer are subject to continual revision as actual results are compared with past expectations and new estimates are made about the future.

The schedule of funding progress, presented as required supplementary information following the notes to the financial statements, presents multiyear trend information that shows whether the actuarial value of plan assets is increasing or decreasing over time relative to the actuarial accrued liabilities for benefits.

## **Actuarial Methods and Assumption**

Projections of benefits for financial reporting purposes are based on the substantive plan (the plan as understood by the employer and plan members) and include the types of benefits provided at the time of each valuation and the historical pattern of sharing of benefit costs between the employer and plan members to that point. The actuarial methods and assumptions used include techniques that are designed to reduce short-term volatility in actuarial accrued liabilities and the actuarial value of assets, consistent with the long-term perspective of the calculations.

The September 30, 2011 actuarial valuation used the entry age normal cost method. The actuarial assumptions included a 5.0% investment rate of return (net of administrative expenses), an annual healthcare trend rate that begins at 11.3% for HMO plans and 8.6% for PPO plans that grades down to 4.5% for all plans by September 30, 2021, and an inflation assumption of 3.0%. The Entry Age Normal (EAN) cost method spreads plan costs for each participant from entry date to the expected retirement date. Under the EAN cost method, the plan's normal cost is developed as a level amount over the participants' working lifetime. The actuarial value of plan assets was \$0. The plan's unfunded actuarial accrued liability is being amortized using the level percentage of payroll method on an open basis over 30 years.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# (c) Deferred Compensation Plan

The City offers its employees the option to participate in a deferred compensation plan created in accordance with Internal Revenue Code Section 457 allowing them to defer or postpone receipt of income. Amounts deferred may not be paid to the employee during employment with the City except for a catastrophic circumstance creating an undue financial hardship for the employee. Further information regarding the City's deferred compensation plan may be found in the City's Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the years ended September 30, 2011 and 2010.

# (10) Operating Leases

The major portion of the Department's property is leased to others. Such property includes marine terminal facilities, special-purpose facilities, office and commercial space, and land.

Some marine terminal facilities are leased under agreements that provide the tenants with preferential but not exclusive use of the facilities. Some leases provide for rentals based on gross revenues or, in the case of marine terminal facilities, on annual usage of the facilities. The leases and the preferential assignments generally provide for minimum rentals.

Property under lease at September 30 consisted of the following:

	2011	2010
Land	\$ 759,815,621	759,815,621
Docks and wharves	486,119,890	485,950,418
Warehouses and sheds	46,103,616	46,103,616
Cranes and shiploaders	173,780,673	173,518,328
Buildings and other facilities	322,027,748	299,335,024
Infrastructure	804,243,391	779,841,892
Historical cost of leased property	2,592,090,939	2,544,564,899
Less accumulated depreciation	(898,847,921)	(823,668,263)
Book value of leased property	\$ <u>1,693,243,018</u>	1,720,896,636

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

The future minimum rental income under noncancelable operating leases having an initial term in excess of one year is as follows:

Year(s) ending September 30:	
2012	\$ 234,240,000
2013	235,772,000
2014	246,350,000
2015	244,409,000
2016	239,209,000
2017 - 2021	1,168,883,000
2022 - 2026	855,348,000
2027 - 2031	133,159,000
2032 and thereafter	4,136,000
Total	\$ 3,361,506,000

#### (11) Investment in Joint Venture

## Intermodal Container Transfer Facility Joint Powers Authority (ICTF)

The Department and the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles (the Venturers) entered into a joint venture agreement to form ICTF for the purposes of financing and constructing an intermodal container transfer facility (the facility) to transfer cargo containers between trucks and railroad cars. The facility has been leased to Southern Pacific, now merged with Union Pacific (the Tenant). The facility was developed by the Tenant who assumed operational responsibility for the facility. The Venturers' share net income and equity distributions from ICTF equally. The ICTF financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2011 can be obtained from the Department.

## (12) Commitments and Contingencies

The Department is subject to claims and lawsuits arising from the normal course of business. The City Attorney's office evaluates these claims on a regular basis. Department management may make provision for probable losses if deemed appropriate on advice of legal counsel. To the extent that such provision for damages is considered necessary, appropriate amounts are reflected in the accompanying financial statements.

Based upon information obtained from the City Attorney with respect to remaining cases, it is the opinion of management that the estimated liability for unreserved claims and suits will not have a material impact on the financial statements of the Department. Contract commitments and purchase orders for which materials or services were not received at September 30, 2011 and 2010 aggregated \$233,714,377 and \$104,168,355, respectively.

#### (a) Risk Management

The Department currently carries an all-risk property insurance program covering loss or damage by fire and other risks (excluding earthquake and flood) with a loss limit of \$1,306,000,000. The coverage also includes terrorism exposure.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

To address third-party liability exposure, an excess liability insurance program is carried by the Department with total limits of \$150,000,000 in excess of \$1,000,000 self-insured retention. The excess liability insurance program covers the Department's operations and includes acts of terrorism within the \$150,000,000 limit. In addition, the Department carries specialized insurance policies providing coverage for damage to owned vessels, damage to other vessels, and pollution liability.

Following is a summary of insurance coverage for the Harbor Department:

		2010
Insurance coverage for fire and other risks	\$ 1,306,000,000	1,281,310,211
Comprehensive general liability	150,000,000	150,000,000
Self-insured retention	1,000,000	1,000,000

Port tenants, contractors, and vendors are required to carry various types and levels of insurance, including general liability insurance on leased premises. The insurance must include coverage for bodily injury and property damage liabilities, and name the City, its Board of Harbor Commissioners, and the Department's officers and employees as additional insured. The amount of settlements reached by the Department did not exceed the amount of insurance coverage in any of the past three fiscal years.

The Department participates in the City's self-insured workers' compensation program. During fiscal years 2011 and 2010, it made payments to the City's Insurance Fund totaling \$1,513,031 and \$1,249,064, respectively, for permanent and temporary Department employees. Amounts in the City's Insurance Fund are accumulated to meet losses as they arise.

Claims expenditures and liabilities are reported when it is probable that a loss has been incurred and the amount of that loss, including those incurred but not reported, can be reasonably estimated. Based on an opinion from legal counsel, the Department recognized litigation claim liabilities of \$5,000,000 and \$11,300,000 for fiscal years 2011 and 2010, respectively.

Liability for Claims and Judgments Rollforward Schedule

Liability	101 C	iamis and Judgi	nents Rollfolwai	u benediae	
		Balance,			Balance,
		October 1,			September 30,
Description		2010	Additions	Reductions	2011
Accrued claims and judgments	\$	11,300,000	5,000,000	11,300,000	5,000,000
		Balance,			Balance,
		October 1,			September 30,
Description		2009	Additions	Reductions	2010
Accrued claims and judgments	\$	5,000,000	6,300,000		11,300,000

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# (b) Potential Obligations Related to the Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority

The Alameda Corridor Use and Operating Agreement was executed by the Department, the Harbor Department of the City of Los Angeles (Port of Los Angeles), the ACTA, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe and Union Pacific Railroads (the railroads). This agreement provides for a payment of funds, known as a "Shortfall Advance," to be made, under certain circumstances, to ACTA by the Department and the Port of Los Angeles. Revenues generated by Use Fees and Container Charges, paid by the railroads, will be used to pay debt service on ACTA financing, to establish and maintain a bond repayment reserve account, and to pay ACTA's reasonable expenses relating to administration of the rail corridor.

To the extent that the revenues from use and container charges are not sufficient to meet ACTA's obligations, the Department and the Port of Los Angeles have agreed to advance the funds necessary to make up the difference. This obligation began after completion of the corridor project and is limited to a total of 40% of the total annual required amount, with the Department and the Port of Los Angeles each responsible for one-half or 20% of the required amount.

ACTA's latest Notice of Estimated Shortfall Advances and Reserve Accounting Funding (the Notice) was transmitted to the Department on August 8, 2011; estimates included in the Notice are dependent upon the accuracy of the assumptions used in their formulation. It is anticipated that there will be differences between estimates and actual results; the differences may be material. The projected shortfall for ACTA's fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, based on the Notice submitted by ACTA, is \$2,950,000. Any shortfall advance made by the Department and the Port of Los Angeles is reimbursable, with interest, by ACTA. Reimbursement could begin as soon as 2018. The Department is funding a cash reserve to satisfy claims related to the shortfall advance potential obligation. The balances of the reserve as of September 30, 2011 and 2010 were \$46,045,000 each year.

Based on the shortfall advance payment made to ACTA during fiscal year 2011, the balance of the Long-Term receivable is as follows:

Liability for Claims and Judgments Rollforward Schedule

	Balance, October 1,			Balance, September 30,
Description	 2010	Additions	Reductions	2011
ACTA Shortfall advance	\$ _	2,950,000	_	2,950,000

#### (c) New Gerald Desmond Bridge Matching Contribution

The Department is pursuing the replacement of the Gerald Desmond Bridge. The total cost to replace the bridge is estimated at \$950 million. The Department anticipates that funding of this project will come primarily from federal and state sources, but local matching funds will also be required.

In anticipation of this funding requirement, the Department has set aside funds to provide the expected 10% local match. During FY 2011, the Department reassigned certain state grant funds from various rail projects to the Gerald Desmond Bridge project resulting in an increase in the

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

amount of reserves set aside for the project. As of September 30, 2011 and 2010, matching funds earmarked for this project were \$69,055,000 and \$51,978,585, respectively.

## (d) Trade Corridor Improvement Fund Matching Contribution

The Department has as part of its continuing capital improvement program, rail projects for track re-alignment and rail yard improvements that are being partially funded by grants from the Trade Corridor Improvement Fund (TCIF). These TCIF grants require a matching contribution of 100% from the Department and as a result the Department has set aside reserves in the amount of \$35,750,000 to meet this match requirement.

## (e) Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP)

In January 2007, the Department adopted a wide-ranging Green Port Policy that greatly expanded the Department's commitment to sustain the environment by establishing new guidelines for the Port's current operations and future development. Key provisions include protection of the community from the harmful impacts of port operations and employment of state-of-the-art technology to minimize environmental impacts. Air emissions from ships at berth account for over one third of all vessel air emissions. Providing electrification reduces emissions significantly. With electrification, or "cold ironing," vessels can shut down their auxiliary engines, while at berth, and plug into dockside electric substations.

## (f) Oil Well Abandonment Costs

Oil abandonment liability

The oil operation assets and liabilities were transferred to the Department of Gas and Oil of the City of Long Beach during fiscal year 2011. Prior to 2011, costs related to the abandonment and site clearance of oil properties (abandonment costs) purchased in March 1994 were based on estimates provided by the Department of Gas and Oil of the City of Long Beach. Estimates of abandonment costs were reviewed annually and adjusted to reflect changes in abandonment practices, increased abandonment expenses, number and life of productive wells, general changes in the life of the oil field, and changes in oil price levels. This procedure is no longer needed as the assets and liabilities were transferred as stated above. The oil well abandonment cost liability at September 30 2010 was \$25,000,000. The amounts related to oil properties acquired in 1994 were presented as long-term abandonment cost liabilities in the financial statements.

Description	Balance, October 1, 2010	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2011
Oil abandonment liability	\$ 25,000,000	_	25,000,000	_
Description	 Balance, October 1, 2009	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2010

26,700,000

Future Oil Well Abandonment Cost Liability Rollforward Schedule

76 (Continued)

1,700,000

25,000,000

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (13) Pollution Remediation

The Department purchased 725 acres of property in the Harbor District in 1994. The property contains soil requiring remediation of environmentally hazardous materials. The remediation is required only on the portion of the land that the Department chooses to develop. To the extent that such remediation is necessary, the Department's liability is mitigated by provisions in the purchase agreement that make Union Pacific Resource Company (UPRC), the seller, responsible for a portion of the remediation costs. UPRC was acquired by Anadarko Petroleum Co. (Anadarko) that assumed this liability in accordance with the original purchase agreement. Anadarko's responsibility is limited to a period not to exceed 15 years and a maximum amount of \$112,500,000 according to the following table:

		Alloc	ation
Remediation cost		Anadarko	Department
First \$50 million	\$	50,000,000	_
Second \$50 million		25,000,000	25,000,000
Third \$50 million		12,500,000	37,500,000
Fourth \$50 million		25,000,000	25,000,000
All additional costs	_		100%
Maximum liability	\$ _	112,500,000	

Additionally, the Department was required to clean up the sediments of an area known as Installation Restoration Site 7 (IR Site 7). The Department completed the necessary work on IR Site 7 during fiscal 2011 and no liability related to this site remains. In 2010, the Department recognized liabilities associated with IR Site 7 in the amounts of \$12,500,456.

	Pollution Remediation	Obligation – She	ort-Term Rollfor	ward Schedule	
	Description	Balance, October 1, 2010	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2011
IR Site 7	\$	12,500,546	_	12,500,546	_
	_	Balance, October 1, 2009	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2010
IR Site 7	\$	19,074,012	_	6,573,466	12,500,546
	Pollution Remediation	Obligation – Lo	ng-Term Rollforv	vard Schedule	
	_	Balance, October 1, 2009	Additions	Reductions	Balance, September 30, 2010
IR Site 7	\$	1,000,000	_	1,000,000	_

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

# (14) Transfers to the City of Long Beach

In November 2010, Ballot Measure D was passed by a simple majority changing the formula for calculation of the transfer to the Tidelands Operating Fund (TOF). Proposition D amended the Long Beach City Charter by changing the formula from 10% of net income to 5% of operating revenue for the transfer of funds from the Harbor Department to the TOF. The City Council, by authority of City Charter Chapter XII, Section 1209 (c)(4) as amended, and with the approval of the Board of Harbor Commissioners (the Board), adopted a resolution in 2011 to transfer \$17,269,485 - 5% of the Department's operating revenue for fiscal year 2011. During fiscal year 2010, at the request of the City Council, the Board approved transfers to the TOF of two amounts: \$12,018,776 – 10% of the Department's net income for fiscal year 2010 and \$12,423,706 - 10% of the Department's net income for fiscal year 2009. The transfer to the TOF is reported as part of the Due to City of Long Beach account in the accompanying statements of net assets and as a transfer to the City in the statements of revenues, expenses, and changes in fund net assets. The total transfer recognized to the City during fiscal year 2011 was \$22,847,938, which includes the \$17,269,485 discussed above plus \$5,578,753 for Aquarium of the Pacific debt service assistance requested by the City Manager. The total transfer recognized to the City during fiscal year 2010 was \$30,451,161, which includes the \$24,442,482 discussed above plus \$6,008,679 for Aquarium of the Pacific debt service assistance requested by the City Manager. The Aquarium debt assistance and Convention Center debt forgiveness are discussed in note 3.

#### (15) Environmental Mitigation Credits

The Department disbursed \$39,375,000 in fiscal year 1997 to secure environmental mitigation credits that would allow the Port to complete projects within its complex. These credits are redeemed based on the number of acres of landfill completed by the Port.

An agreement between the Department, the Port of Los Angeles, and several federal and state regulatory agencies provided for the Department's purchase of land located within the wetlands restoration project at the Bolsa Chica Wetlands in Orange County, California. The land was transferred to the state in return for environmental mitigation credits to allow for the construction of up to 267 acres of landfill in the outer harbor area. During fiscal year 2006, the Department acquired \$11,400,000 of available environmental mitigation credits. No acquisitions or utilization of credits occurred during fiscal years 2011 and 2010.


The cost incurred in the acquisition of the land has been classified as a noncurrent asset. The Department has completed landfills that required the utilization of \$6,492,525 in fiscal year 2007 of the available credits. The balance of environmental mitigation credits will be adjusted in the future as landfill credits are used for Port development. The balance of the Environmental Mitigation Credits was \$44,278,068 as of both September 30, 2011 and 2010, respectively.

Notes to Financial Statements September 30, 2011 and 2010

## (16) Net Assets

Net assets is the difference between total assets and total liabilities. Increases or decreases in net assets may indicate improvement or deterioration of the Department's financial condition. The Department does not intend to liquidate capital assets to fund ongoing operations. Restricted assets are subject to external restrictions such as construction of capital assets, matching funding requirements for federally funded projects, repayment of long-term debt, and fulfillment of contractual obligations with third parties. Unrestricted net assets are available to fund the Department's continuing operations. As of September 30, 2011 and 2010, the Department held net assets as follows:

	2011	2010
Invested in capital assets, net of related debt	\$ 1,929,398,050	1,859,165,959
Restricted for capital projects: Environmental mitigation credits (note 15) Restricted for debt service (note 8) Restricted – third-party obligations – nonrelated-entity debt service contingency and matching contribution (note 12)	44,278,068 16,805,625 116,452,755	44,278,068 16,263,942 147,301,520
Total restricted	177,536,448	207,843,530
Unrestricted: Contributed capital – outside sources Contributed capital – other City funds Other unrestricted	30,427,546 27,749,166 486,410,434	30,427,546 27,749,166 422,818,832
Total unrestricted	544,587,146	480,995,544
Total net assets	\$ 2,651,521,644	2,548,005,033



This part of the Harbor Department of the City of Long Beach Comprehensive Annual Financial Report presents detailed information, which provides further clarification to the information contained in the financial statements, note disclosures, and all required supplementary information. The information contained in this section includes important indicators about the Department's overall financial well being. Reports in this section have been prepared for a 10-year period and in accordance to Government Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 44, *Economic Condition Reporting: The Statistical Section*, guidelines.

#### **Contents**

## **Financial Trends Information**

The following schedules contain trend information to help the reader understand how the Port's financial performance and condition has changed:

1)	Statement of Net Assets	Exhibit 1

2) Changes in Fund Net Assets Exhibit 2

## **Revenue Capacity Information**

The following schedules contain information to help the reader assess the Port's most significant sources of revenue:

1)	Operating Revenues by Type	Exhibit 3
2)	Ten Leading Commodities	Exhibit 4
3)	Ten Leading Trading Partners by Tonnage	Exhibit 5
4)	Principal Customers	Exhibit 6

## **Debt Capacity Information**

The following schedule contains information to help the reader assess the Port's capability of meeting its current level of debt service and its ability to issue debt in the future:

1) Revenue Bonds Debt Service Coverage Exhibit 7

## **Operating Information**

The following schedules contain information directly related to the Port operations:

1)	Tonnage Summary	Exhibit 8
2)	Tonnage by Commodity Group	Exhibit 9
3)	Container Count	Exhibit 10

## **Other Information**

1)	Number of Vessel Arrivals	Exhibit 11
2)	Number of Employees	Exhibit 12

Statistical Section

Statements of Net Assets – Last Ten Fiscal Years (Million of Dollars)

						After GASB 34 in	nolementation				
	_	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Assets: Current	s	704	581	1,005	1,068	1,049	924	440	374	342	305
Other	۵	2,788	2,883	2,403	2,336	2,339	2,299	2,630	2,658	2,612	2,633
Total assets	\$	3,492	3,464	3,408	3,404	3,388	3,223	3,070	3,033	2,954	2,938
Liabilities:											
Current	\$	104	108	135	206	155	88	52	66	44	87
Current – restricted (1)		58	57	56	54	57	56	55	58	56	52
Long term	_	678	751	791	841	1,033	1,097	1,135	1,222	1,263	1,276
To	\$	840	916	982	1,101	1,245	1,240	1,242	1,346	1,363	1,415
Net assets: Invested in capital assets (net of related											
debt)	S	1,929	1,859	1,487	1,440	1,269	1,097	1,108	1,076	1,079	1,112
Restricted	-	178	208	197	153	208	300	279	254	175	154
Unrestricted		545	481	744	710	666	584	442	355	336	256
Contributed capital		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Retained earnings		_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_	_
Total net assets/equity	\$	2,652	2,548	2,428	2,303	2,143	1,982	1,828	1,685	1,590	1,523
Working capital	\$	600	473	871	862	894	836	388	308	298	218
Current ratio		4.3	3.5	5.3	4.1	4.9	6.4	4.1	3.0	3.4	2.2
Debt to asset ratio		24.1%	26.4%	28.8%	32.3%	36.7%	38.5%	40.4%	44.4%	46.1%	48.2%

Note (1): Current liabilities payable from restricted assets.

Statistical Section

Changes in Fund Net Assets – Last Ten Fiscal Years (Million of Dollars, Except Number of Employees)

		After GASB 34 implementation									
	_	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Operating revenue Operating expense	\$	345 166	322 185	312 184	359 196	371 180	353 161	330 149	281 137	250 119	224 93
Income from operations		179	137	127	163	191	192	181	144	131	131
Other income (expense) Capital grants Investment earnings Transfers	_	(50) 7 5 (37)	(13) 19 8 (30)	(14) 11 19 (19)	(24) 4 33 (16)	(68) 10 43 (15)	(54) 2 28 (14)	(48) 2 17 (9)	(64) 6 16 (7)	(71) 1 17 (9)	(50) — 19 (9)
Change in net assets/net income	\$	104	121	124	160	161	153	143	95	69	91
Return on investment		3.9%	4.7%	5.2%	7.0%	7.5%	7.8%	7.8%	5.6%	4.3%	5.9%
Capital expenditures (includes personnel costs)	\$	228	273	189	92	171	92	82	117	175	263
Personnel: Wages and benefits Average number of employee: Increase (decrease)	\$	41.7 436.0 2.7%	40.8 424.7 5.9%	38.6 401.0 8.3%	33.7 370.4 7.0%	28.9 346.3 2.4%	26.2 338.2 0.1%	27.0 337.8 (0.9)%	24.0 340.9 3.0%	21.6 331.0 3.0% &	23.1 321.5

Statistical Section

Operating Revenue by Type – Last Ten Fiscal Years
(Million of Dollars)

		After GASB 34 implementation									
	_	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Operating revenues by category: Special facilities Rentals Miscellaneous	\$	329 14 2	304 14 3	291 16 4	341 14 4	352 15 4	338 11 4	315 11 4	268 10 3	237 9 4	210 10 4
Total operating revenue	\$	345	321	311	359	371	353	331	281	250	225
Growth (reduction) percentage		7.4%	3.3%	(13.4)%	(3.1)%	5.0%	7.0%	17.6%	12.5%	11.4%	(1.8)%
Special facility revenue by type: Wharfage and bunkers Dockage Terminal and equipment rental	\$	280 12 37	259 11 33	246 13 33	291 14 35	301 16 35	284 18 36	267 17 31	227 15 26	192 13 32	166 12 32
Total special facility revenue	\$	329	303	292	340	352	338	315	268	237	209
Special facility revenue by terminal commodity: Containers Liquid bulk Dry bulk Vehicles Steel Lumber Miscellaneous	s	267 16 22 10 8 1	247 17 19 10 6 1	233 18 20 10 7 1	280 18 18 10 9 1	290 19 18 11 9	275 18 20 11 9 1	258 18 17 10 7 1	216 17 15 10 7 1	186 15 17 10 6 1	163 16 13 10 6 1
Total special facility revenue	\$	327	303	291	340	353	337	315	267	236	209

## **Statistical Section**

# Ten Leading Commodities – Last Two Fiscal Years (Thousands of Metric Revenue Tons)

	2011	2010
Inbound:		
Petroleum, bulk	28,154	29,062
Electric machinery	13,813	14,072
Plastic products	8,494	7,819
Furniture	7,168	6,592
Clothing	6,261	5,948
Machinery	4,890	4,532
Rubber products	3,214	2,933
Foods, miscellaneous	1,714	1,587
Hardware	1,618	1,453
Chemicals, miscellaneous	1,471	1,412
Cement		
Metals, miscellaneous	_	_
Outbound:		
Foods, miscellaneous	4,629	5,398
Coke, bulk	6,462	5,069
Chemicals, miscellaneous	3,679	4,188
Wastepaper	4,851	3,499
Petroleum, bulk	3,602	2,391
Scrap metal	2,745	1,997
Plastic products	2,017	1,777
Electric machinery	1,151	1,273
Machinery and parts	1,248	1,196
Feeds, miscellaneous	1,692	947
Rubber products	748	748
Sulfur, bulk	404	404

Metric revenue ton = 1 metric ton or 1 cubic meter, whichever is the basis for the tariff assessment.

Note: Due to the intrinsical change from year to year in the volumes of the various commodities; it is impractical to present a 10-year table. The leading commodities will change from year to year.

**Statistical Section** 

Ten Leading Trading Partners by Tonnage

Last Two Fiscal Years

# Thousands of metric

	revenue	tons	Ranki	ng
	2011	2010	2011	2010
China	49,373	44,920	(1)	(1)
South Korea	4,294	6,256	(2)	(2)
Mexico	3,637	1,370	(3)	(8)
Hong Kong	3,498	3,341	(4)	(3)
Japan	3,448	2,910	(5)	(4)
Ecuador	2,552	2,639	(6)	(5)
Vietnam	2,449	1,995	(7)	(7)
Iraq	1,794	2,379	(8)	(6)
Panama	1,121	910	(9)	(10)
Taiwan	1,055	1,338	(10)	(9)
Canada	843	894	Unrank	ed
Malaysia	784	697	Unrank	ed
Italy	490	468	Unrank	ed
Indonesia	396	352	Unrank	ed
Thailand	402	338	Unrank	ed

Metric revenue ton =1 metric ton or 1 cubic meter; whichever is the basis for the tariff assessment.

Note: Due to the intrinsical change from year to year in the trading volumes with various countries; it is impractical to present a 10-year table. Except for China, the order for the rest of the countries will invariably change from year to year. Some of them will make it to the list one year but will be gone next year.

## **Statistical Section**

# **Principal Customers**

The following list represents the Port's largest customers, in terms of revenue, listed alphabetically. These customers accounted for approximately 96% of the Port's operating revenue during fiscal year 2011. The largest single customer accounts for approximately 22% of the Port operating revenues.

	Custor	ner since	<b>Current lease</b>
	Year	Month	expiration date
BP West Coast Products, LLC	1940	June	05/2023
CEMEX USA	1979	April	08/2021
Chemoil Corp.	1974	July	07/2025
Cooper/T. Smith Stevedoring Co. Inc.	1973	February	Month to month
Crescent Terminals, Inc.	1970	April	06/2015
International Transportation Service, Inc.	1971	November	08/2026
Jacobsen Pilot Service, Inc.	1943	March	07/2017
Koch Carbon, Inc.	1987	December	12/2027
Long Beach Container Terminal, Inc.	1980	October	09/2011
Matson Navigation Co.	2002	May	04/2022
Mercedes Benz U.S.A., LLC	2004	February	08/2010
Metropolitan Stevedore Company	1939	January	03/2016
Mitsubishi Cement Corporation	1989	March	06/2022
Oxbow Carbon & Minerals, LLC	1989	June	12/2027
Pacific Coast Recycling, LLC/SA Recycling	1992	October	11/2019
Energia/Pacific Container Terminal/Pacific			
Maritime Services, Inc.	1972	October	04/2022
Sea Launch Company, LLC	1966	October	01/2013
SSA Marine – Long Beach	1984	August	10/2027
Tesoro	2007	May	10/2026
Thums Long Beach Company	1966	January	03/2025
Total Terminals International, LLC	1989	June	08/2027
Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., INC.	1970	January	12/2028
Weyerhauser Co.	1942	October	Month to month

## Statistical Section

Revenue Bonds Debt Service Coverage – Last Ten Fiscal Years (Millions of Dollars)

Fiscal year	 Revenues (1)	Maintenance costs (2)	Net revenues (3)	Revenue bonds debt service		Times debt service covered
2011	\$ 350	82	268	80		3.36
2010	330	98	232	82		2.82
2009	330	98	232	82		2.83
2008	393	116	277	93		2.98
2007	414	97	317	91		3.50
2006	382	76	306	98		3.13
2005	347	62	285	376	(5)	0.76
2004	294	54	240	95	(4)	2.53
2003	263	44	219	85	` ′	2.57
2002	238	40	198	56		3.52
			Average 10 years	coverage		2.80
			Revenue bond cov			1.25
			Additional bonds of	covenant		1.25

- (1) Includes total port operating revenue in interest income only.(2) Includes all port operating expenses less depreciation and amortization.(3) Revenues less maintenance costs.

- (4) Does not include current refunding of 1993 Revenue Bonds.
  (5) Includes May, 2005 payment for the 1995 bonds; it does not include debt service for 2005 bonds.

Statistical Section

Tonnage Summary – Last Ten Fiscal Years

(Thousands of Metric Revenue Tons)

		Inbound tonnage		C	Outbound tonnage			POLB
Fiscal year	Municipal	Private	Total	Municipal	Private	Bunkers	Total	total
2011	112,962	192	113,154	39,717	_	1,546	41,263	154,417
2010	108,068	209	108,277	36,667	_	2,412	39,079	147,356
2009	99,835	233	100,068	33,077	_	2,110	35,187	135,255
2008	118,562	654	119,216	41,605	_	2,088	43,693	162,909
2007	132,923	362	133,285	37,293	_	2,460	39,753	173,038
2006	132,092	402	132,494	33,298	_	2,625	35,923	168,417
2005	123,169	229	123,398	32,728	_	2,011	34,739	158,137
2004	106,988	313	107,301	28,301	_	1,531	29,832	137,133
2003	91,563	256	91,819	24,737	_	1,680	26,417	118,236
2002	97,225	143	97,368	25,858	_	2,394	28,252	125,620
Average annual growth	2.2%	8.9%	2.2%	5.0%	72.0%	(2.1)%	4.4%	2.7%

 $Metric\ revenue\ ton=1\ metric\ ton\ or\ 1\ cubic\ meter;\ whichever\ is\ the\ basis\ for\ tariff\ assessment.$ 

Statistical Section
Tonnage by Commodity Group – Last Ten Fiscal Years
(Thousands of Metric Revenue Tons)

	Containerized		Other breakbulk		Liquid bulk		Dry bulk		POLB		
Fiscal year	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	inbound	Outbound	Total
2011	83,482	29,623	752	827	28,587	3,239	333	7,576	113,154	41,265	154,419
2010	79,058	28,251	709	613	28,034	4,151	393	6,148	108,194	39,163	147,357
2009	69,354	24,800	869	644	29,139	3,800	653	5,996	100,015	35,240	135,255
2008	88,398	33,234	1,569	619	27,782	3,924	1,458	5,925	119,207	43,702	162,909
2007	99,523	28,293	1,930	743	29,536	5,064	2,230	5,717	133,219	39,817	173,036
2006	96,416	25,449	2,141	789	30,362	4,223	3,476	5,559	132,395	36,020	168,415
2005	88,786	25,166	2,050	862	29,798	4,479	2,763	4,231	123,397	34,738	158,135
2004	74,514	20,419	2,250	722	28,262	4,280	2,275	4,411	107,301	29,832	137,134
2003	60,769	16,983	2,177	717	28,594	2,725	1,896	4,376	93,435	24,801	118,237
2002	67,230	18,653	2,160	582	26,193	4,965	1,785	4,052	97,369	28,252	125,621
Average annual growth	3.3%	4.5%	(4.7)%	(0.8)%	0.7%	18.2%	(10.4)%	5.9%	2.1%	4.3%	2.6%

 $Metric\ revenue\ ton=1\ metric\ ton\ or\ 1\ cubic\ meter;\ whichever\ is\ the\ basis\ for\ the\ tariff\ assessment.$ 

Statistical Section

 $Container\ Count-Last\ Ten\ Fiscal\ Years$   $(Thousands\ of\ Twenty-Foot\ Equivalent\ Units-TEU's)$ 

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Loaded: Inbound Outbound	3,139 1,582	2,982 1,485	2,612 1,332	3,338 1,782	3,742 1,472	3,639 1,277	3,329 1,185	2,791 981	2,282 823	2,547 927
Total loaded	4,721	4,467	3,944	5,120	5,214	4,916	4,513	3,772	3,105	3,474
Annual growth	5.7%	13.3%	(23.0)%	(1.8)%	6.1%	8.9%	19.7%	21.5%	(10.6)%	2.3%
Total empty	1,577	1,469	1,338	1,617	2,148	2,251	2,130	1,584	1,284	1,221
Annual growth	7.4%	9.8%	(17.2)%	(24.7)%	(4.6)%	5.7%	34.4%	23.4%	5.2%	11.4%
Total TEU's	6,298	5,936	5,282	6,737	7,362	7,167	6,643	5,356	4,389	4,696
Annual growth	6.1%	12.4%	(21.6)%	(8.5)%	2.7%	7.9%	24.0%	22.0%	(6.5)%	4.5%

Exhibit 11

#### THE HARBOR DEPARTMENT OF THE CITY OF LONG BEACH

Statistical Section Vessel Calls Last Ten Fiscal Years

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Vessel calls	4,758	4,826	4,933	5,140	5,653	5,588	5,329	4,967	4,924	5,031
Annual growth/decline	(1.41)%	(2.17)%	(4.03)%	(9.07)%	1.16%	4.86%	7.29%	0.87%	(2.13)%	(8.54)%

#### Statistical Section

## Average Number of Employees by Division/Bureau Last Ten Fiscal Years

	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002
Executive administration	17.3	15.6	16.3	13.6	11.8	8.4	9.3	8.7	7.9	8.0
Growth/decline	10.90%	(4.29)%	19.85%	15.25%	40.48%	(9.68)%	7.27%	9.47%	(1.00)%	%
Government affairs	3.4	3.8	3.9	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.5	_	_	_
Growth/decline	(10.53)%	(2.56)%	18.18%	17.86%	%	12.00%	%	%	%	%
Finance and support services bureau: Finance Human resources Information managemen Real estate Risk management	21.2 17.8 18.6 8.0 7.0	17.9 17.6 18.0 7.3 6.4	15.5 16.9 13.1 6.1 6.0	14.2 15.3 7.3 6.7 5.2	14.4 13.3 7.1 7.1 4.0	15.2 14.8 6.8 6.9 0.6	14.9 17.7 6.0 7.9	14.0 19.7 6.1 8.3	14.0 18.8 6.0 8.3	13.9 18.3 6.0 8.0
Subtotal bureau	72.6	67.2	57.6	48.7	45.9	44.3	46.5	48.1	47.1	46.2
Growth/decline	8.04%	16.67%	18.28%	6.10%	3.61%	(4.73)%	(3.13)%	1.95%	1.79%	3.93%
Engineering bureau: Engineering	117.1	115.2	109.7	105.3	103.9	98.7	99.2	100.6	101.3	98.4
Subtotal bureau	117.1	115.2	109.7	105.3	103.9	98.7	99.2	100.6	101.3	98.4
Growth/decline	1.65%	5.01%	4.18%	1.35%	5.27%	(0.50)%	(1.37)%	(0.66)%	2.88%	15.11%
Environmental affairs and planning bureau: Planning	30.3	28.6	25.3	21.1	19.6	16.8	14.9	14.3	13.7	12.1
Subtotal bureau	30.3	28.6	25.3	21.1	19.6	16.8	14.9	14.3	13.7	12.1
Growth/decline	5.94%	13.04%	19.91%	7.65%	16.67%	12.75%	4.56%	4.24%	13.16%	1.34%
Trade relations and port operations bureau: Communications Maintenance Security Trade relations	14.8 76.8 69.8 14.9	14.7 72.7 63.8 15.8	14.1 72.1 58.7 15.6	13.0 69.6 50.7 14.5	11.6 68.3 47.5 13.7	9.8 73.8 47.8 14.3	8.2 79.8 42.7 12.9	8.2 86.1 37.7 12.5	9.0 86.8 29.8 12.5	8.5 83.3 31.5 14.5
Subtotal bureau	176.3	167.0	160.5	147.8	141.1	145.7	143.6	144.5	138.1	137.8
Growth/decline	5.57%	4.05%	8.59%	4.75%	(3.16)%	1.46%	(0.57)%	4.59%	0.18%	0.23%
Part time/temporary	18.9	27.3	27.7	30.6	21.2	21.5	21.8	25.0	23.0	18.9
Growth/decline	(30.77)%	(1.44)%	(9.48)%	44.34%	(1.40)%	(1.38)%	(12.80)%	8.70%	21.56%	18.25%
Total department	435.9	424.7	401.0	370.4	346.3	338.2	337.8	341.2	331.1	321.4
Growth/decline	2.64%	5.91%	8.26%	6.96%	2.40%	0.12%	(0.92)%	3.00%	2.95%	5.96%