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WELCOME TO SCOPE MEETING

DR. RALPH APPY: Thank you very much. I think we need to get started.

Tonight is a Public Meeting on the Environmental Impact/Statement Impact Report, which is an environmental document for our San Pedro Waterfront.

I'm Ralph Appy. I'm the director of Environmental Management for the Port of Los Angeles.

And tonight we have a number of speakers and each of them is going to give a presentation.

I'd like to introduce, first of all, Colonel Thomas Magness. He is the District Engineer for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. And he will talk about their role in the preparation of the environmental document and their permitting role as well for the Project.

So with no further ado, I'd like to turn over the meeting to the Colonel to introduce you to the Project.

Thank you.

STAFF PRESENTATION

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Hopefully everyone
I will find a seat and we can get started and we'll keep the sidebars outside of the room.

I am anxious to hear from the people as they come to the microphone and I'm sure you are as well. And the extent to which we can keep the rest of the conversations outside of the room, that would be terrific.

My name is Colonel Thomas Magness. I'm the District Commander for the Los Angeles District of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I also come to you in another capacity; and for many of you that is as your neighbor. I live on Fort MacArthur. Right now I'm at Pacific Avenue at about 27th Street. And I'm raising two beautiful little girls in this community and very passionate, as many of you all feel, for the water and Waterfront for this Project. And I'm happy to be here.

I'm going to read a couple of things before we get started so that I can read this into the record. This is not my normal M.O., but I'll do this tonight.

On behalf of the Corps of Engineers, I'd like to welcome you all to this meeting, which we are also conducting in Spanish as a courtesy to you, the interested public.

As you know, the Port of Los Angeles has applied to my agency for a permit to create three new
harbors along the San Pedro Waterfront, construct pile supported structures to provide additional areas for landside use, and construct a Waterfront Promenade and Outer Harbor Cruise Ship Terminals.

The project's joint Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Impact Report, which you are currently reviewing, evaluates the construction and operation of the Project and several alternatives.

Under our Federal Permit Program, the Corps of Engineers is responsible for regulating dredge and fill activities in waters of the United States such as Los Angeles Harbor, including activities that may affect navigation.

The Port's proposed activities along the San Pedro Waterfront are regulated under both Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

In addition, the Port is proposing to transport and dump relatively clean material dredged to create the new harbors at ocean disposal sites, which would be regulated under Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act.

Federal actions, such as Section 404, Section 10 and Section 103 permit decisions are subject to compliance with a variety of federal environmental laws,
such as the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA.

Consequently, the Corps has a responsibility to evaluate the environmental impacts that would be caused by the proposed Project prior to making a permit decision. In meeting its regulatory responsibilities, the Corps is neither a Project proponent nor an opponent.

In addition to evaluating the environmental direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of the Port's proposed Project, the Corps must determine whether the proposed Project is the least environmentally damaging practical alternative that meets the overall Project purpose.

Also, no permit can be granted if we find that the proposal is contrary to the public interest. The public interest determination requires a careful weighing of those factors relevant to the particular Project. The Project benefits must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments.

For purposes of the testimony I will hear tonight, I will concentrate on issues specifically related to the Port's proposed San Pedro Waterfront Project.

At this public hearing, the Corps is requesting input from the general public concerning specific physical, biological, and human use factors that should
be evaluated in greater detail as part of the Final EIS/EIR and the Corps permit action for the proposed Project.

The Corps would like to emphasize that we will carefully consider all comments that we receive for the proposed Project and they will be given full consideration as part of our final permanent decision.

Some speakers will be opposed to the Project, while others will be in favor. I hope and expect that you will respect opposing views and allow speakers to make their statements without interference.

Following this hearing, all parties will be given until December 8th to provide any written testimony or rebuttals.

I will now turn the floor over to Dr. Appy and to Ms. Jan Green Rebstock from the Port of Los Angeles to provide a 10- to 15-minute presentation on the Project.

Following this presentation, I will discuss how we will take your oral testimony this evening. Until then, if you know you would like to speak tonight, please fill out a speaker card and give it to one of the Corps or Port staff at the front desk identifiable by their Corps or Port ID badges. This will help us transition to the public input sessions.

Ralph.
DR. RALPH APPY: Thank you very much.

The second part of the Environmental Document we're going to do is related to the state side of the documentation and the Port of Los Angeles is what we call the Agency on the California Environmental Quality Act.

Can I have the first slide, please. So I have to do work here.

These are actually the people at the front table. You've met Colonel Magness. To my right is Jan Green Rebstock, who the Project Manager for the Port of Los Angeles on the environmental portion of the Project. And to her right is Dr. Spencer MacNeil, who is U.S. Corps of Engineers Project Manager.

So we've heard the Corps' overview of this tonight on their role in preparation of the Environmental Document and Issuance of Permits. And then we're going to follow with a presentation on the EIR.

We're going to try to make this as brief as we can. We think it's a good idea to show you some idea of what the Project is. Some of you are very familiar with it; others may not be. So we're going to try to do a very quick presentation of that.

And then we're going to go to the speakers. The allotted speaking time is three minutes per speaker.

In some cases, people have petitioned the Corps for
additional time, if you represent large groups, and those
people will be identified as they come forward and
they'll be allowed to speak additional time.

I'd like to state also that we have -- for
anybody that is speaking impaired or hearing impaired, we
do have in the front some assistance we can provide if
you come down and sit in the front, and also we have some
Spanish translation services available.

We also have some dignitaries here this evening
and we'll be introducing them. Councilwoman Janice Hahn
will have an opportunity to speak and Commissioner David
Freeman is here as well.

This is kind of the process we go through the
EIS/EIR. We love acronyms. Environmental Impact
Statement/Environmental Impact Report. And that's the
name of this big environmental document that's about two
feet thick that we sent out to everybody. And we have
lots of ways you can get a hold of that document through
our website.

Tonight just represents one opportunity for you
to provide comments on it. This is a public meeting to
receive oral comments. You can also provide written
comments prior to the end of -- prior to December 8th --
is when the comment period closes. And at the end of the
talk tonight, we'll show you exactly how to provide
comments. And it's also present in some of the materials we've provided out front.

So if you look at this sequence up here on the left, there's something called the NOI/NOP. That's the Notice that we first send out that we're going to be preparing an environmental document. And at that time, we did ask for people's comments. We received those comments and use them to what we call "scope the document." What are the issues of importance? And following that, based on those comments, then we prepared the Draft EIS/EIR, and that is the item that is before us tonight.

And if you look down at the bottom, you'll see the circle that says, "You are here." That's where we are; at the public meeting to receive those comments.

Following receiving your comments, we will then prepare what's called a Final EIR, and that is a document that goes to the decision makers, either the Board of Harbor Commissioners at the Port of Los Angeles or else the District Army Corps of Engineers, who will issue what they call a "Record Decision" on the Project. And so that occurs after we prepare the final, which we think will be done early next year.

Having said that, I'd like to turn the microphone over to Jan, who will then provide you a brief
JAN GREEN REBSTOCK: Okay. So there's a lot to cover here. It's about 400 acres. We have almost eight miles of Waterfront. And we have about 36 different Project elements. I'm going to highlight some of the major ones for you as part of the proposed Project and then briefly go through the Alternatives that we considered in the Environmental Impact Review.

Hopefully you can see the pointer here.

So we're looking at different cruise berthing options for the Inner Harbor and the Outer Harbor. In the proposed Project, we have two berths on the Outer Harbor with two new cruise terminals.

We're looking at creating three new water cuts in the Downtown Harbor, the North Harbor, and the 7th Street Harbor with a public pier.

We're looking at redevelopment of Ports O'Call, which is about 150,000 square feet. We're proposing to double that to 300,000 square feet with a mix of retail and commercial with restaurants, and a potential conference center up to 75,000 square feet.

We're looking at expanding the Red Car Line out to Warehouse 1, out to the Outer Harbor Cruise Terminal, which would also have a six-acre park and out to Cabrillo Beach.
We're also looking at creating about 27 acres of new parks, with San Pedro Park, a three-acre park within Ports O'Call, and a six-acre park here in the Outer Harbor. So there's also a Ralph J. Scott Fireboat Museum and a couple of other new buildings that are being proposed.

Parking for Ports O'Call would be along the bluffs here at 13th Street. Parking for the cruise operations would be concentrated in the Inner Harbor with parking structures about four stories stepped back to the water.

So that's just a brief overview.

These illustrations you can find in the Environmental Impact Report. Also, in the Executive Summary and the Overview if you have a chance to receive one. I'm going to flip through those quickly, but what you should note here is the Promenade, which is along the water continuously as much as possible. So here you see it outlined in the North Harbor in the gold.

The Lane Victory in the proposed Project would be relocated to the North Harbor, where we make room for tugs and other working vessels that helps also bring water close to downtown and the existing Promenade along Harbor Boulevard.

In the Downtown Harbor, again you'll see the
Promenade along the water's edge and along the 7th Street Harbor. And you'll also see a proposed water feature right in front of the Maritime Museum with a public plaza, the Town Square, right in front of the City Hall Building.

Here's a close-up of San Pedro Park. We're talking about reuse of Warehouse 9 and 10 for recreational purposes that would compliment the surrounding park area.

Here is the Promenade that would be built near or out to Cabrillo Beach. And a close-up of the Outer Harbor Cruise Terminal, where again we try to accommodate the Promenade along the water's edge.

This is a close-up of Ports O'Call. And really what we're just trying to demonstrate here is the opportunity site that would include the parking structures along the bluff.

Here you can see a proposed Red Car Maintenance Facility at 13th Street and a pedestrian bridge. This would also help facilitate pedestrian access to Ports O'Call from 13th Street. And this is what the proposed development site would be with the Master Developer for Ports O'Call.

In the document we do try to highlight connections with the California Coastal Trail and upland
connections along the Project area.

You'll also find in the document an analysis of what the Cruise throughput projections are for the proposed Project and the various Alternatives. So you can look at the ship calls, the numbers of the berths in the Inner and Outer Harbor, and what the assumptions were as we went through the analysis for the Alternatives.

The Proposed Project impacts are laid out there for you. We have several unavoidable significant impacts. Some that were less than significant after mitigation and some that we were able to mitigate to typically less than significant.

But I do want to highlight that we had almost 100 mitigation measures applied to this Project. I think it was about 97; 30 of them under air quality. All of these are CAP compliance or exceed the CAP. And you'll see the same for transportation.

Again, we've looked at six Alternatives in comparison to the proposed Project. Mostly when you look at the Alternatives, the variables are: What happens to Harbor Boulevard and Sampson Way? What are the cruise berthing options? And what is the level of development at Ports O'Call? I would say those are the major defining factors between the Alternatives.

Let's see. In the Alternative No. 1, we have a
Cruise Berth -- just one Cruise Berth in the Outer Harbor. And we're also proposing a new cruise terminal in the Inner Harbor. This would serve three cruise berths total.

One thing I wanted to point out is the traffic improvements. In the proposed Project, there's no change to Inner Harbor Boulevard. It stands in its existing capacity. Sampson Way is widened into two lanes in each direction.

In Alternatives 1 and 2, we look at creating a cul de sac at 13th Street, right here, which would limit the traffic this way on Harbor Boulevard. You would have access into the parking structures, but what we would then do is extend Crescent Avenue down to Sampson Way.

So traffic could flow this way. And the major reason for doing this is to try to avoid a messy five-point intersection at 7th Street.

So the major entrance into Ports O'Call would now move from 6th Street to 7th Street.

There's also an Alternative where we look at reducing Harbor Boulevard to one lane in each direction and taking the additional capacity and making that a greenbelt, which is kind of an extension of the park -- Plaza Park along Beacon Street. So that was another approach. But the point is that Sampson Way becomes the
In Project Alternative 2, it's important to note that this is the only Alternative where you have cruise parking for passengers in the Outer Harbor, and that's 1,500 spaces right here. In all of the other Alternatives the parking is concentrated at the Harbor parking structures. In this Alternative, they're split between the Inner and Outer Harbor and it accommodates two cruise berths in the Outer Harbor.

Also, in this Alternative we look at bringing the Promenade behind the Salt Marsh instead of along the beach here. And that's just another Alternative we wanted to look at in 2 and 5.

In Project Alternative 3 we're looking at three cruise berths with one berth in the Outer Harbor and there's no new terminal here. We do accommodate the North Harbor cut though.

Project Alternative No. 4 has four -- or three cruise berths with none in the Outer Harbor. It's just an Outer Harbor Park.

And under Project Alternative 5, the "No Federal Action" Alternative is: What could the Project be if we did not receive permitting from the Army Corps? So that would be no water cuts. That would be no Promenade along the water's edge where piles are
required, and no new cruise berths.

And this is looking at Project Alternative 6 would be "No Project." So what if the Project is not approved, what could you assume would reasonably occur anyway?

You can receive a copy of the document.

There's CDs outside. We also have some in our office. We have Executive Summaries available. The total document is about 6,000 pages. The Executive Summary we've boiled down to 150 pages. We also have a Reader's Guide, which is about 40, which gives you a good overview of the Project and then some of the key issues involved.

You can download all of those documents from our website. We also have them available in Spanish. And the Army Corps has their public notice up there as well. And we also have hard copies available if any of you would like those. And copies are available at the library if you'd like to just go and flip through it.

We are going to have a court reporter here tonight. So all of your comments will become part of the transcript. In the future, that will be posted on the Port website. You can also fill out comment cards or you can send us a letter. The comment deadline is December 8th. And all of -- copies of all of the comment letters will be posted on the Port website. And here's who you
should be addressing your written comments to. And we also will receive comments by e-mail.

    DR. RALPH APPY: (Speaking in Spanish.)
    COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: We will be taking oral testimony from the public in two sections. The first session will be devoted to hearing from selective representatives of significant interest groups. And because these speakers represent significant numbers of people, they will be allowed a little more time to make their statement. And in fairness, the order of speakers will be randomly determined.

    The second session will be for members of the public who would like to present their views as individuals. And during this session, speakers will be given three minutes to make their comments. And while I know three minutes does not seem like enough time perhaps to express your opinion, I will help you understand when your time is up. Because if you look at the number of people in this room, three minutes' time is -- the number would take us all night. There's opportunities to provide your opinion. And we will make sure that that opinion is heard.

    As I mentioned earlier, if you would like to speak during the second session, you must fill out a speaker card and give it to one of the Corps staff
identifiable by their Corps ID badges. Please do this before the second session begins.

All oral or written testimony will become part of the administrative record for this permit application. Once we have the written transcripts of the testimony, they will be published on my organization's Regulatory Division website and the Port's website, which were provided in the Port's presentation and are posted in this room.

Again, if you want to present your testimony to me directly, you must fill out a speaker card and hand it to one of my staff before we start the second session of oral testimony.

As you make your comments, please note that in front of the table there's a timer. And you may not be able to see it from where you're seated, but when you approach the microphone, you'll be able to see it and I will certainly help you see it as well. The light will be green when you begin. When you have one minute left, the light will turn yellow. When your time is up, the light will turn red. Please respect these time limits so that all that desire to speak have the opportunity.

First, if we can have Councilwoman Janice Hahn, who represents the City of Los Angeles 15th Council District.
Councilwoman Hahn.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

MS. HAHN: Thank you very much.

I really want to give a shout out to the whole crowd that's here tonight because after hundreds of meetings and years of hopes and dreams, people still want to come out and give their input into this very exciting proposition of redeveloping our Waterfront.

So thanks for the opportunity to speak before you tonight. I've been waiting a very long to get this point. It's been over three years since the last major phrase of construction on our Waterfront. And I'm hopeful that we can resume this much needed redevelopment.

All across the world major cities have world class Promenades; Baltimore, New York, San Francisco, Hong Kong, Vancouver, London. The list goes on and Los Angeles deserves to be in that same company of cities.

This morning on the Today Show they featured the five cities in the United States that even in this incredible financial downturn are doing well for a number of reasons.

One of the five cities was Charleston, West
Virginia. And one of the main reasons that it is doing
well is because of the River Front Development that is
happening in that city. And I'm mentioning this because
we have a unique opportunity to provide a world class
Promenade, a destination point, for all the people who
live in the City of Los Angeles and all across the
country to visit every year. That's why I'm glad we're
finally at this point and every one is given an
opportunity to provide their input.

I like the considerate amount of open space
that's included in this proposal. It's important that we
focus on linkages to the California Coastal Trail, like
the Royal Palm Beach, White Point Major Conservancy,
Angel's Gate, Point Vernon Park.

I'm also very glad to see that a continuos
Promenade along the Waterfront is part of this proposal.

In 2002 when the Urban Land Institute came
here, they told us a way to redevelop our unique
community down here was to develop the Waterfront and
build housing and in downtown San Pedro. And the promise
of developing this Waterfront is what has spurred the
housing development in downtown San Pedro unprecedented
in as long as I can remember.

We know that giving people an opportunity to
view the working Waterfront is instant entertainment and
something we should take advantage of. We need to allow
people to walk alongside this water.

I'm also glad we're going to be redeveloping
Ports O'Call. I think people for a long time have
remembered fond memories of Ports O'Call, but they would
like to see it updated, renovated, remodeled.

But I want to go on record saying we -- in this
proposal, we have to hang onto the things that are
important to San Pedro while we embrace our future. We
want to see the Ports O'Call Restaurant stay there. We
want to see The Fish Market. And we want to see Cafe
International stay there.

(Applause).

MS. HAHN: They're a part of our unique charm
and there's no reason that they can't be the centerpiece
of the Ports O'Call Redevelopment.

I can see that the Red Car Line is being
extended to Cabrillo Beach, the Outer Harbor, and
Warehouse 1; that's good. I'm very disappointed to see
that the Red Car Extension into Downtown San Pedro has
been eliminated.

In your own statement of purpose you state
that: "The purpose of the Waterfront Project is to
redevelop the San Pedro Waterfront for increased public
access and to provide connections between the Waterfront
After I read that statement, there's no better way to connect the Waterfront to the community than providing transportation that links Downtown San Pedro with the Waterfront; and the Red Car can do that.

I think we need to be visionary when it comes to planning. We need to plan for people to arrive here by bus or by train. And there's still room in this document for improving the connections to public transportation.

I will say I also think that parking structures on prime Waterfront property is the worst possible land use that I can think of.

(Applause.)

MS. HAHN: We know that the first phase of the Promenade is right along where you're proposing these parking structures. So now you've virtually cut off people's access to see the water in the first phase of the Promenade.

I think you should work with the CRA. Let's strategize and use shared parking in Downtown San Pedro, which would also promote the goal of connecting downtown to the Waterfront. Don't take prime Waterfront development for parking cars. We can do better than that. We can be more creative than that and we can do
something that benefits everyone.

I've also been recently troubled by statements made by a certain Harbor Commission President about whether the Port can afford to invest in the Waterfront Project as opposed to a Container Terminal Project.

It is important especially in these times that we not be shortsighted about making an investment in the economic revitalization of this community. We must consider the long-term economic development benefits and financial return to the Port as well as the city as a whole.

We know that tourism is the second largest industry in the City of Los Angeles. And for every 4 percent increase in tourists, it equals $12 million dollars to the City's General Fund. This will promote tourism and will actually add dollars to the City's General Fund, which we can all use.

I don't need to remind you, but I will. We hold this Port in trust for the People of California. And the public trusts us to make sure that we give them access to their Waterfront. We owe this to the public and to do anything less would be inappropriate.

And I did notice that you have $230 million dollars in your unappropriated balance this year. I think you have enough money to invest in the Waterfront.
I also want to say, in conclusion, that I do proudly support the Cruise Ship Industry here in San Pedro. The Cruise Industry is a vital part of our tourist mainstream. Cruise visitors spend approximately $58 million in this region and support about 2,000 good paying jobs.

I love watching these ships coming in and out of the Harbor. I know there's controversy about the Outer Harbor, but I want us to figure this one out. We like the Cruise Ship Industry. It benefits us in San Pedro. It benefits Los Angeles. Let's figure it out so it can be a win-win for every one.

Thank you very much for your attention.

Let's build the Waterfront.

(Appause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Councilwoman.

Next, please, from the Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissions, President David Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: My apologies. I want to speak to my constituents here. I'm here to listen and that's the only reason -- the only purpose I am serving here this evening. I just want everyone to know that I am here and that I am listening.

Also, I want you to know that the Commission
has not prejudged any aspect of this Project. What's being described here tonight is the Commission Staff's Proposal. It, of course, will be considered along with all the comments that everyone will make.

And with that, I hope we have a nice evening learning.

Thank you.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Next please. For ten minutes, representing the Sierra Club, Tom Politeo.

Is Tom here? Tom, you are up. You're on the clock. I've been wanting to say that.

MR. POLITEO: I'm sorry. I didn't realize that other people would be quite so concise.

Thank you very much. My name is -- well, she was saying all of the things I wanted to hear.

My name is Tom Politeo. I am representing the Sierra Club Today. We have a lot of things we could talk about, but we're really only going to focus on one issue, which is primarily the climate change with respect to this Project.

I hope that my nieces and nephews -- hang on for a second. I want to do a little equipment change here.

I hope that my nieces and nephews won't kick me
because of the condition of the world that we leave for
t heir children. I would rather incur the wrath of every
person in this room than ever look in the eyes of a child
and say I was too selfish to care about the world I left
them.

We face a number of serious crises which could
ruin the quality of life ahead. Only one in two children
in Los Angeles graduate high school. In Detroit, only
one in four do. Crime is a constant problem and our
incarceration rate is obscene.

Our economy is melting down. Our polar ice
caps are melting away too. So is the Sierra Snow Cap.
Around the country floods and fires are worse than ever
and are costing us billions more dollars each year.

With all our problems, our economy and
socioeconomic injustice issues may be the most wide
spread in terms of how we feel the pain today.

However, the number one problem we face is
global climate change. And it comprises the worst crisis
that mankind has ever faced. Climate change is an
insidious problem. Today it is overshadowed by other
problems that currently inflict more pain.

However, if we wait until climate change is the
most painful, we will be too late. There will be no
more -- the water supply to California will be gone as
well. Food will be so expensive and scarce around the 
world, hundreds of millions will starve to death. The 
poor in the United States will struggle to feed 
themselves.

This is why a climate change is insidious. If 
we wait on it to act -- if we wait to act on it before it 
becomes the most painful problem we face, it will be too 
late.

This presents, of course, an insurmountable 
challenge in developing the urgency and political will 
needed to confront climate change head on. We must find 
a way to jump this hurdle or our future will be bleak. 
People will work harder in our generation and gasoline 
prices will sky rocket. If we don't do something to make 
us less dependent on this oil, the only thing that will 
stop the rise in energy prices is a faltering economy.

Because of climate change, we may have already 
past the threshold of peak water supply to California in 
the southwest. In time, water shortages will hurt our 
quality of life and our economic potential. This is a 
problem being repeated around the world.

In turn, we will reach peak food supplies and 
peak lumber supplies as well; all in one generation. It 
shouldn't surprise anyone that this crisis will hurt our 
poor far more than our wealthy. If by the time the
American poor feel it, it will be devastating for the world. All around the world it will be disproportionately felt by people of color. It will kill people by the hundreds of millions.

Because carbon stays in the atmosphere for seven years or more, we will have to act before the carbon levels get too high. Otherwise, we will be boxed into a dreadful future.

This is why climate change is not some far issue that only affects polar bears or penguins. It is why Environmental Groups in this country are concerned with the effects of climate change on minorities. This is why we need to do something about it with every opportunity we get.

Now, the world looks at the United States as the Golden Standard when it comes to lifestyle. The world's fastest developing nations -- China and India -- and are starting to live more like the United States as if it were a birthright. Overseas many openly resent the suggestion that they should use less energy and be more efficient while the United States continues to live high on the hog.

In the United States, California is the nation's trendsetter and Los Angeles is among the state's leaders. This is what makes what we do here in Southern
California so important. We have the opportunity -- perhaps more than anywhere else in the world -- to create a better lifestyle that others will, in turn, follow.

If we show a commitment to doing the climate change that is second to none. We can do it in a way that is -- we can do it in a way that is socially and economically successful, the world may turn its head and follow our lead. We cannot for one second make this about giving things up. Every inch of the way we must make this about what we are gaining, about building a better city and a better world, about -- with more for the entire family and all walks of life and all close to home.

Reducing climate change means reducing driving. This means making sure jobs, shopping, culture, dining, nature, recreation, and sports are all nearby. For our region and for San Pedro, our Waterfront needs to be part of this kind of solution.

One-third of the land in Southern California is used for roadways, parking garages, and related services. In the Ports O'Call area it has been more than half. Creating good destinations means bringing up the land for business, recreation, dining, museums, and all other uses that can help attract visitors.

In our Waterfront adjoining areas we need to
create an attraction of such strong appeal that it just
trips people out of their cars and entices them to walk,
bike, and go on the Red Car, and have a great time in a
sparkling urban oasis which is free of cars.

When it comes to guiding a change this big, our
key environmental laws, CEQA and NEPA, are not up to the
task. And these are largely administrated. And though
they have helped the environment, they cannot turn a
lackluster plan into a silk purse. CEQA and NEPA are not
inspirational or creative, nor should they be.

If we are serious about doing something about
climate change, we need to go well above and beyond the
call of bureaucratic duty given by these laws. We need
to transcend to a new plateau where we can create a green
vision for lifestyle that is far less amount of energy in
driving, but would still deliver the high quality of life
with great economic opportunities.

If we work this from the perspective of
"business as usual," we'll be stuck with the same results
as usual. It is madness, as Einstein suggested, to keep
on doing the same thing and expect a different result.

This is why the Sierra Club is asking the Port
to work with redeveloping transit parks, recreational,
and other agencies to develop a Waterfront plan that
brings all the elements together. We need to
dramatically reduce our carbon emissions.

This is why we hope responsible investors will look to new opportunities in and around our Waterfront area to build a city that is far less dependent on foreign oil.

So -- help support more than our wealthy and though climate change will affect the poor most of all, this is not about the poor versus the wealthy. This is about -- and it's not also about San Pedro versus Los Angeles or Wilmington -- one part of San Pedro versus another. This is about doing something that will benefit us all here locally in the region, in the state, in the country, and in the world making all our lives richer.

Unfortunately, none of the Port's Waterfront Alternatives go far enough. As long as we think we can draw a line around the Project and count the number lead private buildings we put inside of it, it never will.

How we get people here is just as important since -- emissions are 40 percent of our carbon footprint. How well the Project works in the community and region is crucial. The measure of success should be engraved in the Waterfront which supports a lifestyle which reduces climate change markedly. Not just for the Project, but on a per capita basis.

We need to help each person live producing a
good lifestyle using much less carbon. This is why the Sierra Club will support the Sustainable Waterfront Plan as our starting point for discussion.

This is why we ask the Port to join us in a revolution on the Waterfront to see just how much farther we can go to create something that brings us to a better lifestyle, more economic opportunity and reduces our carbon footprint all in one step.

This is why the importance of what we do here transcends not only to San Pedro and Los Angeles, but the state as well.

The Sierra Club will be making a more detailed presentation on the Waterfront and our plans in November or December, because obviously everything I've just said now is such a -- we will announce the date and time on that on "makemyday" that's m-a-k-e-m-y-d-a-y, dot, org.

Thank you.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Next please from the Waterfront, Isabelle, please for ten minutes.

DR. RALPH APPY: And if I could also ask too we do have a court reporter over there and we will need to take some breaks. When you speak -- speak if you come forward -- if you could measure your speaking a little bit so that she can make sure she gets all the words into
so the transcript and it is complete.

Thank you.

MS. DUVIVIER: I'm sorry my back is to all of you.

My name is Isabelle Duvivier. I'm representing the Los Angeles Waterfront Working Group, a coalition of local, regional and statewide neighborhoods and business and environmental organizations, such as the Sierra Club, members of American Institute of Architects, the State Costa Conservancy, and many of the neighborhood councils.

I am an architect, a map maker, and a mother.

We here are blessed with a wonderful opportunity to rethink and remake our Waterfront. However, we are also burdened with the reality that we cannot continue to do business as we've been doing, as Tom already very eloquently described.

Scientists and academics are saying that we have ten years, give or take three, to reduce our carbon footprint if we want to live in a world similar to the one we know.

Before us is an amazing opportunity to demonstrate that through thoughtful development we can be a model at stable development where business and the environment can be partners at solving the coming crisis.

We are also blessed to have the leadership of
two great leaders, Antonio Villaraigosa and David Freeman, who have both publicly committed to creating a green city and the greenest Port in the country.

Sustain Lane, however, has recently come out with a survey of 56 in the country and Los Angeles fell from the 25th position to the 28th position in the last year. Here is our opportunity to show the world that we actually mean what we say.

This is the Sustainable Waterfront Plan. It is a plan that has been evolving and circulating in this community for seven years through community workshops and work groups. I will go into a little bit of detail in a minute. But first what I want to say is: This plan can be done now. This plan will not slow down the process. It is less expensive than the proposed plan because it doesn't include many of the high ticket items that the Port plans to include. It also incorporates the city and the Port's sustainable concepts.

The main goals of the Working Group -- the Working Group has put together a one-page list of specific goals, which I believe is being circulated and I'm happy to also hand those out if anybody needs them. They follow basic seven categories to which I will briefly speak.

The first one and the really critical one is
that all berths will be located at the Inner Harbor.

This plan is not an Anti-Cruise Industry Plan. This plan keeps all of the cruise industry infrastructure compact and centered around the already beautifully developed Promenade and the fountain. In this way, we both duplicate cruise industry infrastructure and support facilities. You can see there's three cruise ships over to the right of this blow-up of our plan.

We keep the three cruise ships near downtown so that visitors to the area can enjoy the local resources in and around downtown.

This plan sets aside Cabrillo Beach and the Outer Harbor area including Kaiser Point for recreational educational uses that preclude cruise service, except for occasional visiting vessels, which is also on the plan. To create a regional quality educational recreational area so people don't have to drive so far to recreate.

The blue area here represents the security zone around the Cruise Ship -- the proposed Cruise Ship. You can see that when a boat is docked, access to the Small Harbor and the proposed Promenade is severely impacted. However, when the ship is maneuvering, the security zone increases by 300 feet on all sides; the equivalent of two football fields.

Having cruise ships in the Outer Harbor
negatively impacts the Cabrillo Beach recreational area.
Not only does it impact the use of the Small Craft Harbor, it also impacts water, air, and habitat quality, as well as public access to Kaiser Point.

Our second main point is to provide linkages to downtown and the community. The Sustainable Waterfront Plan provides these linkages. The community envisions the Red Car Line running not only to Kaiser Point and Cabrillo Beach as the Port has planned, but also they want the Red Car Line to go downtown.

This plan provides for bridges that will help link the downtown to the Waterfront. These are some spectacular examples of other places that have great bridges celebrating the connection of two physically disconnected areas like we have here.

And as extreme as these examples may seem, Green Groups are now and commonly integrating sustainable design in development into building design. They've reduced the heat island effect. They provide for water storage and filtration. They provide habitat and are beautiful. Our plan calls for green roofs potentially on the roof of parking structures and other buildings.

Finally, on the point of linking the Waterfront to the downtown, the rearranging of Harbor Boulevard to accommodate more traffic will further separate the two
parts of San Pedro. The Waterfront Plan emphasizes the
knitting together of the downtown and the Waterfront and
the reduction of physical barriers.

San Pedro is blessed with a wealth of open
spaces, though fragmented and neglected. These jewels of
open spaces -- which I've indicated several here -- that
have the potential to be an attraction for regional
visitors. The State Coastal Conservancy has a goal of
connecting these fragments to enhance recreational
opportunities and provide for critical habitat recreation
and survival.

The Coastal Conservancy is a state agency that
is responsible for making sure all citizens have access
to the coast. Their recent study -- or actually, their
study done several years ago indicates that the L.A.
Harbor area is a critical break in connecting people to
the water. By linking open spaces to each other and the
Waterfront, inland residents will have improved
pedestrian access through the coastal area and regional
visitors will be attracted to the San Pedro Coast Line.

Our fourth main point is the Waterfront Plan
expands the salt water marsh. As many of you know,
marshes are the nursery for baby and small fish. Due to
the warmer temperatures, the shallow water is protection
from predators. By protecting, expanding, and cleaning
our Salt Marsh, we protect our fishing industry.

And just for a point of clarification, our marsh expansion does not move the Boy Scout Camp.

The Sustainable Waterfront Plan calls for the development of 150,000 square feet of retail, a conference center, a Promenade, and a rich complex of open and public space. It keeps all of the existing businesses.

And as Janice mentioned, it's very important to us that there's a great diversity of parking options located near downtown. Our plan promotes a diversity of parking to discourage traffic pollution and encourage pedestrian activity downtown. A primary goal of the plan is to avoid parking on the Waterfront.

(Applause.)

MS. DUVIVIER: Shared parking would also encourage people to park downtown and walk enjoying the local resources.

The Sustainable Waterfront Plan reflects the Port's and the City of Los Angeles' sustainability goals. We would like to see a plan that incorporates bicycle friendly streets, parking orchids, or parking lots with trees to help reduce the heat island effect and reduction in auto dependance by making pedestrian connections between the Waterfront and Ports O'Call more friendly and
easy to navigate on foot.

The Working Group envisions integrated solar; not just solar on roofs, but also on the skins of buildings. This way we can save some of our rooftops for gardens and public space.

We also envision integrated green infrastructure with attention to water filtration, percolation, and cleaning.

This image up here on the upper right, we're seeing more and more of these in the Los Angeles area where we're starting to actually see agencies require the filtration of storm water off of roofs and sidewalks before it enters into our water body.

In general, the Working Group envisions more attention to green site planning, like you see in this bottom right image, where the building has a green roof, it has solar panels, and it also has areas where storm water can filtrate into the ground.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Isabelle, about 30 seconds.

MS. DUVIVIER: In conclusion, the Sustainable Waterfront Plan is less expensive. The Sustainable Waterfront Plan uses strategies of low impact development and multiple benefits. It is less costly than "business as usual," because it uses existing resources and
infrastructure and requires cooperation between agencies and departments that share the cost and the benefits. It also will provide for Waterfront jobs, provide for a diverse cruise business located near the downtown, reduces vehicular traffic and creates better linkages to the community. It promotes a walkable Waterfront that is not carbon dependent and can be done now.

Finally, the L.A. Waterfront Working Group wants to move ahead. We want either to be -- either to have the co-analysis of this plan with other Port plans or we want to have key elements of our plan incorporated in Alternative 4.

We look forward to working with the Port, the Army Corps of Engineers, and anybody else interested to make this place a much better place.

Thank you.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Next please from the Coordinated Plan Subcommittee of the Port Community Advisory Committee, June Burlingame Smith.

Is June here?

MS. SMITH: My name is June Burlingame Smith. I am Chair of the San Pedro Coordinated Plan Subcommittee of the Port Community Advisory Committee. We have been a committee for almost eight years and have been working on
every plan you've seen in the proposed Project as well as
the one that has just been given by the Working Group,
the Sustainable Waterfront Plan.

I have already given Dr. Appy and Dr. MacNeil
some material and my primary purpose here tonight is to
give them supplementary materials for Appendix B, which
talks about PCAC involvement. And I would just like to
list what those materials are, so that every one in the
room and for the record will now what has not been
submitted in the DEIR/DEIS.

First of all, there's a list of motions from
the San Pedro Coordinated Plan Subcommittee and the
actions taken by the Port Community Advisory Committee on
those motions since January 2008. Those include a motion
that asks for 90 days for comment. We're pleased that
the Port moved from their original 60 to 75, but with
6,000 pages to analyze, we thought 90 days might help us
a little bit. And incidentally, none of these have yet
been seen by the Board of Harbor Commissioners. So these
are new for the Commissioners. The staff has seen them
and PCAC has passed them.

The second motion asks that the Ports O'Call
Enhancement Project, which the Board approved, go ahead.
That has also not yet been seen by the Board of Harbor
Commissioners.
And third, on July 15th this year, the Port Community Advisory Committee approved a Sustainable Plan, Alternate Plan, very similar to the one that Isabelle has presented to you. There's some variations and she did a beautiful job with her slides, I think we all agree. But that has been approved by PCAC. And again, the Port Commissioners have not yet seen it.

The second thing that I'm giving to the staff and to be included in the record is a copy of the Port's report on all the motions that we have recommended, so that you can see that nothing has gone forward from the staff to the Board since May 20th of this year.

The third thing is we have a copy of seven specific goals for the San Pedro Waterfront Sustainability Plan, which was approved on July 15th. And as a matter of fact, we have just been apprised of those essentially by the plan you've just seen from the Working Group.

We also are providing a map of that approved plan, the Sustainability Plan. And I have asked and given you a CD that provides all the minutes from the Coordinated Plan Subcommittee, all 82 meetings that we've held. Actually, we've held three more since then. And so then I would like to have all of those incorporated into the record.
I want to take this opportunity to thank all of the citizens -- not only of San Pedro, but in the region -- and the state who have shown an interest in this tremendous undertaking by the Board of Harbor Commissioners. They have shown the leadership -- the exemplary leadership for greeting the Port with their quality and all the rest of it. And we know that their interest isn't doing the same thing as they develop the San Pedro Waterfront.

But this has taken thousand of hours, it has taken millions of dollars on the part of the Port in order to get to this point. And I, like Janice Hahn, hope that we can come together to really solve those tough issues; the foremost is where does the third Cruise Ship first go or fourth or fifth or sixth. That's the big block that has to go through the bucket. Everything else will swish around it.

So thank you very much.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Ms. June. And I acknowledge receipt of those materials and Dr. MacNeil has been in possession and it will be part of the record as you have requested. And thank you for making those available today.

Spencer is my Project Manager. He is the one that will be ultimately accountable to me as we render a
final decision. And he is the one whom I will ask to insure that every one of the comments -- whether they are entered in tonight or any other meetings that are part of the record -- that we address every one of them before our final decision.

Finally, the last speaker in this session -- and then we'll take just a couple minutes to break to allow our court reporter to stretch her fingers.

Mr. Peter Warren from the Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council for five minutes, please, Peter.

MR. WARREN: Thank you for the opportunity to speak. Thank you, Councilwoman Hahn.

It's a little difficult to hold an audible after hearing so many people saying the things that we support in Coastal San Pedro. Councilwoman Hahn I think hit the nail on the head as did the people at the Sustainable Waterfront.

I want to point out that in the notice it says one of the purposes of the Draft EIS/EIR is to inform decision makers of the public of reasonable Alternatives to the proposed Project. And we have worked hard in the Waterfront Group to present a valuable, reasonable alternative that we've brought over the past eight months to officials at the Port and we're saddened to see that it's not included in the EIR. We enforce connections
with the Waterfront, downtown, and Cruise Ships Harbor.

We truly want to come up with redefinition of the word "sustainable." Not just "green," but the idea that the four key elements in San Pedro -- not just the pieces that are within the Port, but the four key elements -- downtown, the Cruise Ship Industry, the Ports O'Call, the recreational and educational and scientific area south of 22nd Street work together to sustain themselves; that they've become an attraction and symbiotic to each other.

So that people, when they want to go for a bike ride or travel somewhere, to see the Waterfront or the shore, don't go to Redondo Beach or Huntington Beach, but they come here and they patronize our shops.

This weekend the Port and Environment Committee, the host of San Pedro Neighborhood Council, passed the following resolution: Recognizing that Coastal San Pedro Neighborhood Council has long opposed a Cruise Ship Terminal or permanent berthing of cruise ships in the Outer Harbor at Kaiser Point. Recognizing that existing and future San Pedro business and job development will benefit by expanding cruise ship berths near downtown and modernizing the cruise terminal there.

Recognizing the Ports O'Call should also be expanded and modernized, but not tripled in size so it would threaten existing downtown business and future
development near and in downtown.

Recognizing that the Outer Harbor Berth is a Port Staff proposal, has at least 30 percent more greenhouse gases than the downtown Alternative.

Recognizing that Outer berthing options add up to 600 bus trips and hundreds of cars and truck trips a day through San Pedro to Kaiser Point; unnecessary trips.

Recognizing that the area south of 22nd Street should become an attraction for all of L.A. and Southern California. An attraction that brings people to play and spend money in San Pedro.

Recognizing that this area should be dedicated to science, education, research, recreation, habitat, preservation, people friendly and compatible business uses resolved.

The Costal San Pedro Neighborhood Council supports the Sustainable Waterfront Plan and strongly opposes the Port's staff's proposal as well as any permanent berthing of cruise ships in the Outer Harbor.

Just to be clear, this was passed by the Port and Environment Committee and will go before the whole council before the month is up. Because of the length of the comment period, we didn't have that opportunity before.

Time is -- has it changed yet?
COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: You've got one more minute, Pete.

MR. WARREN: Thank you.

What we're really asking is for a development that recognizes all the elements of San Pedro and uses this, as Councilwoman Hahn says, as an opportunity not just to build a Cruise Ship industry and to make Ports O'Call wonderfully successful, but to use that to also leverage the advantages of San Pedro, the archipelago of attractions that we have from White Point to Point Fermin, Angel's Gate Park, and Fort MacArthur, the Bell Royal Palms, Point Fermin Park.

We're asking for development to take into account the needs of a developing Port along with the multiple uses for the tide lands that are authorized and required by the tide land's trust.

We're asking you not to dedicate the south end of the Harbor to Cruise Ships and to people who can pay $10,000 a couple to go away for a week, but to reserve the area for the 3 million people within 45 minutes from here for recreations and I've listed those. We're asking to create this space for parks by the Waterfront.

Imagine 50 to 100 years in the future. What would be the greatest gift to the future that we could make? To dedicate this precious resource to now and to
future generations, so that in the year 2060, people will
look back at the Board of Harbor Commissioners of 2008,
and you, Mr. Freeman, and your colleagues, and say, "They
had the public's trust first and foremost in their
minds."

I thank you for the opportunity to speak.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you very much.

Okay. Here's what we're going to do -- and
this is at great risk for all of us -- if you look at the
stack of cards, we have a long way to go tonight and I'm
confident they'll be a few more that will make it into
this stack. We want everyone to have an opportunity to
speak.

So if this break takes longer than a couple of
minutes, you will miss my point. This break is not for
anyone within the audience. This break is only for our
person over there typing deliberately as I speak. And
I'll just keep talking and she'll keep typing, or we can
stop and take two minutes and let her stretch her
fingers. So if you would just stretch in place,
introduce yourself to your neighbor. And then I'll bang
on this microphone and we'll start again.

(Brief recess.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Okay. Let's begin.

Here's the way we're going to do it: You'll
have three minutes to provide individual comments.

You'll have three minutes and I will call up three people. So you'll get an idea if you are next or in the spirit of the fact that the World Series Game -- what's tonight? Game 5 is tonight -- you'll need to be "on deck" or "in the hole" and I'll let you know. And what we need to do is proceed rapidly from one to another.

Please don't Applause. That could take forever. And I know that you understand the intent here is to give everyone an opportunity to speak and not to let applause take the time that it will.

First, please, Tom Dorsey is going to come up.

After Tom is John Papadakis. And after John will be Ralph Guida.

So, please, Tom Dorsey.

MR. DORSEY: All right. I'll try to keep this real short.

The first thing is: We would like to have a lot of places for people to bike and ride. But population in this country is getting older. A lot of people have leg and knee problems. Other people have other disabilities. Not everybody bikes and rides. I think that's an important thing for all the physically able people to keep in mind.

When you're looking at making things so people
can walk more, parking is further away, there might be adequate things taken for people that are physically able.

Another thing is: We just lost a cruise ship. We just lost 104 visits a year from a cruise line. They're not coming back. They went to Florida and they're gone. I keep track of cruise ship calendars; things are looking pretty grim next year and they're not looking real good into 2010. Right now San Diego is having us for lunch in terms of the cruise ships. So that's a lot of money in the Port. That's a lot of jobs. That's a lot of provisioning of ships. And it's important that we be able to take the new sites, cruise ships.

Last thing I want to say real quick is: I didn't notice anybody speaking about the economic disadvantages. We have to have POC out here now on the weekends especially on Sunday because of the number of low income, mostly Hispanic, people that are coming to Ports O'Call.

And it's when -- San Pedro's one of the few places left in this, you know, terrible economy where people can have a reasonable fun time with their families. Fanfare is great. It brings families out at night. It's beautiful.
And while we're doing all this wonderful planning, let's keep in mind that there's -- that San Pedro right now is a great place for people to visit and not spend a lot of money. And let's try and keep it that way. That's all I have to say.

Thank you.

(Appause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

John Papadakis, Ralph Guida, and then David Boyle.

MR. PAPADAKIS: Thank you.

John, I like you but I don't think the sky is falling. Over two years ago I'd think of such a meeting and passionately criticize the proposed Waterfront Plan by the Administration of the Port of Los Angeles. I come here tonight to clearly praise it.

A decade passed since the Chairman of the L.A. Harbor Watch Economic Development Corporation. I can see the Bridges to the Breakwater Grand Promenade Plan that would lift us out of the cruel cycle of poverty, crime, drug addiction, and violence that we have suffered with too long.

The only thing that's really sustainable in a poor community is the living a man or woman can make. I want to make that clear about the word "sustainability."
A plan for the many, not for the few, that would create an urban Waterfront mecca via every Californian's right to public access to the shoreline. The purpose of this plan was to make the nation's greatest working Port also the nation's greatest living Port.

I have reviewed the current Port Waterfront Plan and I extend a huge "Thanks" to the Administration and the staff for comprehensively addressing the big picture. This plan is transformational; you've got it right. For you have incorporated the five vital and interlocking foundational principals that galvanized and united all of us nearly a decade ago.

And they are changing the use between the bridge and breakwater; this is huge. Because by changing the use, you're changing the environment, through change forums, chemical change, fuel docks. That's real environmentalism.

Two: To establish a Grand and broaden the Promenade with primary access to the water, you don't circumvent private businesses with a public use infrastructure.

Three: That the Grand Promenade is continuous as an unstoppable human avenue along the sea, that it's architecturally distinctive.

Four: It's already won awards for that.
And five: Finally, most importantly, that you are building on a statewide scale for the true owners of the Waterfront -- which is the people of the State of California, not just the local people -- nothing speaks more clearly to this intention than the creation of a people and family friendly state-of-the-art worldwide cruise center. And to think, this fabulous cruise center will sit where a dangerous coal pile once blew and killing people, blowing away half of San Pedro with it. I survived that, but the windows in my restaurant did not. Talk about a transformation.

Also, the search for a statewide developer to create Harbors that are badly needed commercial space for our antiquated, empty, and now dangerous Ports O'Call area. All of this is --

With the Port's current environmental initiatives and the Port's not 30-year, but 7 or less year plan to build the entire Promenade, our dream of a people-, family-, and business-friendly Harbor area is within our grasp. Reach for it, citizens. It's for you. Build it and truly make an economically sustainable community. Please build it and finally open L.A.'s door to the sea.

Thank you very much.

(Appplause.)
COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Ralph Guida. And then David Boyle and Lenny Reidling.

MR. GUIDA: My name is Ralph Guida. Besides being a business owner, I'm here on two prongs. One: I'm for this Waterfront Project. One, as a business owner to provide jobs for my employees; and second as a husband and a grandfather where I can have my wife walk along the Waterfront and ride bicycles along the Promenade.

I went to a brief presentation and it appears to be that not all the people for projects show up because when they see a good Project, they just assume that it's going to be approved. I want to speak up and say I am for this.

Also, I was also part of a program with the Port of L.A. for the small businesses and I went through a step program and was able to learn about how to give the opportunities to obtain a job here at the Port and to provide that to my employees.

Thank you for this opportunity.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

David Boyle, please.

MR. BOYLE: All right. Thank you.

I wanted to add my voice in support of the
Project as well. I notice on Page 9 of the Summary of the EIS/EIR that the trail connection of the Coastal Trail -- the Upper Coastal Trail and the L.A. Harbor Coastal Trail. I've done a liveaboard -- a sailboat liveaboard for 18 years and a member of the Cycling Club. We ride this Harbor Trail regularly. And where the two trails join, there's a railroad crossing there. The tracks are at a difficult angle that's quite dangerous. We've had several accidents there. The only way to get across that -- because the way the highway changes, if you follow the traffic flow, you're going to end up paralleling the tracks -- so you have to cross the tracks at 90 degrees and go out into the traffic lanes in order to make a 90-degree turn. If you could include that in your planning, that would be really beneficial.

The only other comment: I hope you're going to provide for -- some place.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, David.

Lenny Reidling and then Roland Rothman and Jill Rothman.

MR. REIDLING: Yes. I'd like to speak in favor of the proposed development. I believe improving the existing Port will benefit the public by creating recreational uses and stimulate the local economy.
Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Lenny.

You can speak longer if you would like. I mentioned the World Series and now all of the comments are much more abbreviated.

Please, Roland and then Jill would follow you.

Roland, please.

MR. ROTHMAN: Thank you.

I'm Roland Rothman. I'm also a business owner and a private citizen here. We believe this Project -- after listening to everybody speaking -- will be socially and economically a benefit to the entire area of Southern California.

A couple things that we ask or that we've noted: The corridor that people talked about; it seems to me that planning is very important. That this Port look at how you can move people as effectively as possible while keeping carbon footprints to a minimum.

Also, I haven't heard much about it -- maybe I wasn't listening as closely -- but Alternative energy, I believe, is of vital importance to the growth of anything that we do. And we would highly recommend that you try to incorporate Alternative energy into this Waterfront.

Thank you.
(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Roland.

Jill, my apologies. I should have allowed you to speak before him.

Please, Jill Rothman.

MS. ROTHMAN: That's okay.

He was speaking of the business side and I'm going to go from a personal side. I have a lot of family that love cruise ships. And when we come to the Ports to pick them up, we drive into the parking lot, pick them right up, and go right back home. So I think that this is a great Project to bring us to make us come and stay, spend the night, spend some money in here and have a good time down here. So we truly support this Project.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Next please, Joe Garcia, Kathleen Woodfeld, and Elizabeth Warren.

Joe Garcia, please.

MR. GARCIA: Thank you.

My name is Joe Garcia and I'm going to be speaking to you on two fronts. One is a profession of civil engineering that's practiced here for the last 15, 20 years. And secondly as a citizen and ex-resident of
San Pedro.

And this Project is -- like I think Janice Hahn said -- is long overdue. We traveled extensively around the country. We also cruise a lot. And I got to tell you, there are a lot more beautiful places to come to than this Harbor. So it's long overdue. I strongly support it.

Two items -- I think they were brought up by others. Reconsider the parking structure by the cruise line. I think you could probably do a better job on lowering that profile in the Harbor area.

And the second: Definitely that Red Car has got to go to downtown and it's got to make that connection.

Thank you very much for the opportunity.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Joe. Kathleen Woodfeld, Elizabeth Warren, and then Jean Alexander.

Kathleen.

MS. WOODFELD: Good evening. Thank you.

My name is Kathleen Woodfeld. I am in support of sustainable growth and, therefore, I support the Sustainable Waterfront Plan.

I believe that this Sustainable Waterfront Plan
actually is the plan that is the least environmentally
damaging. And also it's a plan that meets the goals of
the Project by being the least environmentally damaging.
And what I mean by that is that it links to downtown, it
increases access to the Waterfront and it accommodates
working the cruise industry, and those are the goals of
the DEIR.

The reason that -- one of the reasons that the
Sustainable Waterfront Plan is so diverse is that it
takes an -- in Alternative 4 there's a berth design; it's
like an elbow. And it allows for all types of ships --
large, medium, small -- to berth at that location. It's
a very unique design. It already is in the EIR and the
Waterfront -- the Sustainable Waterfront Plan embraces
that berth design.

Unfortunately, the Port has already gone out
for preliminary design work that -- has contracted for
preliminary design work that actually does what's called
North Harbor Cut; that is part of the preferred Project.
And the North Harbor Cut -- once you do that North Harbor
Cut, you can never make that elbow berth again. It
completely destroys all opportunity to have that. So
it's a very particular concern.

But then again, it has been stated over and
over, the elbow design berth would accommodate all types
of cruise ships, would accommodate cruise ship growth, and would allow the best case scenario for people who are taking cruises to be able to spend their money in our local area and in Ports O'Call, because it's located near the downtown and near Ports O'Call.

I'm also concerned that the study that shows that we need two Outer Harbor berths plus the berth that we have -- the two berths that we have in Inner Harbor was done in 2006, and that the -- it had changed dramatically since then. And I think there might be an overstatement of the cruise industry. And I think that if we build two berths in Outer Harbor, not only are we bringing all kinds of impacts to this community, but we're creating a scenario for what's called "Destination Ships," where people specifically go on the ship only to have that be the destination and they don't come off the ship to spend their money. And this would be very unfortunate for us.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Kathleen.

Elizabeth Warren and Jean Alexander and Vanessa Rodriguez.

MS. WARREN: Good evening.

My name is Elizabeth Warren. I'm the Executive
Director of Future Ports and a resident of San Pedro.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments tonight on this important Project. This Project is critical to grow San Pedro's economic strength and stability. However, it's also very important to this region as a whole.

Future Ports is a membership-based advocacy group based in this area with over 60 member companies and partners; combined, they represent tens of thousands of employees in the businesses despite changes throughout Southern California.

All of our members have two things in common; a vested interest in the economic performance of our San Pedro Bay, Ports of L.A., and Long Beach, and that we all agree and believe in the need for cleaner air and good jobs.

We welcome the developments of this Project as presented this evening by the Port staff. Future Force wants to see a difference in the Port. We want to see balance; a way to ensure that the Port's continue to provide economic stability that's used and needed in order to support all of us with a good quality of life and good jobs. Jobs with benefits; like, paid vacations and health insurance.

We also want to protect our environment and
grow in green manner whenever possible. This Project incorporates dozens of mitigation measures. We'd like to highlight a few simple facts about the jobs created by the cruise industry and that this Project will create.

This Project has over $25 million in spending by -- $25 million in spending by passengers and crew members in the Harbor area alone. 1,277 jobs created in San Pedro. And 2,478 jobs created in the region. This Project will generate -- or the cruise industry generated $52.5 million in income in the local area and $89.1 million regionally. Local spending spent $5.7 million in taxes to state and local and government, and regional spending spent $9.7 million in taxes to state and local government. The biggest boost to our economy in hard times 7,363 direct construction jobs and 17,671 indirect construction jobs created by this Project.

This development will also create approximately 738 permanent jobs for Waterfront businesses plus almost 650 cruise operation jobs. That's a total of almost 26,400 direct and indirect jobs. So if we can keep over 25,000 families working from this Project alone, that's a huge contribution to our local economy towards recovery from this recession.

I've always said that San Pedro is the best kept secret in L.A., But we can't stay a secret to
survive. Doing nothing is not an option any longer. We've had no significant construction for years and all we've gotten for is six or seven years in time and money spent on environmental documents and no projects.

Future Force urges this Board to expedite the EIR, keep this and other projects underway so we can create thousands of construction jobs, cruise jobs, and other good jobs to keep people employed and our economy and our ports moving.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Jean Alexander and Vanessa Rodriguez.

MS. ALEXANDER: Thank you. My name is Jean Alexander. I live in San Pedro and I've had a boat for over 35 years. And I do have my boat over in the West Bay where they're going to be building the new Marina. It's quite a Project. And we do have concern about a cruise ship out there because of the safety zone and for the sail boats the way we use the channel, but I won't go into a lot of detail. But we are concerned about that safety zone and the cruise ships.

And also I have a boat that's over 40 feet long. And slowly we've been losing all the boat yards in the L.A. Harbor that conserve our boats. And there are
still a few, but we're losing a lot. We've lost a lot like San Pedro Boatworks, where I hauled boats out for 30 years.

And so we would really like to see, instead of a cruise ship, we would rather see a boat yard in the Harbor preferably out where we are. We think that's a better use right now. I know I represent a specialized group, but I think we contribute a big part of the economy there too, because we use restaurants, boat yards, Marine stores. So I'd like you to consider not having a cruise terminal out there and finding space for a boat yard and Harbor.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Vanessa.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good evening. Vanessa Rodriguez with the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce. The L.A. Chamber area is the largest and oldest business organization in the county representing over 1,600 member companies and over 800,000 employees.

As many of you know, the Chamber is credited for its role in helping create the Port of L.A. in 1908 and today proudly supports the San Pedro Waterfront Project for the opportunity it provides to develop important human elements near the Port's commercial and
Upon reviewing the project's Draft EIS/EIR, the Chamber encourages the preferred Alternative for the economically polled stimulus it presents while appropriately mitigating environmental and traffic concerns.

The preferred Alternative will increase the number of cruise ship calls and will revitalize the San Pedro Waterfront by adding commercial space for retail shops and restaurants making it a cultural focal point for the South Bay.

Last August the Los Angeles Times reported the region's unemployment rate at 7.1 percent; one of the highest in the country. With such a staggering percentage, we can all agree it is imperative to do this for our country by supporting economic development projects.

Redeveloping San Pedro Waterfront will bring new jobs for a slowing economy. As Elizabeth Warren mentioned, the Preferred Alternative is expected to provide over 7,000 direct jobs during the construction period and nearly 18,000 indirect construction related jobs.

Following the project's completion, the Project will sustain 738 permanent jobs in addition to 645 cruise
related jobs.

Our reports indicate that approximately $18 million in new tax revenue will be generated by the city -- or for the city and the state.

Furthermore, the Project will be built with the latest green building guidelines, as well as making use of water recycling opportunities and environmentally friendly landscaping.

Additionally, by increasing pedestrian bike lanes, the Project will encourage more sustainable transportation options.

For these reasons, the Chamber supports the Preferred Alternative.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Next three. If we could please have Steve Blount, John Schaefer, and Jon Miller.

Please, Steve Blount.

MR. BLOUNT: Thank you for pronouncing my name correctly. I'm from Rhode Island; not North Carolina.

I'm a candidate of the Assistant of the Assembly District which encompasses Seal Beach and Huntington Beach and they have some community concerns; environmental and energy issues as to San Pedro.
I'm a former member of the San Pedro Peninsula Chamber of Commerce and I'm a current member of the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. And I work for Union Minerals and that was at Berth 52 and Mobile oil at Berth 46.

And I'd like to address the issue of the safety navigational hazard of cruise ships being berthed at 46. I would like to have the two berths shifted around to 48 and 52 -- or 50. And that way it would eliminate a lot of the navigational hazard, the maneuvering a mega cruise ship would have in that area and lessen the concern of the marina residents and boat owners and patrons in doing it.

And I want to give you an illustration of how hazardous this can be. In another campaign in 2004, I completely forgot my wedding anniversary. So as to compensate for that, my wife required me to take her on a seven-day cruise. We left L.A. Harbor on the Vision of the Seas in late May 2005 and we got to Warehouse 1. We entered in Pea Soup Fog. And from then on, it was a battle with a sailboat. And it was reported that this cruise ship clearly heard the following conversation aboard the ship -- now, never mind whether the apparatus, the device, the instrument mentioned in the conversation would have made any difference, but the fact
is it was Pea Soup Fog and this conversation was clearly
heard and I'll end it with this point well made.

Following conversation between a man and a

woman:

"Where is the GPS? You were in charge of the

equipment."

"Why me? It's your brother's boat."

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Steve.

John Schafer.

MR. SCHAFER: How are you doing? My name is

John Schafer. Born and raised in San Pedro, as is all of

my family. I'm a third generation pile guard. Business

manager Pile Guard.

I know you've probably heard this before, but

basically, I'm going to represent a lot of the workers

that are going to be working on this Project from the

people that are going to be driving the pile, to doing

the decks, to doing the shoring, to doing the terminals,

to doing the cut-ins, and those that will be doing the

recreations before.

We have a little over 900 members and we're

basing -- as we have been for over 100 years now. And I

just want to try and put it into a simple perspective.

It means a heck of a lot to our members. Over half of

our members live in the Harbor area and we work on
projects right now such as the Gold Mine East Side extension. We have members on the Expo Line. We're working on the Wind Farms up in Bakersfield. We're working on the five with four teams with bridges and so forth. And we've been working as divers to improve security in the Ports and the Harbors.

At the same time, I appreciate the dialogue that's been going on for some time now. I've seen the other sides of Port development. My mother passed away from asthma living in San Pedro, and my son has had childhood asthma. I know what we can do with the future. I know it intricately.

We can build a cleaner Harbor. We can build it whatever way people want it to be built, but the idea is it needs to be built. It is a terrific idea to have plans and designs and so forth and look at this from another angle and another angle, but sooner or later you have to realize that doing nothing as the ultimate Alternative doesn't make anything any better. We need to move forward. So I encourage you to consider all options, but to build it as quickly as possible.

I've got a degree in Political Science and I've worked on a lot of these developments inside downtown L.A. But I have two members that I've met -- that I've known for over 20 years who recently passed away in large
part because of the inability to find a job that was close to home. It may not seem -- like they had other issues and I agree with that -- but when you have to drive, for example, to Brawley every day to get a job, it's -- it can have a hard toll on your family and on you yourself.

We want people to work close to home and build it as soon as possible.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Jon Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good afternoon. I'm Dr. Jon Miller, a local resident.

I support the Sustainable Waterfront Plan, especially the form in which they keep all the berths of the cruise ships in the Inner Harbor.

I have several concerns, but one of them is the air pollution that putting ships out at Kaiser Point will create from the ships and the hundreds of bus and truck trips that will be required to service these ships. I'm afraid that it will make a bad air quality problem worse.

For example, a study reported in the American Journal of Epidemiology this month of 66,000 nurses over a 10-year period showed that for a 12-month exposure of an increase in 10 micrograms per cubic meter in PM-10
particles -- which is mostly diesel exhaust -- gives an increase of 10 percent risk for all cause mortality excluding accidental death. And a 43 percent increase percent in risk for cardio vascular deaths. And I think this actually threatens the residents of the local neighborhood -- including Fort MacArthur residents, Colonel. So I don't think it's a good idea to have these cruise ships out there from that standpoint.

Also, I'm concerned that if we have the new cruise terminal at Kaiser Point and the cruise industry goes down as it is doing right now, that the berth -- the ships will preferentially go out to Kaiser Point. That will drain all the passengers away from the downtown area where they could have contributed to the economy if they're all bussed out to Kaiser Point and put into the cruise ship bubble where every dollar spent is spent with the Cruise Ship Company. I'm afraid that we may be overbuilding and preferentially draining away from downtown with this Project.

I'm also concerned -- I have to say I'm concerned about the fact that contracts have been signed for design work on the water cuts for the preferred Project. Now, I have to say that this discretionary action -- these discretionary actions by the Port and Board of Harbor Commissions appear to be
predeterminations of the Project. They're either
predetermination, if you've already signed contracts, or
they're a waste of public money if the Project doesn't go
through. So that's a concern.

I agree that we should not put parking by the
sea. That is a waste of valuable land. I want to see
this Project come through and give us the best Waterfront
we can have. We need to preserve our Ports O'Call and
honor it and make it better and not destroy it. And I
agree with everyone that said that doing nothing is not
an option. We must do something, but we've got to do the
right thing.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Dr. Miller.

Next to read please, Mike Caccavalla, Carmen
Trutanich, and Michael Manio.

I hope I've pronounced the name right. Let's
try that again.

Mike Caccavalla?

Carmen Trutanich and Michael Manio.

MR. TRUTANICH: My name is Carmen Trutanich.

I'm a local resident. I've lived in San Pedro most of my
life. Right now I reside in Harbor City.

I can remember when San Pedro was full of jobs.
As a kid I grew up and worked. 10,000 people employed across the bay. The slips were full of ships and there was a lot of things to do.

Today in San Pedro, the terminal is dead. The slips; there's no more fishing. San Pedro was a destination; now it's a dead end. It needs to become a destination again. And it needs to become a destination through sustainable jobs and through local control.

I agree that the Project in the form that it's in right now has to happen. It can always be amended, but we've got to do something. This Board has got to act and whatever is before you now is better than nothing. We've done nothing for years and years and years.

And this town is basically languished. You look around the world at different cities who are world class -- Hong Kong, New York, San Francisco -- and they have a world class Harbor with bus lane recreational businesses.

San Pedro, which is the Port of Los Angeles, it's an industrial armpit. We need to change that and give it back to the community by creating jobs within this community.

I'm a candidate for Los Angeles City Attorney and I think that this Project needs to commence and it needs to commence now.
I implore this Board to enact what you need to do. Include the downtown in the Project that you're building. There are people that invested their lives in this community. There are businessmen down here in the Harbor that could have their business anywhere in this city and they choose to put it down here in the Harbor. And yet we're looking outside of the 15th District for control of that Project. That Project needs to be controlled by the people within this District.

That means you need to get the input of the business people who have invested with not only their lives but with their money over the years. You can't overlook them. And that's what I've seen happening so far.

We need to bring back the community to this Project and we need to approve it as quickly as possible.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Michael Manio from Presentation Media Incorporated. Juan Sotto and Don Norton.

MR. MANIO: Hi. Good evening. This is my first time here. My name is Mike. I'm with Presentation Media.

Our company is a small business owned --
veteran owned sign manufacturing company. I'm an Account
Manager. I live my life soliciting to go to pre-bids
with sign manufacturing and signs in general. I'm here
because I believe this is history in the making for
everyone that lives in San Pedro. And I'm a Hermosa
Beach resident. My daughter is staying with a relative
who has the flu and I'm a single parent. So I believe
that this job will help me job stability-wise. And I'm
just here for the record that I'm in favor of this
Project.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Colonel THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Michael.

Juan Soto, Don Norton, and John Mavar.

MR. SOTO: Good evening. My name is Juan Soto.

I have been working at Ron's Jewelers for the past 27
years. I've seen this town go from economic to an
economic upturn where everything was going right -- there
was industry here; there were jobs; people were spending
money -- to now, where there's a trickle down in the
economy. We're at the bottom of the run. And it hurts
me to see this town the way it is now because I know that
it's a much better town. And if we don't do something
soon, if we don't get this thing started, it's going to
get worse.
People talk about this Project helping downtown. Let me tell you something: If something isn't done soon, there will be no downtown. All you're going to see is land developers come in, tear that historic downtown down and build up condos, because that's all we have for our future now.

I have dedicated myself to preserving the legacy of a good man who had a business in this town. He could have moved anywhere. In fact, he did, but he came back to San Pedro because he loved it. And for us to keep bickering about this plan and that plan, where is the stone that this is written in? Why can't we just say, "Okay. We're going to agree to do this Project. If something needs to be changed later on, if there's new technology, we'll implement it." But for us to keep coming back year after year after year and bicker about every single little plan that everybody has -- we have time to implement things, but we don't have time to waste.

So I wholeheartedly support the proposed plan.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Juan. Don Norton, John Mavar, Robert Brandon.

Don?
MR. NORTON: Hi. I'm Don Norton. I work in Wilmington with the Pacific Harbor Line and on the Board of Directors of the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce.

And I'm just here to say: I'd really like to see this Project move forward. As other speakers have said, the construction trades desperately need this work and we really, really need to get on with redeveloping this Waterfront and addressing our transportation and parking issues and meeting the needs of the cruise industry.

I'd say with respect to the parking, that you might take a look at all the ideas that are out there that that might be an area where every stone hasn't been turned over yet. And you might be able to create a compromise that's more acceptable to more people.

With respect to the cruise industry, we need to meet their needs or the business will go elsewhere. And the truth is, they support a great deal of business and a lot of jobs here in this immediate area. And the reality is that the bigger ships are starting to arrive. The first one will be here in February. And it will be operating with substandard facilities.

So again, we need to move this Project forward. Thank you.
(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Don. John Mavar, Robert Brandon, Charles Brockett.

MR. MAVAR: I think it's John Mavar. Is that correct? What's put on there.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: You can call it whatever you want to.

MR. MAVAR: Well, it has been quite a bit of time that I've come to these meetings along with the community here. And I just have to say: I'm tired, tired, tired. I think it's time for you do something.

I'm going to make this short and sweet and just say: I support the Port's plan. Seven years, eight years, ten years -- this is what the community has been asking for. This is why the Port put this plan together.

I'm looking to save jobs and create jobs. I would have to say: No walkway along the Cabrillo Beach. Red Car to downtown. No parking structures along the Waterfront. How about a park structure underneath the Vincent Thomas Bridge or some more apartments, or on the CRA property?

Enhance and fix up Ports O'Call. Ports O'Call works on the weekends, but not for everybody in San Pedro. Please look at enhancement, but also providing for people to come off of the hill and from all over L.A.
1 to enjoy our Waterfront.
2 Thank you very much.
3 (Applause.)
4 COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, John.
5 Robert.
6 MR. BRANDON: I want to say thank you for
7 letting me give my comments.
8 First I'd like to say maybe the easiest way to
9 save our court reporter a little time is to just copy and
10 paste everything that Peter Warren said. I have some of
11 my own comments, however.
12 Waterfront redevelopment is vital to our
13 community and the sooner it starts, the better. I
14 support the Sustainable Waterfront Plan.
15 I don't want to see a cruise terminal at Kaiser
16 Point. Use it for public or educational and scientific
17 purposes.
18 I don't want to see Ports O'Call in bars; I'd
19 rather see it restored.
20 Add another berth, a cruise berth at the
21 existing cruise terminal. Let me tell you something
22 about the cruise business here in Los Angeles. One of
23 the reasons the cruise ship moved to Florida is because
24 Florida has access to destinations. Take a look here at
25 Los Angeles. We can go to Encinatas, Catalina Island, or
the Mexican Riviera. That's it. All we're going to get
other than that is cruise ships coming to the Panama
Canal on the radial access. So we've got May going up
and we've got September coming back. So unless we can
build some destinations out there in the sea, this cruise
opportunity isn't as good as everyone thinks it is.

Now, if we have the cruise terminal improved in
the Inner Harbor, this will support the redevelopment of
downtown by allowing the cruise passengers to walk to
town. Our merchants struggle to stay in business and
need our support.

Harbor Boulevard should be left as it is. The
last thing we need is motor trucks transporting cruise
passengers up and down the only uncongested north/south
street in town.

So once again, I want to say that I support the
Sustainability Waterfront Plan. And I hope you will
consider it.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Robert.

Charles Brockett.

MR. BROCKETT: Hello. I'm Charles Brockett, a
20-year resident of San Pedro. I live in the 2800 block
of Peck, which is between Gaffney and Pacific. I'm a
I attended your meeting in January of last year where you invited inputs and I prepared an input and sent it in within your deadline. And it's in the form of a petition, which was signed by me and 186 other people; all but five of which are my neighbors. And what it says is we don't want a Cruise Ship Terminal on Kaiser Point and cited some reasons: Safety, pollution, view blocking, traffic, and light pollution.

The reason I'm speaking tonight is I never got any feedback. 186 people; no feedback. I don't know if anybody read it. I don't know if you got it on file. Nobody started a dialogue. So you invite inputs, but I'm not sure if you respond to them.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: I'll just ask, Charles, was this submitted to an earlier version of the EIS?

MR. BROCKETT: This was submitted as a response to the presentation you made in January, the 23rd of January. I got it in by the deadline. It was inputs to that version of the plan.

DR. RALPH APPY: What we do is we take those comments and we just do a scoping of the document. There is no direct response to that. This is the time to do a direct response to comments.
MR. BROCKETT: So did you read it?

DR. RALPH APPY: Yes, we did.

MR. BROCKETT: Do you have it on file? And is it available for decision makers to review?

DR. RALPH APPY: Definitely.

MR. BROCKETT: Good. Thank you.

Colonel THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Charles.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Okay. 30 seconds of silence.

(Brief recess.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: While John Thomas comes forward, followed by Richard Welsh and then Scott Carter.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. I'd like to start out by letting everyone take a brief look at the secondary filter of my home -- air filter -- which is a three-stage filter. This is the second stage and I added it. It's made out of a couple of -- here's coming from outside, the air coming from outside being pulled through the filter into the house. Here's the other side of the filter. You can't really tell much difference because the particles are so fine, they go through a professional quality -- two professional quality microscopic filters made from surgical masks. And that was just placed
1 approximately six months.
2 So the young kids' lungs in the area probably
3 look a lot like this from the air pollution. And about
4 five or ten years ago, I suggested that the Ports of Los
5 Angeles, Long Beach, invest in setting up a distribution
6 network for bio-diesel B-100, and a cold weather blend,
7 and ethanol. Hopefully, we would be able to convert
8 gasoline-powered vehicles in the area to burn on E-100 or
9 E-85, and non-motorized compressed natural gas and, of
10 course, electric vehicles.
11 Obviously, since this advice was not followed,
12 this is a perfect example of the air quality. This
13 filter is behind a dust filter and that, of course, is
14 behind a standard fiber window screen with an overhang
15 outside the window right here at 10th and Pacific in San
16 Pedro.
17 I'd like to point out that you can eliminate
18 the parking problem largely among the Promenade by simply
19 extending the Red Car Line to the Metro Green Car Line
20 parallel tracks -- parallel to the tracks that the line
21 on now. So it will actually take people somewhere
22 instead of being the Red Car Line to nowhere.
23 And I'd like to suggest that we bring the
24 electric trolleys back and route them across the entire
25 panels for each peninsula.
And extending the Harbor Boulevard behind the park at 22nd Street would be a logical step. And also eliminating the other cruise terminal due to excess traffic and air pollution is highly recommended.

I don't hear anything about the impact of the caustic and toxic concrete dust that will be released into the air and water while they're building -- and when the Maritime Museum is constructed. I think that's a big waste of time and money. It's ludicrous. It's an idea that was born of sheer idiocy.

And I also notice there's a lack of a stage for drama and music performances. And there's no requirement for buses and cruise ships to use bio-diesel and/or compressed natural gas non-motorized.

And I'd like to see free parking provided for one to five hours wherever it's convenient and doesn't take up too much room or block anyone's view.

And, of course, there are no plans for public dock slips free of charge by the day. And, of course, we need a pedestrian and motor bridge at West 9th Street over the tracks to Ports O'Call to eliminate the problem of having vehicular and pedestrian traffic blocked by the Red Car Line.

And also I'd like to back up the Sustainable Plan that was presented this evening as being the best
plan. And I think you should trash your plan as it is presently stated and adopt the Sustainable Plan.

Thank you.

(Appause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, John.

Richard.

MR. WELSH: Yes.

Thanks for having the public session. It's an exciting time with all the development going on. I'm a long-term San Pedro resident and a water freak of sorts. I enjoy sailing, windsurfing, surfing, et cetera. And my big concern, of course, is with the proposed Cruise Ship Terminal at the end of Kaiser Point.

Being in the water -- literally in the water -- while wind surfing, it's a little daunting having a possible 800- to 1,000-foot long cruise ship come in through the channel along with the security personnel restricting the use of the waterway. And to me this is not a real good placement of recreation for the general public and more importantly for our community members. So I'd really like to see this Cruise Ship Terminal located in the downtown area; not just for the purpose of wind surfers and sailors, but also for the revenue that would help increase for those downtown businesses and also the reduction in pollution with the car trips.
So not only that, but I'm sure the Cruise Ship Captains take, for example, Captain Stuebing on the Love Boat -- I don't think he would want to navigate that water way with all the sail boats and wind surfers and power boats going through.

So let's keep it for general recreation and keep the cruise ships in downtown San Pedro.

Thank you very much.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Richard.

Richard, you realize he was just an actor?

Scott Carter, Rick Whearty, and Steve Shorr.

MR. CARTER: Hi. Thank you for providing this EIR public hearing. I appreciate it.

My name is Scott Carter. I'm a local businessman and home owner and 28-year water recreationist and a member of the Cabrillo Beach Park Advisory Board, although they don't support my opinions. At Cabrillo Beach, wind surfing, kayaking, scuba diving, snorkeling, and now kite boarding.

I'm in favor of the entire Project. However, it is determined by the locals powers that be. And I will only address two points that impact the Outer Recreational Harbor area.

The feedback I receive from the water sports people that I've talked with at Willow Beach -- over the
years and just recently -- it's mostly wind surfers and kayakers that use the Outer Cabrillo Harbor on the inside of the breakwater.

If a Cruise Ship Terminal is established at Kaiser Point, it will establish a security zone that will likely slow down boat power, boat traffic in the traffic lane that allows up to 35-mile-an-hour speed limit currently. That is actually good for our recreational nearby in the 5-mile-per hour zone and the non-motorized area that the Harbor department established in 1999 and the year 2000, which I might add has worked.

There is -- has been no serious accidents since the non-motorized area was established and that is a good thing. And I can only say that I think having increased security and slower boat traffic will only add to our safety.

Addressing Figure 2-A drawing, with the boardwalk being built in front of the Scout Camp will result in removing all safety aspects to any child spending the night there.

Can any mother or father here actually want to destroy this long time historical camping facility that serves as an organized water sports facility for the sake of having a few people a day walk on a largely empty boardwalk just to say, "Oh, my. Isn't this nice?"
Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Scott. Rick. Come on up here, Rick.

MR. WHEARTY: My name Rick Whearty, representing the people of the City of Los Angeles, the boaters around here.

I'm glad to see that the Port is looking at the development of an area that benefits the individuals. I oppose the Cruise Ship Terminal there. And I think that's pretty much been the consensus tonight throughout most of the comments here.

I like what Tom Politeo had to say about the overall impact and the future that this Port can set up residents to leave the world as many of other major Ports have done around the world.

I mean, the overwhelming response has been to be against this Cruise Ship Terminal at Kaiser Point. The traffic, the impact, the security, the pollution, the view. I mean, I don't even know how the drawings even got done. You know, to have the Cruise Ship Terminal remain at the existing place and -- so that the traffic goes to the Ports O'Call area and that all the traffic, you know, directs right off the freeway, right in the secured area -- everything is almost already there. It
just needs to be improved.

I started building boats when I was 15 years old and it's one of the industries that's pretty much drawn by the wayside around here.

I've presented a couple things at the Port commission meetings about the Port Everette Fashion District, which has been deemed a complete success. In that document that I gave to Geraldine Knatz there's some comments that every boat generates almost 50 ancillary jobs. So that the expansion of the Port marinas, a boat yard, and the ancillary businesses that support recreational boating, powerboat, sail, windsurfing -- all these things really benefit the community with a relatively non-polluting method of creating employment within this Port. And as for the restaurants and all the uses that can come out of this -- of expanding the recreational uses for the boating public can be very beneficial.

The craft scope on May 8th -- and I've done some research -- all these buildings have been occupied. The marina's been full and it has been deemed a complete success, such to the point that -- there was also another very similar Project done at Port Bellingham. They had such great success at Port Everette, so they copied it and did another one at Bellingham.
So for the people of Southern California this has to be looked at. The Newport Harbor Shipyard was created from the Old Shipyard and proved to be a great success. It has restaurants and a boat yard that's all clean. It generates a lot of business. You know, San Diego has pursued, you know -- Livermore Marina, Pier 39, which has been a complete success.

There's been -- the Millenium Group has put in a super yacht maintenance haul out yard that hauls 400,000 ton mega yachts, which has brought hundreds and hundreds of jobs to that area.

So I think that the Port of Los Angeles, you know, should look at Shelter Island, Ventura Harbor, San Diego, and the great successes in Washington and develop some other Alternatives besides the impact smog producing things that have happened around here.

Time?

All right. Thank you very much.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: That's it.

Steve Shorr, Gary Dwight, and Joe Gatlin, please.


Gary Dwight, Joe Gatlin, and then Kevin Ramsey will be after Joe.
MR. DWIGHT: Hi. My name is Gary Dwight and I am fourth generation and lifelong resident of San Pedro. I am President of the Cabrillo Beach Boosters. I was involved in the 18-story development in Downtown San Pedro. I'm also on the Board of Directors of the Economic Development in both San Pedro Chamber.

Our community is languished for 38 years. We need to do something now.

I appreciate all the points regarding the sustainable jobs. These are the things that we need to see within our community.

I appreciate that almost everything that the Councilwoman said, including the interconnection of the Red Car to downtown, the removal of parking along the Waterfront, and an opportunity for those that have literally invested their lives as far as businesses within San Pedro -- downtown, Ports O'Call, et cetera. And we shouldn't just be tossing them aside.

But either point, we do need to get started as quickly as possible. We've had a lot of talk and we've seen a lot of different proposals. But it's -- the time is now for our community, for our children, for the future of San Pedro and Los Angeles.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)
COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Gary.

Joe.

MR. GATLIN: How you doing, sir.

My name is Joe Gatlin. I'm a lifelong resident of San Pedro for 63 years. For six years I was on the Neighborhood Council of San Pedro. I was the current president and now going into October -- also on the PCAC and CCAC Steering Committee -- I've been around here for a while. I'm also the current President of NAACP in San Pedro. Also the Founder for the National Council of Negro Woman in San Pedro.

And the reason I'm bringing those up is:

Development like this affects our community first. And we're the last to get hired and the first to go. We don't have a choice here, but force the economic progress.

I want to say right now I'm 100 percent for the development, but there's a couple things I want to bring out that I think that really means a great deal to us. Downtown San Pedro has to be part of this plan. The Red Car has to be part of this plan. The Councilwoman mentioned the CRA and possibly the Port getting together for parking downtown. We desperately need that parking -- we really do -- to sustain downtown and also to get the parking off of the Waterfront.
The Cruise Ship Harbor at the south end of town; 100 percent behind it. That's something that will positively impact downtown if it's done properly.

One other thing I want to bring up that's not in either of the plans is if you look around San Pedro, you'll see a lot of kids on skateboards all over town. We have several opportunities right now to build a first class skate park in maybe one of these -- possibly two of these places, which would really -- as you know -- there's no recreational space in Central San Pedro except for Old Knoll Hill, which is part of the Port's plan which has to be demolished in two or three years. And the kids really need some place to play and something organized. And we can put a first class skate park in this site. I really believe that.

And also, increase the Ports O'Call -- besides the Ports O'Call Restaurants and a few others. We need to increase it and make it a first class facility.

And last but not least is the bridges over 9th Street and also close to 1st Street -- or hopefully, ideally for us, 5th or 6th Street -- because we need that bridge to get into downtown. We can't make this a Project where downtown is left out. Right now, we put parking spaces there, add proper shuttles, the bridge. It would really improve everything.
But again, I support the plan and I want to thank the Port for doing what they've done so far. Thank you.

(Appause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Joe.

Kevin Ramsey, Sue Castillo, Carmine Sasso.

Kevin.

MR. RAMSEY: Thank you, Colonel.

Good evening. My name is Kevin Ramsey. I'm President of the National Association of Minority Contractors of Southern California.

On behalf of NAMC, we wish to publicly and strongly support the approval of the San Pedro Waterfront Project.

Over the years, we have worked hand in hand with the Port of L.A., identifying opportunities for small local contractors.

We particularly want to express our appreciation to Margaret Hernandez and her staff to invite our members to participate in a step program; a program to assist small local minority and women contractors to complete the Port projects.

In addition to the Harbor Board of Commissioners who recently approved the Small Business Enterprise Program and set a 25 percent Small Business
Enterprise Goal. San Pedro and Wilmington communities are impacted by the positive and negative impacts of the Port of L.A.

As an International Port, these communities and regions should receive the economic benefits of jobs and opportunities on Port related business; homeland security, modernization, and growth of the poor.

A great deal of time and effort has been expended in mitigating the environmental impact at a time when smaller businesses provide 70 percent of the jobs across the nation. This is a Project that we want to have an opportunity to participate.

The members of NAMC are ready, willing, and able to compete as prime and subcontractors for this historic and necessary Project to make our Port the desired Ports O'Call.

The flourishing businesses, restaurants, promenades, and cruise ships that brings the community the economic vitality of the 21st Century. And also we'd like to get our Local 88 contractors as prime subcontractors on this job to work with the Army Corps.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

MS. CASTILLO: Sue Castillo. I live downtown.
I'm very supportive of the development downtown. In fact, I'm very excited about it. I don't want to talk about that.

I'm mainly here to focus on a technical issue about the Outer Cruise Ship Terminal proposed. I, like many people other people, are opposed to it. But I actually think that it's completely inconsistent with the plans that have been done for over the past 20 years for this area, the City of Los Angeles General Plan.

There are two components that it is inconsistent with. The Port of Los Angeles Plan clearly states that the southwest area of the Port's property is to be classified as recreational. There are Policies No. 3 and 4 that say the West Channel Cabrillo Beach area shall be orientated toward public recreation, commercial sport fishing, and recreational boating facility.

Policy 4 states passenger terminals -- as well as many other things, of course -- but passenger terminals are obviously -- are glaringly not listed as what the code views for the West Channel Cabrillo Beach area.

Also, in the Zoning and General Land Use Designation, they talk about various commercial uses in supporting these areas for the west -- for the Cabrillo Beach West Basin area, recreational use, but then it
contrasts with the West Bank area, which does clearly list passenger terminals. It's not in the West Beach area -- the West Basin and Cabrillo Beach area. It's just not there. Therefore, I think it's inconsistent.

Also, the San Pedro Community Plan said it's very important to preserve and enhance the characteristics of that area, and that scale, height, and bulk matter. They use those terms. Scale, height, and bulk when you make a cruise terminal is inconsistent with Cabrillo Beach and their personal level of recreational uses that it is being used for right now.

And also, one last thing, on the Community Plan, Policy 19.1, Cabrillo Beach and West Channel of the Port are devoted to public recreation -- public recreation -- sport fishing, and recreational boat facilities.

Policy 19-1.2 says that the West Bank of the Main Channel and each channel areas be devoted to a number of things including passenger terminals. It's not in the other areas.

On the other technical issue, I know you're supposed to consider all the other Alternatives. The Alternatives, I've read -- I've read them all, even the ones that were considered and discarded. What was not considered was placing the - if there must -- absolutely
must -- take away from the cruise industry downtown and
place something down the -- further down the Main Channel
for navigational reasons -- I do understand that there
are significant navigational issues. It's simply not
considered to place the single cruise terminal facing the
Main Channel side of that peninsula. And that's a
glaring omission, I believe, in the report.

So I'm going to turn this in and I'll make more
comments in a written later on.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Sue.

And I'm pausing here for dramatic effect before
Carmine comes forward, but also to give a little break.

Carmine, please.

MR. SASSO: Thank you.

I'll just be really -- I'll be really quick.

My name is Carmine Sasso. I'm a lifelong resident in San
Pedro; born and raised here and seen it go through many
changes.

I support the Port's plan. What we need to do
is get past all the political and special interest
rhetoric and start moving forward. We're wasting
valuable time. We need to initiate and move forward so
that the community can thrive and prosper.

If you're ever on the Daily Breeze website,
some of the blogs that are on there, you can click on
those blogs and you can read about whatever story that they're reading -- writing about.

You'll see that sometimes they refer to San Pedro as "Where the sewer meets the sea." Okay. And I don't know about you guys, but that's really infuriating to me being that I was born and raised here.

So this is something that will put us on the map in a forward direction. We don't need to look no further than Long Beach to abate that shoreline village, Pine Avenue. Look how they turned that area around. There used to be tattoo parlors and x-rated movie theaters. So they came a long way and that's what we need to look at. We don't have to get all fancy about it. Just look and see what they've done, what's worked for them. Apply the same formula for us and move forward. That's what we need to do. Stop the rhetoric and let's move forward.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Carmine. Melanie Anne McAllister, Julie Scolville (phonetic), and Joe Amalfitano.

MS. McALLISTER: Hi. My name is Melanie McAllister. I'm a 15-year resident of San Pedro and I'm
also a Community Social Worker here in the San Pedro area. And I haven't attended one of these meetings for a year because it's very hard for me to get away from my job.

I realize this may be a swear word now or politically incorrect, but my husband and I are just trying to walk from the Bridge to the Breakwater. That's all. I don't know why it's taking three years to walk from the Bridge to the Breakwater, but every night we walk down along the new area -- Promenade -- and for health concerns for -- he has high blood pressure, diabetes, and for weight loss concerns. So we're just simply trying to walk from the Bridge to the Breakwater.

I'd like to support and reiterate our honorable Councilwoman Janice Hahn. I'd like to support and reiterate the Sustainable Waterfront Project Architect's ideas.

I just have to say that as a Social Worker and a resident, I was deeply disappointed, disillusioned, and disenchanted that you were not available at the Taste of San Pedro Festival and the San Pedro Lobster Festival for outreach information and communication to your community residents. The Port of Los Angeles was, but the San Pedro Waterfront Project DEIS and DEIR Report Project was not. And my family, my residents, my community, my
clients were all there trying to look for information and
give input on this Project and they were denied because
you did not have a table there. So I'd like you to take
that into consideration.

Thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Julia Scolville. Come on up here, Julia.
And then Joe Amalfitano is after Julia.

MS. SCOLVILLE: My name is Julia Scolville.

And I'd like to speak about the needs of the youth. I
think that's being sorely neglected in the Port plans.
And I'm speaking particularly about the Waterfront and
the use of the Waterfront for students to learn how to
sail, how to build their own boats, and all about the

science of sailing and so forth.

I'm an ex-boat owner and sailor. And it gives
you so much pleasure and a sense of accomplishment to be
able to have your own boat. And without the use of any
pollution, any kind of fuel, you're able to get from
place to place just using the wind.

Now, the other speakers talked about Long
Beach. Long Beach is a smaller city than L.A. and it has
a beautiful sailing center. There's no reason why we
couldn't do the same thing here. And that's it.
(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, ma'am. Joe, come on up. After Joe is Michael Labison and William Lyte.

MR. AMALFITANO: Hello. My name is Joe Amalfitano. I'm a lifelong resident here at San Pedro. I have no business ties of any regarding this Project. I'm not a restaurant owner, business owner. I'm here as a citizen and I agree with the Port plan.

Along with many of the other speakers, especially Mr. Sasso speaking of the rhetoric. I've heard about global warming and melting glaciers because there's a steakhouse at Ports O'Call. I'm hearing about, you know, the West Point, Kaiser Point, all of 22nd Street that the ship can't turn around. They've got them turning around now. There's plenty of wind surfing area. I go out there fishing all the time. There's plenty of space for all of that.

What we need to do is focus moving forward. With all due respect to the workers, I am a member of it too and I know it provides jobs, but this needs to be done for San Pedro. We've been talking about it for 35 years now and it's time to move forward.

I know that in previous meetings there's the Master Developer is going to come in. And I would assume
that if a Master Developer feels that a Cruise Ship Terminal does not fit for the south end, then I guess it won't be there.

People are talking about pollution. How this works at other states and cities that have cruise terminals with electric buses and whatnot, I'm sure it can work here also. There's many solutions to what needs to be done, but it is time to move forward.

Mr. Mavar made a point of bringing down the people from the hill and different, you know, consumers, what the Port puts there will attract the consumer it's looking for. And it's a shame that San Pedro residents do have to go quite a ways to go to a steakhouse and other businesses. We have this beautiful Port here that should be developed and I'm in full favor of the Port Development.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)


Mike, please.

MR. LABISON: Good evening.

I'm Mike Labison and I was born here. No. I'm sorry. I was born in Compton. That's up the road. I
went to school here. No. I'm sorry about that too. I went to school in Long Beach. But, you know, it's in the area. I've worked here all of my life except for a short period of time in the mid '60s.

And I appreciate the uniform, Colonel. You're an Airborne Ranger Combat Engineer. And I see your badges. So thanks for that.

I'm a high school graduate. I'm a laborer. I'm a pile driver. And I'm retired from the Operating Engineers. And I spent a lot of time in this channel between L.A., Long Beach, Angel's Gate, Long Beach to the west end -- or Catalina Island. And there's a lot of stone that's in this Harbor that came from Catalina Island.

I represent the Labor Force, guys and ladies that I've worked with in this Harbor for almost 40 years. This is a vital Harbor. It's a great place to live and work. And I'm in support of this Project top to bottom.

It sounds like the idea of having a cruise from Berth 46 doesn't sound to be too popular -- shoot. I was here when the Sansenia blew up at the same place that this proposed terminal would go in.

I was the Project Manager for the company here at Phase 1 at the Pier Project. And I've worked on it
through Phase 2 and Phase 3. And the Harbor Project is still an open issue right now.

I support this Project. I think it's long overdue. I've seen 12 years of stagnancy in both harbors between L.A. and Long Beach and I've seen the growth in other harbors. And I've spent time up north in the San Francisco Bay area, Washington and smaller ports between Oxnard, Ventura, Oceanside, and San Diego. And I've seen in smaller harbors, these kinds of projects flourish and bloom. And I think we've been stagnant here for too long. This is not just to support the Labor Force, but it's to support the community.

We want the work. We need the work. This Harbor is the gem and I think it can be made a jewel. We deserve this. This is a world Port in the highest sense of the word. It's not a microcosm of containers and boxes going in and out. It can support the infrastructure of recreation, tourism, ships, the cruise lines, and the casts and support that we can give it.

I'm behind it. I'm for it. And I want to see it go on from here.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Michael.

William Lyte.

We have five more, Ladies and Gentlemen.
MR. LYTE: I'm Bill Lyte. I'm the President of the Harbor Association of Industry and Commerce. I'm also on the San Pedro Chamber and PCAC Boards.

Representing the Harbor Association, which is more than 100 firms with thousands of local employees, I'm speaking tonight. Our Harbor Association also spent at least $50,000 here at the local restaurants in the last year and as we do every year and intend to do that in the future. So we're very, very supportive of the local community and economy and we're very supportive of this Project. Our Board has reviewed it intensively and came out in very strong support of it.

We recognize that it provides the vitality, needed jobs, the retail sales and multiplier effect, money to public agencies. We also think that it could really make the Waterfront blossom. And I was thinking about that as I visited Monterey this summer after about 20 years away. I was absolutely astounded by how beautiful it was. This run down old county was just chockful of people from all over the world spending money. Every business was flourishing as were all the tourist destinations like the aquarium.

I also think that if this Project were approved, it would create a hub for the high tech businesses. That's really what we're working on trying
to build a Port Technology Industry. And the high tech
people like to come to beautiful places. You know, I
want to make sure they come here instead of Long Beach.
Long Beach would draw them more business right now, but I
think that this is where it's going to be anchored.

We're very much in support of this Project. We
hope it's approved right away. And we will support it's
implementation in every possible way.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Bill.

Andrew Silber, Lynn Alvarez, Tim McOsker, and
James Campea will be our last ones.

So please, Andrew Silber.

MR. SILBER: Thank you.

My name is Andrew Silber. I'm a resident of
San Pedro and a business owner in San Pedro. And thank
you for giving us the opportunity to address this issue
today.

I'm extremely involved in the community. I go
to all the many boards and I sit on committees. So I
spend a lot of time on trying to improve this area.

I'm very supportive of the Draft EIR/EIS. I'm
very grateful for the Port for putting it together. I do
have some reservations, many of which you've heard
already, so I won't dwell on them much.

My main concern is the interface between the town of San Pedro and the Waterfront. It's been studied extensively including the UMI study. It's vital to the town that it's tied to the Pacific Ocean. To cut it off with Harbor Boulevard and treat the two as separate entities is, I believe, a big mistake. It's been a continuous mistake that needs to be fixed. The time is now to fix that mistake and integrate it doing what we used to call the seamless interface.

Some of the issues that have been taken out -- you've heard at length, of course, about the Red Car. If it can't be a large rail driven red trolley, it could be something else. But we do need a loop to move people from the cruise terminal through Downtown San Pedro and back to the Waterfront.

I appreciate enormously the beautification that have gone into these six proposed projects; four of which are serious proposed projects, two of which much less improvement.

The Councilwoman I thought addressed it very accurately. It's very important that Ports O'Call, of course, is restored. I personally prefer it is expanded. I think it may be to the detriment of Downtown San Pedro, but I'd love to see it restored.
I'd like to see you look after the current tenants who are in Ports O'Call and large restaurants that thrive there.

And I urge the Port once again to consider carefully the north, south division that runs along Harbor Boulevard; the Red Car Line, the bluff, and the amount of traffic that Harbor uses. Those three things keep Downtown San Pedro from the Waterfront.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you.

Lynn Alvarez.

MS. ALVAREZ: Hi. I'm Lynn Alvarez. I've lived in San Pedro all my life and I work at the Port of Los Angeles as a Longshorewoman. And I'm here tonight to say that I support the Port's proposed plan.

I live in the south side of town and I think the addition of the Cruise Ship Terminal in the Outer Harbor would be a welcoming sight. Also, this terminal will add lots of jobs for Longshoremen and others that this community desperately needs.

I also think that Ports O'Call needs to be completely revitalized and that getting a developer to do this is a great idea.

I look forward to getting this started and
finished as soon as possible.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Lynn.
Did you say "Longshorewoman"?

MS. ALVAREZ: That's right.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: I like that.

Tim. And James Campea will be our final speaker.

MR. MCOSKER: I was hoping to be the final speaker because I have about 45 minutes of material.

Is that okay with you, Colonel?

I'll go very, very briefly. You've had a long evening. We really appreciate your attention and we appreciate the Harbor Department for being here.

This is -- like a lot of folks who spoke tonight, I'm a lifelong resident of this community as well. And this is a very important community to all of us. And it's a tough community to get consensus and you may not get consensus, but it is absolutely imperative -- and I think you heard tonight -- that we move forward.

The opportunity -- a lot of people talked about the opportunity for jobs. A lot of folks have talked about the opportunity for, you know, economic development in this area making San Pedro a destination.

Those of us with a long history here remember a different town, remember, you know, things have changed
and times do change. And we have an opportunity here
working with the Harbor Department with the support of
the Harbor Department, but also with the community coming
together to do something that is really, really nice.

It won't be perfect at the edges. I think
Carmen also said that there's opportunities to make
changes. I mean, I hear and I respect the opinions of
Subcommittee Councils and Janice Hahn when she talks
about the long time tenants down in the Ports O'Call and
hanging on to them, because that's going to be important
for you for buy in from the community. It's going to be
important for you for buying from the community.

And doing whatever we can to keep the
revitalization on it -- to keep the hope of
revitalization for the downtown is going to be really,
really, really important to get that too. And so you
have some challenges ahead of you.

I think the most important thing you heard
tonight was that it is important to move forward. It's
important to move forward. I mean, I was honored to work
for our former mayor, the San Pedro resident, Jim Hahn.
When Jim Hahn, Janice' older brother, moved -- you know,
took the downtown and this great idea and said, "Let's do
this. Let's do this and let's bring in a lot of
resources."
And I think there's a lot of folks in San Pedro who feel disappointed over time that maybe it hasn't moved quickly enough. Well, here we are. That's passed. That's gone. Those days are gone.

So let's move forward with this plan. Let's listen to the community. Let's incorporate changes as necessary to make sure you're responsive to all these excellent comments.

And thank you for your long attention tonight.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, Tim.
And James.

MR. CAMPEA: Thank you for waiting.
I'm James Campea, long-time resident of San Pedro.

The word "sustainable" comes up a lot and what that says to me -- with construction jobs for this Project, they will create jobs for the Project and then when the project's over, the construction jobs are over. That doesn't say sustainable to me.

I am in support of most of the Project. I don't think it should be held up by the decision to have -- whether you want to have the cruise terminal on the Outer Kaiser Point. I don't think that should hold up the Project. There's a lot of good things for the
Project. The community needs it.

I think it was Mr. Mavar said something about people coming down from the hill. I think, you know -- when I looked at the City of Santa Monica, I looked at Long Beach or San Diego or Monterey, the people from the city, where do they go on the weekend? They don't have money or expenses or time to go some place out of town, so they want to go to some place in town. And I think presently San Pedro doesn't offer a place for a lot of people with different interests to come here.

And I have never taken a cruise. If I did, I think I'd rather get off in Long Beach because I think that city appeals to a lot of people that take cruises. There's a lot of things to do. There's San Diego. And I don't know if the actual Cruise Shipping Industry is sustainable. Maybe with this current economic crisis, what if it crashes? If the Cruise Industry crashes, then does San Pedro crash if it's all built around that?

I think we need to -- if that Outer Kaiser Point is kind of predicated on everything going forward, I'm afraid it's going to pull away -- and I know it's been mentioned tonight -- from the San Pedro's town, the City of San Pedro. People get off the boat, they don't know what to do. There's nothing to do. There's a few good restaurants.
We like it because we live here. We would like it more if it was invested and that people from all over Los Angeles came here and they just didn't just go to the beach. Maybe they would park and walk in town, eat in town, shop in town.

Sometimes when you think about people shopping in town, where are they going to shop? The 99 Cent Store. You know, that's ridiculous. We do have a Target though, but they don't know where it is. Maybe the Red Car can take them over there.

But I think "sustainable" is a word you need to look at and that we could all -- we live here and we like to go here and enjoy theaters, music, eating, shopping, you know, like regular cities have.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, James.

Well, that's it. What a terrific night.

First of all, thank you all. For those that stayed, there will be parting gifts. You see, everyone else left and they didn't know. But for those who stayed, there will be a prize. And you can get -- I think we have the EIS in a CD version you can pick up on your way out.

Thank you, everyone, for attending. I think
there was, you know, some good consensus. And a lot of, you know, I think, a shared vision within this community and the comments certainly reflected that. And I appreciate the respect that everyone had for the opinions of the speakers.

What a great community we live in and what a great opportunity that I think is in front of us. And now let us work together to undertake what is now in front of us. Render appropriate decisions that do advance this Project, but also embrace this concept of sustainability of stewardship of preservation of resources. And that is certainly a requirement for us all.

Ralph, any other comments?

DR. RALPH APPY: No. I just want to point out that for all of you that stayed, we logged exactly three hours and 36 minutes of talking tonight. And we recorded every word and those will be on our website and we'll respond to all of your comments. And we appreciate all of you very much for staying for all of you that stayed until the very end.

Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'd like to just add something. I didn't put a card in there, but I'm a San Pedro resident for 35 years too. And I'd like to see
Ports O'Call. I'm from Hembrook and we have -- whenever a ship comes in, we play the National Anthem. For every ship, you should then consider the Ports O'Call. That sounds good.

DR. RALPH APPY: Thank you.

COLONEL THOMAS MAGNESS: Thank you, sir.

(The public meeting was concluded at 9:05 p.m.)
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