MR. HAGNER: Welcome. This is the second scoping meeting for the Southern California International Gateway Project located primarily in the eastern part of Wilmington. I would like to introduce a few people. First of all, I'm Dennis Hager. I'm the project manager for this project in the Environmental Division working for Dr. Ralph Appy. To my immediate left is Chris Cannon. He is the project manager for the environmental firm that will be preparing the Environmental Impact Report. We also have Mary McCormick here, also part of this whole team, and many of the people you saw in the back of the room with the little name tags are the individual area specialists that will be looking at the various areas of concern.

What we want to do first is, we're going to have a very brief discussion about the project and what went on at the previous scoping meeting, just give you a little heads-up. And then we will have a discussion about what the project is -- the process is on the project, and then BNSF will give a brief description of the project itself. At the end of that we will move into the public comment
period. We also have here Commissioner David Freeman of
the Harbor Commission. Commissioner Joe (inaudible) of
the Harbor Commission in the back, and Commissioner
Jacquelin Mendoza over there by the pillar. And we have
been advised since we do have three commissioners here,
they are not allowed to speak because of the Brown Act.
So they will be sitting here, listening intently to your
comments.

As an overview of the last scoping meeting last
Thursday, four general issues appear to be of primary
importance of the commenters for this project. The first
one, of course, is the air-quality issues. The second had
to do with the traffic. There is a recognition that, yes,
this would take traffic off the freeway, but it would put
it all into the vicinity of the project and cause concern
to many of the speakers. The third item was noise from
the rail operation, and the fourth had to do with light
from the rail operation. So those were the four areas
where we got most of the comments.

Let me backtrack for a moment. We are having
simultaneous translation, so that's the murmur you hear in
the background, and if I have to stop, sometimes it's
either to allow various record keepers to catch up so ...
that we need to investigate. That's what these scoping meetings are for, to give us ideas on what we should look at. One of the things is that how are we going to handle the truck routes, how are we going to route the truck routes, looking at the local traffic flow to minimize the impacts having to do with this terminal. Also as part of an ongoing broader issue but specific issue, looking at how many vehicles and equipment and also the possibility of electric vehicles being utilized as part of this project.

One of the things that has come up is looking at the possibility of the mag lift system, and that's something that we will be taking a look at in this and looking at feasibility, both short-term and long-term. And then the impact of relocating certain businesses, including those that are -- oh, the -- that's what the note says; excuse me -- relocating the businesses and what happens to their employees. So that's a concern that we're going to be looking at in the EIR.

We're going to set up a few ground rules for the public comment, and we'll reiterate these. We do have a goodly number of people here. What we ask is that to the extent possible, you hold your comments to three minutes. At about three and a half minutes I will start to get a little antsy. If you have written comments or letters
What I'd like to do now is take a break. I believe Councilwoman Hahn has entered the building, and she has a -- she has a pressing engagement elsewhere, but she does want to speak on this very important project. So Councilwoman Hahn.

COUNCILWOMAN HAHN: Thank you. I'm glad you can afford me the opportunity. I'm on my way to speak to the Harbor Transportation Club over at the Ports O' Call tonight. So thank you for allowing me these remarks.

From day one when this project was proposed, I made it clear that I cannot support a project that will be bringing new trucks into what we have. For too long Wilmington has been the dumping ground for the Port of Los Angeles, and we can no longer allow that to happen. Since I was elected four years ago, I've been working to improve Wilmington. I've worked to keep trucks off our Wilmington roads. I've worked with multiagencies to enforce illegal truck operations in our neighborhood, and I'm working to increase the penalty fines for trucks found
on our roads illegally. At my urging, our own port police founded the truck enforcement task force, and they work today with the CHP and other law enforcement agencies to make sure that these trucks are not ruining the quality of life in Wilmington.

We've then -- I also pushed for the off-peak bridge movement to get trucks out of neighborhoods during rush hour. We've done too much and worked too hard to approve a project that brings new trucks into this community. While this project certainly will take thousands of trucks off the 710 freeway, let's make sure that we don't dump those trucks on the residential streets of Wilmington. So I'm here tonight to say on the record, if this project brings more trucks on the streets of Wilmington, I cannot support it.

I'm requesting that the Port of Los Angeles look at the possibility of creating an on- and off-ramp that goes directly into this proposed intermodal facility. I also want to request that you look at the possibility of placing all entrances and exits for the facility on Sepulveda, not Pacific Coast Highway.

I would also like you to look at the economic impacts of this facility, what will happen to the 800 plus existing jobs mostly from Wilmington and Cal Cartage (phonetic). We need a good plan to ensure that we do not
lose those vital jobs. As part of this scoping project, I
would like us to find Cal Cartage a new home and study the
impacts of the new location on this project within this
EIR so that we have a real analysis of the impact of both
of these projects to Wilmington. And also how will this
project impact the businesses currently on this land, like
Fast Lane Transportation? We should ensure that they are
fairly compensated and relocated.

Currently a portion of the proposed land is being
used to store empty containers outside of residential
neighborhoods where they should be stored. If this
project moves forward and this business is moved, I want
to publicly request that it be relocated to an appropriate
location out of residential Wilmington.

Finally, it is no secret that the location was
originally designated to be a new location of the Pacific
Harbor Light Rail Yard. If this location is no longer
available for Pier A, I would like the port to inform us
where the rail yard will be relocated. Let me be clear.
We will not tolerate it being placed in any residential
neighborhood that's a block from the yard.

Thank you for allowing me to be on record
regarding this very important issue. No longer will we
tolerate port projects that negatively impact the
community in Wilmington.
MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much, Councilwoman Hahn. We also have in the audience Council Member Val Wertz (phonetic); from Congressman Jan -- Jane Harmon's office, Chad Mohar (phonetic); and Victoria Zendahas (phonetic) from Assembly Woman Oteza's (phonetic) office. Welcome.

I'll continue on now, if I may.

The scoping meeting provides the first opportunity for the public participation in the overall CEQA process. CEQA is a California law that requires public agencies to evaluate the impacts of projects before decisions are made whether or not to go forward on them. So this is the first part. It begins with a Notice of Preparation which is -- consists of description of the project, not as in great detail as in the Draft EIR, but enough to make some determinations of what needs to be studied in the project. It provides information about the project, and it allows the public and agencies to assist in identifying potentially significant impacts in areas that need to be described and studied in the document.

Next, please.

Here's a schematic. On the main axis is the process itself. We have issued a Notice of Preparation. After the comment period closes, we will start to draft the EIR. There will be a Final EIR produced, and then
that EIR will be presented to the commission for their
decision as the lead agency. Above are areas for public
input. The first one here is the scoping meeting. Also
there's public and agency review of the document. Written
comments can be submitted to the Harbor Department. They
can be sent to us by mail; they can send it to us by
e-mail. The packages that were provided when you entered
the room has information on those addresses, both e-mail
and U.S. mail. You can make comments tonight, and they
will go into the official record. We do have a court
reporter here taking a transcription. You can write the
comments and give it to us today. After that, when we
start drafting the EIR and have completed the draft, we
will put it out again for public review, a 45-day,
public-review period. We will have a public meeting very
similar to this, and we will be accepting your comments.
Again, you can give them verbally, in writing, by e-mail.

The Final EIR will be supplied to all commenters
and all agencies before consideration by the Board of
Harbor Commissioners, and then at the Board of Harbor
Commission meeting where the document is considered for
certification, again, they will have open for comments.
You will be able to speak before the Board as with any
other board. Next one, please.

Here are some of the areas that we've identified
as potential environmental issues: Aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, and so on. They're there. You don't need to read them. There are different levels of concern with each. That came out in the previous meeting of last Thursday. Again, the big four seem to be air quality, lighting, noise and the whole issue of transportation and traffic.

Next appears to be a proposed schedule when the EIR is out. The comment period will close November 4th. If you are going to send us written comments, please be aware of that date and get the comments to us. We're looking for a completed Draft EIR the summer of '06, at which time it will be released again for a 45-day, public-review period. Excuse me. Looking at spring '07 for the Final EIR, and certification consideration by the Board summer of '07. So that's the -- that's the proposed schedule. We're going to try to work very hard to meet it. Next.

And now I'd like to give it over to Rob Reilly with BNSF. He's going to talk briefly about the project and give us some more information about it. Mr. Reilly.

MR. REILLY: Good evening. Can you hear me all right back there? My name is Rob Reilly. I'm the general manager with BNSF Railway. I'm responsible for the operations in the L.A. and Long Beach area. First of all,
I'd like to thank everybody for coming here tonight and giving us the opportunity to present our Southern California International Gateway Project. We know that meetings such as this are important because they help ensure that the project-related issues are all addressed. I'd like to take just a few minutes and discuss the project overview, and I'll be referring to the slides up here behind me.

For those of you that saw the maps in the back, the proposed location is bordered by Sepulveda Boulevard to the north, Pacific Coast Highway to the south, Terminal Island Freeway on the east, and the Dominguez Channel on the west. The facility will sit on a 183-acre parcel of land and when fully operational will be capable of handling 1.2 to 1.5 million containers annually.

Most importantly, it will have direct access to the $2.4 billion Alameda Corridor project. Many of you know that the Alameda Corridor is the 20-mile rail expressway that links the Port of L.A. and the Port of Long Beach and the city of Los Angeles and the rail lines in Los Angeles. The Alameda Corridor improves the flow of cargo in and out of the ports while minimizing the effects of freight movements on local communities. Many of you remember when it opened in April 2002, it eliminated some 200-plus grade crossings through the local communities.
As trade volumes continue to increase, BNSF is committed to taking full advantage of the benefits offered by the corridor to help reduce truck traffic. The proposed project is compatible with existing land use which includes a heavy truck-intensive operation along with a rail yard.

Current operation today where containers -- some containers out of the Port of L.A. and the Port of Long Beach are trucked to our rail facility at Hobart yard which is approximately 20 miles up the 710 freeway in the city of Commerce. These containers obviously do not utilize the Alameda Corridor and instead take up much needed space on our local highways. The proposed facility would be located within four miles of the ports and have direct access to the Alameda Corridor. Truck access to the facility will be at the south end off of Pacific Coast Highway. It is estimated that some 30 million truck miles annually would be eliminated from the 710 freeway and other local freeways. Next slide.

In order to expedite movement within the facility, it will have six 2500-foot queuing lanes for truck access, so trucks won't queue on public streets. The trucks will enter the facility from the south end of PCH and will have minimal delay to gate kiosks that will utilize card-swipe technology and wireless handheld
devices for efficient processing.

Truck-direct-to-rail planning will allow trucks to move immediately track-side where their cargo will be lifted off by the proposed electric cranes. The truck then will continue to the exit, minimizing the time spent idling and reducing time in the facility.

Some containers are loaded onto the rail cars at the port. I'd like to briefly discuss why they all can't be loaded on-dock. For those of you who may not know, on-dock is where a container is loaded at the rail facility directly at the port and then transported via train out to the Alameda Corridor. A near-dock is a facility in close proximity to the ports where containers are consolidated before being taken by trains through the corridor.

BNSF is in favor of doing as much business on-dock as possible because it's a very efficient way to move containers due to the fact it requires less handling. We work very hard with the ports and our shippers to use on-dock as much as possible. Our on-dock loading has been consistently up over the year. In 2005 alone it's up 26 percent as compared to 2004.

However, there are a few reasons why it cannot all be done on-dock. First, available on-dock loading space at the ports is limited. The second challenge is
the fact that there aren't always enough containers
destined for the same location that can be loaded on the
dock to make up a complete train. Since there are not
enough containers from the terminal to make up a complete
train, containers must be taken to a central location
where they can be sorted by rail destination, loaded onto
rail cars, and then are transported by rail out of the
area.

The proposed project -- BNSF is committed to
making this facility the greenest facility in the country.
The facility will set a new standard for environmental
stewardship in Southern California. BNSF proposes to use
electrically powered cranes to lift containers between the
trucks and trains, the first intermodal facility in the
country to do so. These cranes have zero emissions and
also offer reduced noise and lighting than conventional
operations. In addition they regenerate power during
braking and lowering of loads.

BNSF also proposes to use LNG-powered hostling
tractors for moving containers within the facility with
reduced NOx -- which reduce NOx emissions by 63 percent
and particulate-matter emissions by 80 percent compared to
standard off-road diesel tractors, while noticeably
quieter than traditional diesel engines.

We are proposing using LNG multi-engine or hybrid
switch locomotives. Currently BNSF operates the only four LNG locomotives in the United States with all four based here in Southern California. LNG locomotives are 1200-horsepower, natural-gas locomotives. Hybrid switch locomotives, also referred to as Green Goats use clean, efficient 290-horsepower, gen-set engines to charge batteries. They have a 40 to 70 percent reduction in diesel-fuel use and greenhouse-gas emissions and 80 to 90 percent reduction in NOx and particulate matter. They are also noticeably quieter than traditional diesel engines.

In addition, BNSF will use Smart Start technology to automatically shut down idling locomotives, reducing fuel use, noise, and air emissions.

In order to fully evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed facility, the alternative of a traditional operation using conventional technology will be studied as well. Under that scenario diesel-powered, rubber-tired Gantry cranes and hostling tractors would be used. This alternative would also utilize LNG or hybrid-switch engines, locomotive idle-shut-down features, truck-direct-to-planning systems, and will optimize the use of the Alameda Corridor.

In conclusion, in this proposal this proposed facility will offer enough -- a number of important benefits. Most important among these is the elimination
of millions of truck miles per year by decreasing the
distance cargo travels by truck before being transferred
to rail. It will increase the utilization of rail through
the Alameda Corridor and incorporate the use of cleaner,
more efficient locomotives which will result in rail
transportation being two to four times more fuel efficient
than trucks handling the equivalent loads. Many people
may not realize that one double-stack train can handle the
equivalent of 250 to 280 trucks. With state of the art
technology, we anticipate trucks will be expedited through
the facility in an efficient manner. This will improve
the efficiencies for truck drivers, allowing them to make
more turns in a given shift.

Thanks again for your attention, and we look
forward to working with the local communities and the Port
of Los Angeles to ensure that the scope of this
environmental review process is comprehensive and
adequately addresses concerns of the community, the
region, and the future.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you. Moving on, we are now to
probably the most important part of the evening. We want
to hear from you. Again, ask that you limit your comments
as much as possible to three minutes. Recognizing that if
you have any written material, you can submit it, and it
will be included into the record. It carries as much
weight as your spoken words. If you wish to speak and you haven't filled out a speaker card, please do so. There are people situated in the back with name badges that can help you.

Again, if you wish to provide written comments, it can be done tonight. There's a table over by the officers, and you can leave it with us tonight. You can send it to us by U.S. mail or by e-mail. If you do it by e-mail, include in the subject line the title of this project. You can just put SCIG, S-C-I-G, and also include your mailing address, because when we finish the EIR -- actually when we start the EIR, we want to include you in all future notices. So it's important that we have you give us your mailing address.

Also if you wish to make your comments in Spanish, we have translators here that can do that for you. Just let yourself -- make yourself known. If there's anyone with a pressing family matter of a time-sensitive nature, please let us know. We'll try to accommodate you. And we will call up a person to speak, and then the person to follow them, so we can keep the flow going.

So first of all before we call up the speakers, I'd like to welcome Rick Pulido -- Pulido, excuse me -- of the City of Carson Planning Commission, and Mayor Jim Dear
with the City of Carson, and we would like to start off
with Mayor Dear speaking and then followed by Ron
Gustelum.

MAYOR DEAR:  Greetings.  My name is Jim Dear.
I'm the mayor of the City of Carson.  I'm glad that we
have a lot of people here, and I want to make one initial
statement.  What we're talking about is -- looks like the
EIR, Environmental Impact Report, so it can be with this
type of project you're bringing forward.  I would like to
say that that's a good starting point.  We expect this to
be a project that anticipates the needs of the residents
whether they're in Long Beach, Carson, or Wilmington, and
so this process I would like to see brought to the City of
Carson Environmental Commission.  We have the chairman of
our Environmental Commission here today, Mr. Roye Love.
So if the proposers would please do a presentation, not
just one initially, to the environmental commission in
Carson because our city is going to take a proactive stand
on this issue.

We also have other elected officials here.  I
hope they're going to speak.  I see Val Wertz; she's the
Long Beach City Councilman.  Val, are you here?  All
right, in the back.  And I see a Waterford Tulley.  He's
from the Community College Board.  He's here tonight.  So
my point is -- and I know Janice Hahn was here earlier,
but the elected officials are concerned, and we're involved in this project.

It's not just the Port of Los Angeles, but in a new day that the Port of Los Angeles is talking about, it's going to involve Long Beach and Carson with most of the things that we do. Because as the growth continues, it's going to impact our community, and a great deal of the port traffic travels through or next to our city on the 110 freeway, the 710 freeway, and the Alameda Corridor goes through the city of Carson. So I look at this -- I know you had a meeting a week or so ago in Long Beach -- but I look at this as the beginning of our dialogue to find a solution. And you might want to look at it Kinder Morgan Company (phonetic) has been in the business of liquid-fuel concentration. And so many, many months of working out with some false starts actually, we finally worked out a plan of action for that facility that is maybe a first in the nation as far as being environmental friendly, and we worked out a program as a good neighbor project aspect to it. So we want this to be a good neighbor. If this project ever becomes a reality, we want to make sure that it's going to be something that we can all live with. I mean that literally.

So thank you very much. I appreciate your time, and I'll look forward to seeing you very soon in the city
of Carson. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Ron Gastelum followed by Bryan Grijalva.

MR. GASTELUM: Thank you, and good evening. I very much appreciate this opportunity to speak on behalf of the L.A. Regional Chamber of Commerce. I'm going to make my comments brief because there are a lot of people who want to talk. I did read the Notice of Preparation. It's a complete document. It does describe the project very well. I think it was very useful to have today this presentation by the company, and I want to commend the process. I want to commend the port for initiating this process. We want to commend the company for their commitment to the process. It's not easy for a company to stand up and go through this kind of process, given the complexity, given the potential impacts on the community. I do want to commend the company for that commitment and in particular, their commitment to an environmentally friendly project. We don't know yet what the result is going to be. They don't know either. Tremendous financial risk by the company and as you stand here, you don't know what the result is going to be, so I want to commend the community for your commitment to the process. And that goes to the statement by the mayor, in the end we hope we have a better project.
I'm a past CEO of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. I am familiar with major infrastructure issues related to the entire issue. I know we're making developments today in this infrastructure. We have to think about not only tomorrow but 50, 20, a hundred years from now. So as we approach this project, we need to think about what our future is, and I think that as the community engages, as the company engages, we will have a project that will live and be compatible with all this interest that we have to serve.

The L.A. Region Chamber of Commerce is going to be involved in this process. There are many people throughout the region in our business community who have a interest. We hope to be a positive contributor to the process, and as it begins, we want to be here at the start of it. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you.

Bryan Grijalva followed by Peggy Forster.

MR. GRIJALVA: Good evening. My name is Bryan Grijalva. I am the president of the Auto Rebuilder's Association of Wilmington. And we just want to voice our concerns about addressing to the residents in the community comporting about 200 small businesses in and around Wilmington. I represent 58 businesses which are right adjacent to the proposed site. And our concerns are
that we may be eliminating the pressures on the residents, but we're creating about the businesses. Shipped at all anywhere east or south of the proposed site, it will directly affect us. It will be right on top of us.

There's so many concerns here. Traffic, of course, from the residents -- we're all located directly west of the channel. And also noise reduction -- a sign out there that says noise reduction. That's great. However, putting more tracks in -- we've all heard a train. We can't do business like that with more trains there. Our concern is mostly with the businesses in that area. Let's not forget about us because any community is made up of residents and businesses, not just residents. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much. Peggy Forster.

MS. FORSTER: If I may, sir, I'd like to be on last.

MR. HAGNER: Pardon?

MS. FORSTER: I'd like to be last on your list.

MR. HAGNER: If you wish. Patrick Wilson followed by -- oh, this is a good one -- Patty S-r-a -- if you're Patty, and you signed up, okay, you're next.

MR. WILSON: Thank you. My name is Patrick Wilson, and I'm president of Fast Lane Transportation in Wilmington, and I'm speaking only in that capacity this
First I'd like to talk about the potential and other benefits of this project, and as reported, it will take a million plus trucks off the 710 freeway. It has the potential for improvement to the air quality which will be linked as the ERI process continues, and additionally, when the discussion was made about the air-quality emissions, what really needs to be considered is the emissions that are currently generated from the existing uses within the project area, as well as the reduction of the truck trips on the 710 as a result of this project.

So having said that, I support the concept of the project, but there are some supports that would include emissions, and I don't believe it's necessary, frankly, because the EIR process is a visible and public and well-reported process. Port has a huge opportunity again to do it right. Otherwise the EIR could be subject to years of litigation regarding the assessment of environmental impacts and their mitigation.

Despite the mitigation of the corporate party, for example, the Port of Los Angeles Board of Harbor Commissioners' President David Freeman, to my right, yesterday directed staff to draw plans to allow only local electric or LNG-powered trucks to move cargo between the
port and the project. So it has the attention of the appropriate people here.

You know, what I would say is that this project will result in the relocation of some businesses, and that includes mine. And my business is the storage of containers and trucking in our community involved in businesses. Having said that, we are well located in a completely industrial environment, and as councilman said, I would like the same opportunity to continue to conduct my business. We are a very specific operation that needs to be addressed as a result of relocation, and that needed to be seriously considered. And finally, we need assurance that the needs will be met by the port. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Patty followed by Ricardo Pulido --
Commissioner Pulido.

MS. SRAMEK: Good evening. I just have a few remarks to make. Again, we see on the slide show, this is going to take -- this project will take trucks off the 710 freeway. However, if you all look at your maps, you'll notice that there's a (inaudible) right up to Long Beach, and you can see the displayed maps. This is within about 300 yards from two schools, a preschool, the homeless veterans facility. They also have a one-to-eight-grade school there and our parks. I would just like to say this
is going to be a terrible, devastating impact to the west
device of Long Beach. We're going to be faced with
(inaudible) when we heard those numbers -- we couldn't
believe it -- 2 million trucks a year. Now you can build
a terminal; it's possible. New technology is great, but
there's no denying that but there is no way to mitigate
the 2 million trucks that's going to come in. None. And
it's going horrible.

We have children sick with asthma. It doesn't
make any difference to anyone. Right now just from the
Union Pacific Operation that's been there 25 years, I
believe, and we have hundreds of thousands of trucks
coming down that freeway, and in general, the area of our
homes now, and it just doesn't -- I can't believe that
they would even consider doing a project like this. And
they tell us it's for the greater good, for people to get
more and more so they can receive their good, but what
we're going to receive or have with the new studies --
there's more asthma, lung cancer, and heart disease.
That's what we're going to get.

So I would like to have something put into the
EIR, but I haven't heard mentioned, and that would be the
particulates from this many tires, the noise, and the dust
and also a very careful look at the pollution that we have
now. This should be cumulative or what the end effect is
going to do with 1,500,000 trips a year is what Union
Pacific is doing now, and note what Union Pacific is also
going to want -- to expand. So I ask you, what are we
going to do? What's going to become of us? Also I
spoke -- I believe it was yesterday -- and I would like to
request again the scoping -- the comments of the scoping
of this EIR ends on November 4th, and I would like to ask
for a one-month extension on this. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Ricardo Pulido, and then Nick
Sramek.

MR. PULIDO: Good evening to the communities here
of the city of beautiful San Pedro, Wilmington, Carson,
and Long Beach, all of our friends out here, and to the
Harbor Department in this great city of Los Angeles. My
name is Rick Pulido, Commissioner of the City of Carson, a
good neighbor here watching out for our community and our
children.

We have several concerns, and they start off
with, as a guy said, a city-good-neighbor policy that we
have evoked and been able to work out with the Kmart and
with other big conglomerates and corporations. We feel
it's time that the businesses -- the shipment companies,
the owners -- not the truckers and the working people like
myself and persons out doing their -- moving the goods and
the workers and the people -- but the owners and the big
business, like I said, pay their fair share. It's time
that they pay their fair share for all the construction
shares, and we need those done by them. We need also the
infrastructure covered, not only the off-ramps and ingress
and egress, but the greenbelts -- the greenbelts along
about the rail yard there. We don't think it's a good,
acceptable area but to categorize it, like I said, if
there's something to be compromised and mitigated, we're
understanding.

We need more time. What is the rush here that we
have to do this scoping meeting tonight and expect the EIR
and the process move forward so quickly? We should take a
six-month moratorium when we do this planning. And folks,
it's going to affect the rest of our citizens here in the
cities and the rest of our lives for the rest for many,
many decades and centuries. So slow down on this process.
Get more public input. We expect it to go out to every
city, like the lady just said. West Long Beach -- every
city should be here and have a public scoping meeting like
the mayor said earlier -- to our environmental
commissions, to our planning commissions, so we can hear
and help. We're here to help. We don't get the drawing
and the moving situation in the world, but hey, please
take heed at this point at what we're doing here.

Also we're going to expect and request that we
have more health-care services provided for our community
and for our children with asthma, epilepsy, mental
illness -- all caused by these contaminants and these
pollutions that are coming to us. We're not going to put
up with it anymore. We're strong. We've got a lot of
communities uniting, working hard together to stop this
from happening. Now we're in the process, and realize
we're here to work for the community first and our
children first.

The rest of you all -- the big businesses, pay up
and ante up and pay your fair share. It's time. You're
building your dollars off our backs, so we are very, very,
you know, at this point -- having (inaudible), but I won't
take any more time. I just want to tell you thank you
very much for the time, and we will expect, and we will be
here diligently. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you, Ricardo.

Nick followed by John Peterson.

MR. SRAMEK: My name is Nick Sramek. I live on
the west side of Long Beach. First thing I want to say
is, with all due respect to Councilwoman Hahn, if her
proposal to have the entrance to the facility on Sepulveda
is accepted, it would just put thousands of more trucks
right in our neighborhood right next to the freeway
(inaudible) we got all the RCTF, pass all our schools,
parks, everything else, okay? I think the bottom line is,
we don't want any of these things in any of our
neighborhoods as far as Wilmington or Carson. Okay.

I just want to tell you I spoke last week, but I
just want to add a few comments to what I said there.
First thing is it's just horrendous the way these trucks
come in and they're coming in off of ships. And when they
unload a ship, they come in 1,000, 2,000, 3,000 at a time.
You know it, because they're go to RCTF and back up
Pacific Coast Highway and up to Anaheim, two deep at a
time. Nobody drives it anymore when it gets like that.
You can't. You just wait for an hour or two. Okay. We
know how it is. If you put in another facility, we're
going to have another 1, 2, 3,000. You're having these
super ships coming in, and it would be 4, 5,000 containers
at a time. You're going to take every route out. You're
going to back up business. You're going to come through
one of the proposed routes, at least you come up to Balkan
Street where these roads are -- mainly are economic engine
to the city of Long Beach, the west pack area where all of
our small businesses are. You're just going to bog it
down. So I wanted to talk about that.

The next thing was -- and this changed the first
time I heard it last week -- that BNSF is proposing to
have -- take all this -- no accumulation of trucks on the
1 streets. Okay. If that was possible, I'd like to see
2 where they are going to put 2 -- 2,000 trucks at one time
3 in this facility, and everything's going to work right
4 with 2 or 3,000 -- however many trucks, the noise from
5 that. On a Saturday I'll look down, and it probably
6 looked like (inaudible). Okay?

7 The other thing is -- and I'll mention real
8 quickly -- is that BNSF is preparing a proposal to use
9 this new technology, but there's nothing to force them to
10 use it. So when you do the ERI, you really need to look
11 at, you know, the worse-case conditions. Okay. What are
12 the worse things that happen to be in there because there
13 is nothing that's going to force them to use this
14 container technology.

15 The last thing I want to talk about is just what
16 the gentleman before me said about extending the time for
17 comments and for the scoping process. There's been a
18 bunch of changes. When we first heard this project a
19 month ago, a month and a half ago, it was 700,000
20 containers, and now it's 1.5 million. Now, instead of
21 having all these trucks on our streets, they are going to
22 park them all in the facility. We don't know what other
23 changes are in there, and now that we are here -- our
24 neighbors in Carson, okay -- all of the communities need
25 to hear this. You need to extend the time a little bit.
Add one, two months, whatever it takes, to go to all the communities, make sure everybody knows about this project, and have a chance to comment on it. So thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.

John and what is your last name?

MR. PETERSON: Peterson. You're in agreement with everyone in my office that can't read my writing. I'm John Peterson.

I'm an attorney for Fast Lane Transportation, and I'm here in that capacity. I will submit written comments, but briefly tonight I wanted to address a couple of simple facts, based on the environmental assessment that has been circulated. It appears that, given the impact the plan will have on Fast Lane, especially with placement of the lead lines south of PCH through the Fast Lane property, they're basically bisecting the Fast Lane property. The environmental assessment doesn't address how to mitigate the impacts as it relates to planning which is basically the division of a neighborhood, albeit the business neighborhood, and the significant impacts that will result to transportation and traffic for placement of new lead lines, for the placement of new rail traffic that will effectually make the remaining property that is not actually covered by these lines, accessible to
public transportation, to the public street system.

So it is important that as you go through the process, that the -- that you take into account, not only the issues, the problem, the defined problem, but then you provide for the appropriate mitigation because what will happen in the situation where Fast Lane and the businesses in the vicinity of that are going to be dramatically impacted. And in the initial statement and environmental assessment that's been circulated, there has been no attention paid to it at all. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.

Next we'd like to welcome Ray Pok of Councilwoman Uranga's office, City of Long Beach, as the next speaker and after him, Skip Baldwin.

MR. POK: Thank you. My name is Ray Pok. I'm chief of staff for Councilwoman Tonia Uranga's office of the 7th District of Long Beach. Council member made comments at this last meeting, and I was going to address the Harbor Commissioners, so I think those comments -- what I'd like to address is the need for not just the community, but the need to involve all of the responsible agencies. According to -- this project is in the City of Long Beach. However, there is not much discretionary decision to be made on the city side. It is in the Port of Long Beach Harbor District. Unfortunately, we did face
situations like this. We have an existing rail facility. Because it sits in another city, we have very little jurisdiction. The EIR should take a look at different opportunities and mechanisms for other jurisdictions to have input in the process and have comments really in some of the decisions that are to be made on this EIR. It's very refreshing to see commissioners here, and council members are here, and the L.A. Harbor Commission. She was very appreciative of the reception Commissioner Freeman and all the board members gave her. We had our harbor commission at our meeting. However, we had also a 710 hearing process that went well over a year. Unfortunately, these facilities are shared. It's not a matter of whether it's in Wilmington or L.A. or Long Beach. The impacts are spread across the region, and these are, in fact, an international facility, but the local agencies are sometimes separated merely by a boundary line. I encourage the Wilmington community or those people who came out to Long Beach to work with us because we'll try to come to as many L.A. meetings as possible, and hopefully, we can get some sort of joint meeting with the commissioners to begin. We did have a commissioner at one of our meetings, and we'll try to bring commissioners at your meeting. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.
Skip followed by Arthur Hernandez.

MR. BALDWIN: Good evening. I'm Skip Baldwin. I'm with the Citizens Committee, and but I do have some comment on this. I looked through the NOP here, and in this look on the last page -- not on the last -- page 38, it simply states basically that this project so ludicrous. All the things we hadn't wanted -- we specifically told them we don't want -- won't stand for in Wilmington is in this project. All of the pollution, emissions from the trucks, light, noise, glare, and so forth -- they're included here. And you think you're going to magically on paper mitigate them, but they're not.

And I suggest two alternate projects. One, no project at all because that's what's appropriate. Number two is make this a fully enclosed project as a giant warehouse, let's say, and even the tunnels the trucks come in are covered. That way the air can be filtered and so forth, and all the pollution can be kept inside for the port and its employees to enjoy.

Well, I did have a third one also, and the third one is to take all the property east of that location, all the way to Santa Fe, and just bring that into public domain and buy all that property out and then put a big park over there, and then, it might be acceptable. Who knows?
Also we want to go into this environmentally friendly BNSF. We have some disastrous experience with them in Wilmington. They have a facility located at L Street and McFarland (phonetic) and again McFarland -- and this facility is zoned residential. This is a rail yard, and it's zoned residential. And one of the problems we had with them was they used this as a dump, and about four years ago we found that all through the areas of the residential zones they had big double dump trailer tractors in this who were bringing sand over and dumping it in their yard. And it was a tremendous mess, and strictly illegal and so forth and so on. And when we mention it to them now, all these environmentalists from the BNSF were well, they don't even know about it. They don't know anything about it at all.

So I'm telling you that BNSF has a bad environmental record, and I also read about it in The Times. They've been pretty disastrous, so don't depend on them for anything inside this project. They do what they want. The next bunch comes on board and says well, we don't know a thing about it. So thank you for letting me comment.

MR. HAGNER: Always a pleasure, Skip.

Arthur Hernandez, and then John Thomas.

MR. HERNANDEZ: In the scope of the announcement
of the -- of the proposed project, I'd just like to say
that in Wilmington, we've been impacted to the degree
where the diesel locomotives are coming into our
community. It shakes the house. The windows rattle.
There's in excess of noise of 400 decibels. The community
at times, many times cannot even sleep at night, and it
impacts our community to the point where we don't know
what to do. We voice our opinions through every possible
area of communication, with our councilwoman -- and
Mrs. Hahn came up here and gave a speech, and I agree with
her. I think she's right. When we come up and talk about
intermodal over there on the east side up over there at
(inaudible) area or south of Willow, there's no other
place. Long Beach has to enter in an agreement along with
Wilmington to provide an area so that the Alameda Corridor
can go forward and scope the balance. I'm not saying this
is a perfect plan, but they have to cut an agreement
because the port wants to go forward and give some sort of
permission so that they can move out all these containers.
Otherwise we're going to have to eat them all up right
here in the harbor.

On-dock, off-dock is still coming back to
consideration and mitigation, and if the bid set is in
agreement and they go along with the program without LNG,
I'd have to look at it twice. Nobody else has a plan to
go forward and move these containers, so I have to look at it and go along with it in that sense. When also in Wilmington we have been impacted to the point where I called for removal of the McFarland line and the monitoring and environmental impact -- that the monitoring that I get is negative. The new (inaudible) -- we have a new residential community in Wilmington. That's the reason why I called for the removal of the McFarland line. There's over 50 homes there. I've gotten signatures on petitions of over 67 homeowners there, and also on record at Janice Hahn's office, I've got a petition there with 435 signatures of my constituents that live in that area, and it's on record. Also I recommend that if the Alameda Corridor goes forward, there should be a plan to institute the LNG and also electric trains. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Art, I know you write all this out. Can I have a copy for the record? Thank you.

John Thomas followed by Donald Compton.

MR. THOMAS: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I noticed something that appears to be over right here in this whole project. Let's start by thinking about dividing at the docks where these containers are unloaded and loaded between containers that are going to the local community, for example, and containers that are going outside the local community. I see absolutely no reason
why rails cannot be run from these docks to wherever
you're going to locate this rail yard and to have a system
of cranes that goes across several rails that could be
utilized to simply transfer to the trains that, you know,
you can route your containers to different locations in
that manner easily, and at the same time you can have
trucks that are picking up containers at the docks for
local shipments. The only trucks that are allowed in the
area -- there's no reason -- and if you can set up
rails -- a rail system to transfer all of the containers
and goods by rail directly from the docks through the rail
yards and outside the L.A. area and then divide your
shipping points outside the L.A. area and different
locations and kind of spread the whole operation out a
little bit so you don't have a whole, huge concentration
of diesel trucks coming to one location, it seems to me
that that would be the best possible plan. You know, I'm
surprised that that's not included in this.

And of course, I believe that it's time that the
Port of Los Angeles seriously consider manufacturing and
selling diesel fuel in the Port of L.A. and Long Beach and
requiring all the diesel-powered trucks that come into the
Port of L.A. to simply gas up, buy the diesel which would
cut the air pollution and their empathy meter by
90 percent or more.
And I think also it's a very good idea to consider an enclosed truck corridor next to the Alameda Train Corridor that would be below street level and closed with filters to scrub emissions from the trucks that, you know, need to do local deliveries. And of course, you know, you probably should consider putting solar electric cranes and elevators and also some type of firefighting equipment on these cranes because then, you know, right there where you're transferring containers, is the most likely place that an accident could happen involving hazardous materials. And of course, if you have your foam and water firefighting equipment and hoses there at the crane location, it will be a much safer operation. And of course, you can also reverse the entire operation to have it arranged so all the incoming goods can be off-loaded from trucks from rail yards outside the L.A. Basin if they're coming from long distances, shipped by train, preferably an electric train with low emission or no emission, you know, via diesel or diesel-electric into the rail yard and then transferred and transferred -- shipped by rail to the various different ports or local community. And that's all I have to say.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.

We're going to take one more speaker, Donald Compton, and give our court reporter a break. Looks like
she's on her last fingers.

MR. COMPTON: My name is Donald Compton. I'm a volunteer public advocate and probably going to be seated as a council person with the Wilmington Neighborhood Council with an education seat. But I'm here tonight along with Art Hernandez. We're interested in bringing a metro gold trolley system down the 110 freeway and into centrally located Wilmington and along the C Street border on Harbor Department land, and then northward up into the BNSF Watson yard. That's why we want that track rolled out and thrown away, and they can reroute around, and we'll have a gold trolley and main service yard and station there for the tens of thousands of working poor in this whole area adjacent to Pacific Coast Highway and the Torrance Number 3 bus stop and right across the street from the District Senior Center.

Now, this isn't just talk. Commissioner Hernandez and I are in court in Compton versus City, et al. in NC, Charlie, 041364 in San Pedro. We are there seeking a writ of mandate to compel certain officials to do their duty of office and now the MTA, Janice Hahn's office, and Caltrans to bring us this train that should have been here years ago. Those interested in following up with this can contact me at any time. We have plans available.
How will this be funded? And I'll be very quick about this. One-third of all those port container trucks are due to use the 110 freeway. That's in the master plan coming up along Harry Bridges. That's our next step. And those trucks go, so goes the port nexus in our view, and this will take two -- at least one lane on either side of the median strip, which will be the rail easement. That freeway's been built to hold a rail easement 50 years ago, and it's still good for that, 25-mile-long bridges. Those two lanes taken away will naturally displease a lot of motorists. Well, they can park their vehicles and ride the train, and the Port of Los Angeles can come up with the money because it's their trucks that are going to be using our freeway. That is compensation. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much. At this time we'd like to take about a five- or ten-minute break to allow our court reporter to take a rest and get ready for more of the next half. Thank you very much.

(Brief recess was taken.)

MR. HAGNER: Ladies and gentlemen, if you can take your seats again we'll continue. Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to start again.

The first speaker up is Andrea Hricko, and after her is Gordana Kiorpeoglou. For the reporter, Commissioner Lopez Mendoza's first name is not Jacquelin,
it's Geralyn (phonetic), and I will probably be transferred to our new Bakersfield office Monday morning. But it's all yours, Andrea.

MS. HRICKO: Thank you. My name is Andrea Hricko, and I work at the technical (inaudible) center at the University of Southern California. I'm here to ensure that the significant health impacts that this project will generate are evaluated thoroughly in the Draft EIR. I work with a team of scientists at USC who are doing a children's health study, a study on the effects of air pollution on children's respiratory health, and I also work with the team of scientists at UCLA who are studying the health effects of particulate matter. I would just recount a few of their studies that are relevant to this project.

A September 2004 USC study shows that 18-year-olds growing up in polluted communities in Southern California have a fivefold increased risk of having abnormal lungs, directly related to passage of air pollution that are related to traffic including particulate matter and elementary carbon, a marker for diesel when measured near traffic. The USC study published in September 2005 shows that children living close to traffic have a twofold increased risk of asthma.

An August 2005 UCLA study shows that mothers in
Los Angeles living close to freeways have more premature babies. A September 2005 USC study shows that elemental -- shows elevated particle levels leading to much higher cardiovascular mortality, and that is in Los Angeles.

These health effects are happening under current conditions in Southern California. Why do the traffic health studies I mentioned matter in terms of the BNSF RPDF project? Well, it matters because within one-quarter of a mile, according to the NOP, within one-quarter of a mile of the BNSF facility and adjacent to the Terminal Island Freeway, we have a K-to-8 school tucked in, a parochial school, St. Lucy's, Cabrio, a day care center, a homeless shelter and homes and residences for homeless veterans. Why are we concerned about diesel? We're concerned because we believe particulate matter is a cancer-causing chemical, and we know that most recently from the September 2004 study showing railroad workers who developed cancer after years on the job. Hunting School (phonetic) is already impacted. It is directly across from the proposed facility, and it has the highest levels of elemental carbon as a diesel marker of any school or monitoring station in the entire port area. The existing level of elemental carbon at Hunting Elementary School and this neighborhood must be reduced, and no additional and
new air pollution sources should be allowed in the community.

Finally, you can shift one-and-a-half-million trucks off the 710 freeway to Wilmington and West Long Beach. You can shift the entrance to the RPTF from PCH to Sepulveda as Councilwoman Janice Hahn has suggested. You can keep trying to shift these one-and-a-half-million diesel trucks, but all you're doing is shifting the burden of disease from one community to another. If this project is to go forward, it must employ truly innovative technology and solutions to reduce air pollution and protect the health of all residents. All possible alternatives, especially on-dock rail, must be considered. As I mentioned last week, I will submit a CD with all of the relevant health studies that USC and UCLA have done, as well as others from around the country and international studies, and request that these studies be evaluated as part of the Draft EIR. Thank you for the opportunity.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.

Gordana. After that is, I believe, DorothTe Alsentzer.

MS. KIORPEOGLOU: Hello, I'm Gordana Kiorpeoglou, and I'm with the Coalition for Cleaner Air and Cleaner Environment. I'm here to complain about one thing and one
thing only. We need to take a real action about the
day -- cleaner air for our kids, all of us, everyone of
us. And the companies should be responsible for providing
them for us -- all of these companies. We have so much
money to spend on Iraq on a war, but we don't have the
money to spend here to improve our air. Without our air,
we won't exist, and our kids are getting sicker. So let's
work together, and let's think about one thing:
(Inaudible) that do mean cleaner air. Thank you very
much.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you.

Your name is Dorothy or DorothTe?

MS. ALSENTZER: DorothTe.

MR. HAGNER: Your first name just came to me.

Followed by Tom Politeo.

MS. ALSENTZER: I'm here on behalf of the Natural
Resources Defense Council. We believe in energy and care
of (inaudible.) First the definition of the project and
the purpose of the project in the NOP are deceptive.
Under CEQA the project may not be summarily defined as to
preclude consideration of real alternatives. But this NOP
does exactly that, by defining the project as a near-dock
facility. This improperly eliminates all work to be
followed from there. Also the purpose of the project is
narrowly described as constructing a need for a near-dock
facility. This project is about increasing containers impacting the port. Building another near-dock facility cannot be the only alternative for us. The EIR should present a realistic purpose and definition of the project and offer real alternatives including maximizing these on-dock facilities and employing low-emission technologies for this port.

Second, CEQA requires an accurate description of existing conditions to establish the dateline. The NOP, despite the current (inaudible), as you all know, not all activities are equal in terms of their environmental impact. Without providing detailed information on the impact of the current activities of the site, the energy trivializes the magnitude of new impacts that will be caused by the operations of trucks, locomotives, switch engines, and yardage at levels of (inaudible) new sources, as you all know, is the major cause of new cancer risk in this area.

Third, the project description severely underemphasizes the support that's possible for the local truck traffic (inaudible). Fourth, CEQA requires that all CEQA mitigation measures be adopted, merely planning to or investigating these various measures falls short of the requirement to adopt the mitigation measures, including listing alternatives for the proposed project that have
less impacts and adopting them in increased measure.

Finally, the EIR must address the market structure. Nearly every speaker at the last meeting raised issues that, I would submit, should have made your list of issues that were raised at that meeting. This proposal would place yet another considerable pollution and health risk in a lower community that is already bearing the burden of the 710, the Terminal Island Freeway, refineries, two ports, and the EITPS. The EIR must analyze and eliminate the environmental impacts, and the environmental health impacts.

And finally, I'd like to echo previous requests for extension in the deadline, given the magnitude and complexity of this project and the number of people involved. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Before we speed on, I'd like to make an announcement that we've been asked to emphasize that we have received direction from -- okay.

MR. FREEMAN: I was just going to say that there are only two commissioners here now so that I am, again, a free man and free to speak.

Let me tell you folks, there's just not going to be any diesel trucks for this project. The board discussed this yesterday. We're going to look at whether we can move to LNG or electric trucks, and we're now
discussing with the persons in Southern California whether it's possible to have a maclair (phonetic) freight conveyor system here.

We have -- you folks spoke loud enough last time, and even though I wasn't here physically, I heard you, and the rest of our commissioners heard you. So I love the NRAC and you make excellent points, but that's yesterday's speech. We heard you the day before yesterday. We -- the board has directed the staff to look at the alternatives to this project, and I can just tell you that this is a classic case -- classic case of environmental justice. The idea of not sort of looking at whether there's an alternative to all these trucks -- we are hearing what you say. I just don't -- I don't feel comfortable sitting here a deaf mute and not being able to at least converse with you and let you know that you're not talking to the wall. You're talking to five new commissioners appointed by Mayor Antonio Villaraigosa, and we are -- we're determined to break this pattern of more and more pollution and move to a pattern of less and less pollution.

And I want you to continue hollering, making all those statements and giving us your heart-felt thoughts, but I just want to be sure that you knew that there are five commissioners that are listening and hearing what
you're saying, and this project is going to be revised because I think it helps. It -- this -- this is not something that should be done with a whole bunch of trucks burning diesel fuel, and I understand that even if we had cleaner trucks, there is a problem. That's why I'm looking at the idea of a mag lar freight conveyor system or some alternative means of transportation. We're going to look -- we're hearing everything that's being said here about these options. And I'm not trying to interrupt the meeting or get you to stop making your speeches, but I do want you to know that there are five people that have assignments, that are in charge now at the port, that are listening to you and hearing. And we want to encourage you to keep this up.

So thank you very much.

MR. CANNON: I'm going to pick up for Dennis.

Tom Politeo.

MR. POLITEO: Tom Politeo. I live in San Pedro, was born there. I almost, like, should be pinching myself for the next three minutes to make sure that I heard what I just heard. Thank you very much for saying what you had to say.

Ten years ago I was a lot more impressed by this project, the 80 percent reduction with particulate pollution from the trucks, 75 percent reduction in the
diesel. But we also know today that the effects of diesel is a lot more problematic than we thought before with the studies that came out with USC and UCLA, and we know from the study in 1999 that the particulate pollution in these areas is enough to have cancer 5, 10, and 20 times over these federal standards. So I don't think trucks by themselves isn't going to cut it. That's only a 5 to 1 improvement. You've got to do 10 to 1 and 20 to 1 and 30 to 1, and if this port expands, we're going to have to go 60 to 1. And the only way we're going to do that is by moving to a closed route, electric-rail system that's computer-controlled where containers go to where they're supposed to be without even having to be handed up and coupled with cars. That's the way of the future and the environment here, that options like this are now actually taking priority and coming on the table.

Now, assuming that this project does move forward, it runs along the side of the Dominguez Channel, and I think this channel has been taking most of the areas or at least where the fishing industry is located are like junkyards. We need to landscape that stretch if this project moves forward, and that stretch along the Dominguez Channel with trees that are appropriate to that location and plans and beautify it. And that can be the start reclaiming some of the natural environmental habitat
that's along that channel.

You know that for some 20 years the county has thought about turning the Dominguez Channel into a recreational resource. For some 20 years the county's been thinking of turning the Dominguez Channel into a recreational resource, and we can stop that process here.

One of the other things I'd like to see happen in this particular situation is to get the truck drivers on the block. As long as the shipping companies don't have an incentive to minimize the number of hours truck drivers are working, their promises to minimize truck driving through the regular process you're using are only promises because of the truck drivers in the communities that bear the cost of them having to wait in long queues to drive their trucks on the roads that are crowded. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much, Tom.

Henry Hogo followed by Meghan Loper.

MR. HOGO: Good evening. My name is Henry Hogo, and I'm the assistant deputy in the executive offices of the South Coast AQMD. And Mr. Greenwald of our agency made comments this past week. I just want to reiterate those three comments that he made and add two items.

First he talked about a need for the environmental assessment to look closely at the on-dock scenario and to look at on-dock or as far as you consider
this new project. Second was the comment on truck traffic and on the rail, and we want to commend your commission for their direction to look at alternatives that -- cleaner alternatives that we are really hearing today that could solve a lot of the emissions problem in the short term and in the long-term continuing to look at ways of using them further.

We are working on a project right now with LNG trucks, and they're actually operating in the Detroit and Toronto area, and we're hoping to bring those LNG trucks down here for a demonstration. They're going to be found in 2007 standards. We're working towards maybe 2010 standards with these trucks.

Relative to rails, Mr. Greenwald made the comment that the port does have authority to request or require that the operators that operate here use the cleanest rail locomotives as possible, and we do recognize that you look at that. We will provide more information in written comments.

I do want to end with two points. Last week our board adopted a new regulation that will require (inaudible) to use a health-risk assessment, and we would want to ensure that you follow up with that adopted new regulation. And lastly our governing board is considering a regulation that requires new facilities to mitigate to
the extent possible their risk to one in a million when it's by schools, and we believe that we -- although this will be required for a permitted facility, we believe that this should apply to unpermitted sources, too, as they look at this environmental impact. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Meghan Loper followed by Lucia Moreno Linules.

MS. LOPER: Hello. My name is Meghan Loper. I'm a public policy coordinator speaking on behalf of Majestic Realty Ed Roske, Junior (phonetic) and active members of the L.A. Chamber and Mobility 21. Thank you for this opportunity to come before you today.

By way of background, Majestic Realty is a 67-year-old development company headquartered in Los Angeles with more than 65 million square feet in our portfolio. We have projects in ten states and offices in Atlanta, Dallas, Denver, Las Vegas, and Los Angeles. We are one of the nation's largest privately held development companies and are proud to be the largest developer in L.A. County for the past 15 years. We also have substantial holdings in the Inland Empire.

As portfolio builders, we build and hold. Thus, we view ourselves as active stakeholders in our various communities. When we build a project, we know we're going to be in the community for the long-term. Our employees
work and live in the community. We have found a way of
being good neighbors, and last year our social foundation
invested nearly $2 million in local nonprofit helping to
build a stable community.

We're here tonight to encourage you to plan for
the growth that is coming. The economists tell us that we
can expect 6 million people in the region within the next
20 years, and the majority of the growth is coming from
our children having children. The growth that we're
already experiencing will only get worse unless we find a
way to work together.

From our perspective, we are running on empty.
Given our lack of infrastructure and transportation
findings, our highways are congested, our railways are
congested, and our air is polluted. However, we do not
believe that there is one silver bullet. The proposed
facility is one small tack in trying to have responsible
growth. Granted, the planning process should include and
incorporate energy and environmentally friendly, efficient
equipment, smoothing out the supply chain. But doing
nothing is not an option. The economic and environmental
well-being of our community is at stake. We urge you to
work together with the railroad in finding ways of more
efficiently accommodating the flow of goods through our
region with this proposed facility. Once again, we want
to emphasize that doing nothing is not an option. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you.

Lucia followed by Cecilio Moreno.

MS. LINULES: Good evening. My name is Lucia Moreno Linules. I live at 1140 North McFarland Avenue in Wilmington, next to the walking yard. I have lived in Wilmington for the past 32 years. I work in Wilmington. I'm the manager at (inaudible) which serves the low-income community and has approximately 4200 members. I serve on the Community Council Executive Board, and I'm a founding member. I serve on the YMCA, Wilmington Branch. Four of my sisters are school teachers in Wilmington. I have two teenage children. I go to church in Wilmington. I do everything in Wilmington. So anytime a project as big as this is being proposed, the effect that this has affects me all the way around -- where I work, where I go to church.

I mentioned my involvement. I'm not speaking on behalf of any of those organizations or my work, but rather for you to know that I am tied to my community. I speak only as a resident tonight. I'm opposed to this project because I feel it's harmful for Wilmington. I realize it's beneficial for the rest of the country, but we're being asked to pay too high a price for the benefit
of others. This is a joint project between the port and BNSF. I believe the port is making an effort to treat Wilmington fairly, but I'm not so convinced by BNSF.

I live next door to BNSF walking yard, and they are -- they are not a good neighbor. I have -- and they have not been a good neighbor for many years. They do not maintain their yard. They do not landscape. They don't clean it. They produce fumes that when you try to walk over PCH Bridge, you have to cover your mouth because you cannot breath them. So they are not producing whatever is now they're proposing for this location in the Watson yard, and that one is located in between the residences all around it. If it's such a small yard and it's managed in such a poor fashion at the expense of the community, why do we think that they will run a better facility at this new location? How can we trust them? I have a hard time trusting them.

I ask that you consider, as mitigation for the damage that we will bear -- please remove the Watson yard rail. I know it's a different type of operation, but it would go a long way in helping to improve the quality of life for the residents along the McFarland rail line -- the trade. Make it a requirement to improve and maintain and have a budget for this maintenance in their rail line in any area that it goes residential line. Force them to
be a good neighbor. If they can't, please consider that
the port build its own facility instead of going into a
joint project with BNSF. Require them to have (inaudible)
for the train. Make it -- make it a requirement that in
the future if the rail lines connect further on, as I saw
on the map, that they decrease the use of the rail line
that goes to the residential area and eventually pull it
out all the way.

Earlier Mr. Rob said he was the general manager
of the Long Beach and outer area -- he has not done a good
job with the facility that he has in Wilmington. And so
the relationship that BNSF has with the community -- or
there is no relationship -- bad relationship.

All these major impacts, whether it be pollution
or trucks or noise or street damage should be mitigated.
The port is a public entity. It has an obligation to care
for the communities that it impacts.

MR. HAGNER: Lucia.

MS. LINULES: Yes. May I have a few minutes?

MR. HAGNER: That's fine. But I think if you'd
like to, you know, just wind up and give us those comments
to put them in the record, they can be written. We can
just take your handwritten notes and --

MS. LINULES: I think that I waited for all the
public people to finish so, but this is my last -- thank
you.

    MR. HAGNER: Sure.

    MS. LINULES: I just think that the persons who
care -- I don't expect BNSF to care willingly because at
any community meeting that I have attended, they have
taken part of the money out that they are federally
protected and that we can't place any restrictions on them
(inaudible) with interstate commerce, and that's a quote.
Since they won't do it willingly, please take care of the
community, the businesses, the residents. Place
conditions that make this project responsible. Mitigate
for any and all adverse affects. It's not enough to say
that it isn't a tremendous impact. If it has an impact,
it should be responded to. Find funding for all of these
trucks because having the knowledge at the facility for
the community if everybody that's driving is driving those
beat-up old little trucks. Make a plan. I saw the port.
They're looking at times available for truck drivers. I
think this project should look at that as well. I can see
when you create a project of this magnitude, you should
take care of the community that it's going to affect.
Thank you.

    MR. HAGNER: Lucia, if you could give me your
notes so I can give it to the transcriber.

    MS. LINULES: I'll transcribe them first; then
she can have it.

MR. HAGNER: Cecilia, and after that Jessie Marquez.

MS. MORENO: Thank you. I'm Cecilia Moreno. I live at 1407 East Opp Street, and I've listened to everything that Lucia has said, and it's hard to follow because she covered everything. But my concern with this project is -- like I mentioned, I live at 1407 East Opp Street.

After the Alameda Corridor was built from the place along Alameda where Henry Ford and Alameda come together, that portion has a lot of trucks that has to wait through a lot of signals in order to head north. As a result of that, we on my street on Monarch and Opp Street have seen a tremendous increase of trucks coming into our neighborhood to get to (inaudible), so they cut through our street to get to Pacific Coast Highway, to get to the 710.

If this project goes through, I can't even imagine what we're going to have to put up with in the future. This happens every day. It happens on the weekends. It happens at 4:00 o'clock in the morning, 2:00 o'clock in the morning. There's a school right there, Winston Park Elementary, and like I said, all of our homes along Monarch. That's where nobody is -- I have not
seen -- I should say I have not seen that enforcement
taking place. These trucks should not be driving down our
streets for kids to go to school. They should not be
parking on our streets overnight or driving through our
neighborhood at 2:00 clock in the morning on a Sunday. We
have to put up with this every day. And nothing is being
done about it.

This project is going to (inaudible). I can't
even imagine on top of everything that was mentioned, so I
need to talk about -- there is a need to getting BNSF to
address this -- of fighting them. We're nowhere near our
(inaudible) because many of the representatives of the
community have come to the tables and really hoping that
BNSF can work out those issues, and we're not getting
anything. And that's unfortunate. So in order for them
to come to the table bringing all these problems and all
the great things that are going to happen, when you can't
even face the problem that's already here, so that's all.
Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you.

Jesse followed by Roye Love.

MR. MARQUEZ: My name is Jesse Marquez. I'm the
executive director for the Coalition for a Safe
Environment headquartered in Wilmington. I have lived in
Wilmington all my life. At the last meeting in Long Beach
I addressed many of the problems and what we did not like about this project and why we could not support this project. Well, tonight we're not going to do that.

What we did, we canvassed our members and volunteers to research what are the best available technologies available today to replace what is being proposed. We have asked, and the public has asked for years for all the rail industry to use the best available technology, and they have not. Any proposed technology that has been proposed, they used their political muscle. They used their money, their political lobbyists to kill every one of these technologies, so that today not a single one is up and running.

We did find four technologies that we're going to submit to you that we would like to see researched and adopted and implemented. And these four technologies -- not a single one of them uses diesel fuel; not a single one of them uses any petroleum fuel including LNG. Not a single one of them uses any type of radioactive or harmful substance.

But I would like to request that we have a 90-day extension of this public comment period. I would like to request that the Port of L.A., the city of L.A., and the Harbor Commissioners approve this 90-day extension so that when I describe these four technologies, we will hold
public forums and invite the universities, the researchers, and that type of businesses that have been supporting these concepts, to come forward and present them at public meetings so that the public can see that they do exist.

Number one alternative is called a gravity-conveyor-transportation system. Now, what is that? Imagine when you were four or five or six years old and you were playing with your little marbles and your little cars. Now, what did you do? Those marbles would roll down the driveway. You put a piece of wood, and the little car would roll down the piece of wood. Why? Because the gravity pulled it down. So what is the gravity-conveyor-transportation system? Imagine building from the Port of L.A., from a ship, an incline tube that goes underground, angles downward towards Downtown L.A. Then imagine another one, opposite direction, coming down this way. Gravity pulls down this conveyor system. It uses no fuel other than gravity. Now, imagine putting a generator on each of the rollers as these containers are rolling down. It generates electricity. So now there's extra electricity that can be used in Los Angeles. Well, the person that presented to me this concept lives in San Pedro, and we will have a model to show you within 30 days.
The other three that you know that they are is called a linear induction motor system. Commissioner Freeman mentioned a mag lift with the magnetic levitation -- levitated train transportation system, and the other one is electric trains. But what is the criticism? They are too costly. Well, the fact of the matter, goods moving down by train in the United States is already a trillion-dollar industry, so no matter what we're going to adopt, it's going to cost billions.

So they're looking at a super 20-year plan. I've lived here 50 years; I've gone through two 20-year plans, and we've gotten nowhere with it. We need to look at a 50-year plan, adopt the best technology, and use it for the future.

And why are the railroad lobbyists talking against this? Because they can't adopt a new technology. They don't dare. To adopt these would put them out of business, which is fine. This creates new industry here in L.A., new companies that will build these technology systems, create hundreds of jobs and offer them here, and create thousands of jobs here to build them all over the United States. And they say oh, the mag lift, the levitated system, electric trains is too expensive because of electricity. Well, imagine if we build a solar panel relay station all across -- all over -- so that solar
energy electrifies this technology, and I will submit these to you now.

    MR. HAGNER: Thank you.

Roye Love, and Rick Whearty is next after Roye.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you have a card for me?

MR. HAGNER: No, I don't. That's very surprising.

MR. LOVE: Good evening. I'm Roye Love, the chair of the environmental commission for the City of Carson. You heard our mayor indicate earlier one of the problems we have in Carson is people don't seem to realize that we are right adjacent to Wilmington. Some of the recent studies indicate that the pollution is going to spread over 20 miles. We're only three miles away. Another problem we have in Carson is that we are inundated by emissions from refineries, and we have, of course, the truck traffic. All of these things were already there, and you need to consider this, that when we're talking about bringing in new projects here, we have a school that's being built right at Santa Fe Street. We have a lot of sensitive receptors, and of course, everybody knows about the studies in Germany, USC, UCLA -- the whole thing indicating about the amount of asthma and cancers and all of the health impacts of the pollution.

So definitely that means you definitely need to
look at this closely. The manner of the environmental
justice is not something that has been resolved. We can't
continue to have communities of Carson and Wilmington
being inundated. I mean, we are not people who can be
dispensed with, so I'm saying and joining with our mayor.
You've got to also consider Carson is a town that has
about 95,000 to almost a hundred thousand people, so we
need to have a hearing.

    I would like to invite you to come before our
environmental commission so that we can inform the
residents of Carson what's going on. I learned about this
hearing two days ago, just two days ago. So there was no
time to tell anyone. If it wasn't for this, I wouldn't
know at this point. So I'm saying this is critical.
You've got to consider that, but we must -- I found a lot
of this we don't look at the cumulative impact of what's
already there, and we are bathed in this stuff, and there
needs to be some changes.

    So again, I'm asking you, please let's hold a
hearing, public hearing. I would join in the request to
extend these public hearings at least 90 days, but hold
your next hearing in the city of Carson where you get to
hear some input from about 90,000 to a hundred thousand
people. All right. I just want you to understand that
clearly, and I like your comment, and I hope they'll work
out fine, but basically we have a problem here, and I'm
asking that you take care of it. Thank you very much.

MR. HAGNER: Rick followed by Leslie Mahley.

MR. WHEARTY: I'm Rick Whearty, and I work on the
docks in Wilmington, taking care of boats. I live in Long
Beach, and I really think that this rail yard thing is
just the tip of the iceberg. With the overall health and
the future of us and the future generation in the Long
Beach, Los Angeles port area, and the inland areas its
effects is something that really needs to be addressed.

I think that this truck/train traffic situation
is the single largest obstacle in the way of the greater
port's expansion plans. Current plans between the
shipping docks the truck trips, the train dock, the level
of pollution and all carried down through the port
currently suffer unacceptable levels of asthma and
pollution and cancer issues. I think it's totally
unacceptable at this time, and with the proposed growth,
it will become even worse.

And I hope that the port looks at the big
picture, and that we do take -- if we can't find a
solution to this problem, that we make the whole overall
picture of the Port of Los Angeles and Long Beach as a
green area, and that we can promise our future generations
a clean living in this general area. Thanks a lot.
MR. HAGNER: Thank you. Welcome.

MS. MAHLEY: Leslie Mahley.

MR. HAGNER: What is your name?

MS. MAHLEY: Mahley, M-a-h-l-e-y.

MR. HAGNER: And following her Noel Park.

MS. MAHLEY: Our commission said that a number of new alternatives are definitely going to be considered. However, there is nothing in the NOP that discusses the alternative technology. Commissioner Freeman discussed the NOP -- the alternative technology, but the NOP completely ignores trucks. I can see that the NOP on this proposed project must be withdrawn, and the project must go back to the drawing board. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: After Noel would be Peggy Forster. Is she here?

MR. PARK: Noel Park representing (inaudible) here tonight. We're troubled by the casting of this project as a traffic-on-the-710-freeway-reducing project. Anybody that thinks that the millions of trucks are going to disappear off the 710 freeway as a result of this project is going to be waiting a good long time. And the port's own traffic studies show that in 2025 that the peak hour of port truck traffic on the 710 freeway will be 50 percent higher than it is today. The reason why the ports and the industries are lobbying for billions of
dollars to expand the 710 freeway to 14 lanes and to replace the Sepulveda Bridge is not because the truck traffic is going down. So I think it's sort of pitting the citizens of West Long Beach against people who want to reduce traffic on the freeways. It's quite misleading.

I would also say that if we applied these cleaner technologies that are proposed for this terminal operation -- but the port's emissions inventory show that of the total emissions for the railroad operation of the air basin that related to the port 11 percent are related to switching and 89 percent are related to the line haul locomotives, and there's nothing here that speaks to the line-haul locomotives. The no-increase plan -- I think Tom told us this -- the no increase plan shows that as of 2008, the total PM emissions in the air basin from line haul -- from railroad operations will exceed that of port-related trucks, and by 2025 the railroad emissions will be more than seven times those of port-related trucks just because of the stringent truck regulations that are coming into play in 2007 and the tier-two locomotives that the railroads are using are, in terms of emissions for horsepower hours, extremely dirty in comparison with the newer trucks. So if the line-haul locomotives are not controlled as part of this emission from the thousands of visits from those locomotives, they're going to create a
serious problem in the rail yards.

One possible mitigation -- there are a number of railroad possible mitigations listed in the no-increase policy, and I've heard the port staff say that now it somehow becomes a feasible mitigation. Port officials say that no increase isn't good enough; that's true. But for example, ARV diesel fuel for railroad locomotives -- add its figures into the blue line of the no-net increase, but the railroads have made it absolutely clear they have no intention of doing it in a way that's reminiscent of a neighbor's comments a while ago that there's also a proposed measure here for electric locomotives for the Alameda Corridor and the Alameda Corridor East. Our comments on the no-net increase submitted extensive pictures of electric locomotives hauling freight trains around the world from England to France to Germany to India to Japan. We have these picture of these containers down to the docks in Yokohama, and so we deeply appreciate what the Harbor Commissioner said about trucks. Trucks are a highly visible symptom of all this, but the railroad locomotives in an earlier time means more trucks.

We also have to have stringent controls on the line-haul railroad locomotives, or this pollution is going to go up instead of down.

Finally I would like to submit to you take Tom's
Messey's (phonetic) column from today's outside Press Telegram in which he finished up by saying it seems increasingly this is about this project -- it seems increasingly likely that pollution here is also a killer, and government needs to give it as much concern as it gives to facilitate shipments of table tennis balls from China. Progress is measured by a robust economy. It is not progress if it comes at the expense of the public well-being. Our problems are not confined to the states, cities, streets, but ultimately the state of the air. I am fully opposed to this. Here's an intense article from the San Francisco Chronicle, tells right up about what I'm talking about right now, and I would advise staff to very strongly consider this article as they go forward with this environmental process.

And finally if I may, I want to second the questions of light, glare, noise. We spent this weekend in San Diego in a hotel adjacent to the Interstate 5 freeway, and the roar that goes on 24 hours a day, as it will adjacent to the 47 with a million and a half trucks a year going up and down whatever their power is. As Mr. Freeman pointed out, more people want to see the environmental justice ramifications of this which are profound and extend all the way up the rail lines to Commerce and beyond. And then I also want to say that as
this is not a "traffic reduction on the freeway" project because, in fact, it is a "facilitate more container movements after the freeway gridlocks" project, that all of the reasonable, foreseeable cumulative impacts of that including more ship calls, more terminals put in operation, more railroad use, and all of these things have to be considered in the Environmental Impact Report.

Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Peggy Forster.

MS. FORSTER: Thank you. My name is Peggy Forster. I'm from Studio City. And my comments are directed specifically to the facility for BNSF railway personnel. You have developed an impressive and elaborate visual presentation which I saw was right in the lobby, and your facility site has been chosen and (inaudible) is firmly established. Your EIR process is well underway. Your projected estimates for the environmental impacts can, no doubt, be developed with care. In other words it seems that you have proceeded with all due speed but without due caution.

The local community made up of neighborhood councils and environmental coalitions, city officials and administrators from local schools and hospitals were not consulted or included in the concept and design of this proposal. May I humbly suggest in the future port
officials and affiliates reverse this process and consult first with community residents and representatives before making decisions and expenditures which are bound to be overruled to alleviate and correct your violations and your negligence in addressing the illness and its stress in this community -- all of it caused by the port pollution. And locating a rail yard adjacent to three schools is poor judgment, poor planning.

So I'm asking you to please rethink this project and reverse your methods. Thank you.

MR. HAGNER: Thank you very much.

We have a written comment that I will read into the record. A letter addressed to Mr. David Freeman, President of the Board of Harbor Commissioners, Los Angeles, California.

"Dear Mr. Freeman.

"I don't think you should put the rail depo by a school. I have asthma, and I know how hard it is to breathe around trains and trucks. I bet that if you took a vote of the kids at Hudson --" which is Hudson Elementary School presumably "-- the majority would be against it. I'm not saying you shouldn't build this,
just couldn't you build it someplace else? I mean, there's better places, right? Also there has to be kids with asthma there, and they have the same problems, so please do those kids a favor and build it somewhere else.

"Sincerely, Naomi R. Jones, 2518 East 5th Street, Long Beach, California 90814."

Thank you very much. This -- to summarize in addition to the issues brought out in the Long Beach meeting, primarily air quality and traffic, though noise and light was mentioned at the end --

It seems truck traffic is a very big issue with the residents.

Air quality.

The range of alternatives to be considered was brought up often.

Noise to the community.

We also heard about concern about the impact on businesses and the jobs that they provide if those businesses were to be relocated.

Again, air quality and health effects.

And again, as in Long Beach, discussion about
impacts on schools.

And a call to work closely with neighbors in
Carson and Long Beach.

With that I'd like to close the proceedings.

Thank you for coming out, and see you at the next meeting
with the Draft EIR.