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DR. APPY: Okay. We're ten minutes late already. How
time flies.

First of all, I want to thank all of you for
coming and meeting at yet another meeting on the waterfront
plans that we've developed at the port.

Tonight is the Public Scoping Meeting for the San
Pedro Waterfront Project, and we're embarking on an
environmental document for this. And it's combined
document, which means that it's partly a State
Environmental Impact Report that the Port of Los Angeles is
the lead on in preparing it; and, because there's elements
of it that are in the water, which we'll discuss a little
bit later, it also has some Federal environmental
documentation that has to be done. That's called
Environmental Impact Statement. The U.S. Army Corps of
Engineers is the lead on that. So we have kind of a
dual-purpose meeting going on here tonight.

Some of you may have been to these meetings
before, and the format was very similar to the previous
project that we had. Maybe I'll -- can everybody hear?

Okay. I guess the consensus is that people want
to hear me talk. So if maybe we can all settle and we'll
get going. Okay.

So we're having a scoping meeting -- previously
we had another scoping meeting and another couple
environmental documents we did, and I want to start by just
a brief bit of clarification on this. Previous to this, we
had a large master plan project called "From Bridge to
Breakwater."

It was a very large project, went out 30 years,
expanded 400 acres all the way from the bridge to the
breakwater. What we've done now -- we did a Notice of
Preparation. We did a meeting just similar to that on this
project and so now we've gone -- we've gone back and
retooled the project and downscaled it.

A lot of the Master Plan elements still remain.
We'll address those in the future, but our direction now is
to look at a project that is somewhat smaller and looks at
certain elements, particularly some of the infrastructure
elements that are necessary to do that. Then as
development comes forward, then we'd address it as well in
the future in additional environmental documents.

So that was the Bridge to Breakwater Project, and
this NOP/NOI that we're doing tonight is, if you would,
kind of a replacement of that previous Scoping Meeting we
had. So that's -- that's Item No. 1.
Item No. 2 is I had a comment from Joe Marino that came up to me tonight and said, "Gee, aren't we going to be doing the 22nd Street enhancement we talked about at the last public meeting?"

And the answer is -- and that project was a small project that was kind of preliminary. We wanted to get something going on the ground that didn't implement any of the bigger parts of the project, so we went forward with a small document called environment -- Negative Declaration. The Board approved that project. We had Public Meetings on it. We had a Public Meeting on the Angels Walk signs and what's going to happen to 22nd Street, Ports O'Call; and that project was approved and is going forward. You're going to see construction on that occurring this year, for instance, up 22nd Street. So the acreage in there, a flat grass area, the parking lot, the open field area behind there is all going to be constructed. Okay?

So this project then is something that will happen that we're talking about tonight is something that's going to happen in the future in addition or on top of that. There are a couple little conflicts possibly in the future. Nonetheless, we're going forward on that. Any of you who think we were reneging on that, that was what was approved and about a, what, 48 million dollar -- 44 million dollar project that we're doing. So for any of you that are concerned about us not moving forward on anything, that's not the case. We're going forward on that.

The purpose we have here tonight is to receive your comments; and, generally at this point in time, we'd like to hear about the big-picture items. We'd like to hear about -- well, what is a -- what is a mitigation that you need to do for the environmental effects? Maybe there are some environmental effects that you think we need to look at that we haven't, that we didn't identify in our notice that we sent out to -- that was available to everybody. Maybe you think there are some alternatives you think we should look at. Instead of doing part of this, you should do something different. Those are the types of comments we're really interested in getting from you tonight.

It's called a Scoping Meeting because we're scoping out how we prepare the next document, which will be called a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft Environmental Impact Report. It will be a very large
document and will take us quite a while to prepare, probably -- how long? At least ten days, right? This fall we'll have a draft document out. That was a joke, the ten days, for those of who are familiar with what our environmental documents look like these days. Yeah.

So having said that, what I want to do now is I want to do some brief introductions. My name is Ralph Appy. I'm the Director of the Environmental Division for the Port of Los Angeles.

Starting from your right, my left, is Jan Rebstock Green, who is the Project Manager. She works for me in the Environmental Division, and she is the Project Manager for the environmental portion of it.

This is Michael Cham. He's also with the Port, with the Port Planning Division. He's been doing the planning associated with the Project and actually what the Project is. You're going to hear a little later about the description of the Project.

Next to my right is a very important person, Dr. Aaron Allen. He is the Head of Regulatory, correct, for the North Coast Section Chief for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Next to him is Dr. Spencer MacNeil, who is also with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and he's the Project manager for this on the Corps. He's Jan's counterpart, if you would, for the Project.

Next is Chad Beckstrom. He's with a company called Jones & Stokes, and they are the environmental consulting team that's going to be doing a lot of the technical work for the Port. They act as staff for the Corps and to the Port in preparation of this. There's a lot of work involved in these. A couple other people that are present here -- Gregory Fritter -- Felterer for U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Are you there, way in the back?

He's the Public Relations with the Corps of Engineers.

Also there's Lillian Deloza right here, who helps us with our planning.

So if you have any comment cards, make sure you get them to Lillian, if you would. She'll deliver them here. Before I move on here, I just want to make sure that, if you do want to speak tonight, you need to fill out one of those public comment cards. We get them up here in
front, and then we go through them.

I'll talk a little bit more about some rules that we have. So if every one of you were to speak for three minutes or ten minutes tonight, we'd be here for a very long time. So we do have some time limitations. So what we're going to do tonight is, No. 1, we're going to provide some information about the Project and some of the alternatives we're looking at and -- does that slide up there? Good. We're asking you to really help the Corps

and the Port in identifying and developing the significant issues -- I talked about that a little bit -- and alternatives we're going to analyze in the EIR. We're inviting your participation in the scoping of the document. It is important to hear from you.

As I mentioned earlier, this is a joint document so I'm now going to turn the microphone over to Dr. Allen for him to talk a little bit about what the Corps is all about.

DR. MAC NEIL: Good evening.

As Dr. Appy said, my name is Aaron Allen. I'm Chief for the North Coast Section of U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I'm going to give a short, brief overview of the Corps's involvement in this Project. We had very specific Federal jurisdictions. I'll just be outlining the basic process we're going to go through as part of reviewing their application for a permit.

We're currently considering an application that we've received from the Port of Los Angeles to create three new harbors along the San Pedro Waterfront, construct pile-supported structures to provide additional areas for land-side use, and construct a waterfront promenade and Outer Harbor cruise ship terminal.

A Notice of Intent for the draft EIS/EIR for the revised project design was published in the Federal Register on December 22, 2006. The Corps will accept any written comments concerning the scope of this draft document and the Public Notice for the San Pedro Waterfront Project until February 28, 2007. You still have a lot of time to provide comments on this document.

Under our Federal Permit Program the Corps of Engineers is responsible for regulating the discharge of dredged and fill materials in waters of the United States. You'll be noticing, when I'm discussing our jurisdiction, everything we're going to be concerned with is
predominantly in the actual water. That's where our jurisdiction comes from under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

The Port is also proposing to transport and dispose of dredge material out in the ocean. It also would come under the jurisdiction of Section 103 of the Marine Sanctuaries Protection Act. Those are really the key federal laws that the Corps is going to be regulating this Project under.

We've decided that, based on preliminary review of this Project, there are the possibility for potentially significant impacts; therefore, we are doing an Environmental Impact Statement, which is very similar to the Environmental Impact Report under the CEQA state law.

For purposes of this meeting, I'm going to concentrate on the decision-making process we go through as part of somebody applying for a permit. The three main components of the Corps's permit decision process are the National Environmental Policy Act or NEPA, Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, specifically 404(b)(1) Guidelines and Public Interest Review. Under the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines, we have to select the least environmentally damaging practical alternative, and that cannot be contrary to the public interest.

Using the 404(b)(1) Guidelines, once we complete the Environmental Impact Statement, the Corps has to make a final permit decision. That's going to be based on reviewing the Project Alternatives, evaluating avoidance and minimization of impacts to waters of the United States. We are prohibited from issuing a permit that isn't for a project that's the least environmentally damaging practical alternative.

At this public hearing we're requesting input on the scope of the Draft EIS/EIR, specifically what issues, what topics, what factors need to be evaluated more in depth as part of this NEPA process. What alternatives should we be considering?

We're right at the beginning of the process. This is really your opportunity to participate in what's actually going to go into this document. One thing I want to emphasize is all the comments that we get both at the Scoping Meeting and as part of the Public Hearing for the Draft EIS/EIR will be given careful consideration under our permit review process. So we certainly encourage everybody
that has comments to provide them.

Now to provide a brief overview of the actual project, I'm going to introduce Jan Green Rebstock of the Port of Los Angeles. Thank you.

MS. GREEN REBSTOCK: Thanks, everyone.

Before we get into the specifics of the Project, I just want to walk through a little bit more about the CEQA/NEPA process. Briefly, just to cover some of the objectives -- shared objectives that CEQA and NEPA both have, the purpose of the environmental review is to disclose potential environmental effects that could occur from the construction or operation of the Project; and we want to look at how to avoid or reduce those impacts so your comments regarding that would be appreciated.

We want to prevent environmental damage through proposed mitigation measures or other Project Alternatives that could accomplish the same objective but result in fewer environmental impacts. If we aren't able to reduce significant impacts, we want to explain why we chose to move forward with the Project anyway.

We also want to foster interagency coordination in review of the projects, hence doing a joint document with the Army Corps of Engineers. And the CEQA/NEPA process also gives the public an avenue to participate in environmental decisionmaking, and that's what you're here to do today.

So I'm sure all of you have seen this before. Just kind of review. We are at this stage in the environmental review process for this document. We did issue an NOP/NOI, as Ralph said earlier, in August of 2005; and we went through a scoping process. Since then the Project has been refocused.

I would like to make the point that any of the comments that you submitted to the administrative record as part of that process still apply to this Project inasmuch that the project elements are the same. Hence, there was a proposed cruise terminal construction as part of the Project. We have all your comments in regards to that on the record, and we'll still be looking at that as we move forward.

Okay. So we're here at the Scoping Meeting. We issued the NOP on December 22nd, 2006. There was a 66-day public review period, which we're in the middle of. That will terminate on February 28, so you have until the end of next month to submit your comments. Then we're going to
move forward to preparing the Draft, and this is what a lot
of people refer to as the black-box period where you don't
really hear a lot from us while we're doing our analysis.
Then a Draft document will emerge, and we're
looking at late fall to circulate that. That will be at
least a 45-day public-comment period again. You'll get
another chance to read some of our evaluations and
conclusions and comment then.
Then we will have a Public Meeting at that time
and bring this to the Board of Harbor Commissioners, which
is then faced with the decision to approve the CEQA
analysis for the Project and whether to approve or deny the
Project at that time. Then they would hopefully certify
the EIR/EIS.
Okay. So if you slip to the next slide, I've
kind of covered that time frame here. We're looking at
hopefully an approved document in spring of 2008.
Sure. Okay. And so just to cover a little bit
of what we've done to notice the NOP/NOI, we've sent out --
again, we've had over a 60-day public comment period.
We've sent copies to the County Clerk and the State
Clearing House, which notifies all the State agencies that
might have an interest.
It's been posted in the Federal Register, and
we've sent out postcards to notice 72,000 people within the
immediate area. This was translated into Spanish. The
public notice was also posted on the Port website. We've
made it available at the Info Center.
And also I wanted to mention that we did issue a
revision to the NOP late last week. You should be
receiving it in the mail this week. We also have it posted
on the Port website.
It just provides a little bit more information
about the Red Car line extensions. We did discuss it
briefly in the NOP/NOI, but we wanted to give a little more
detail about what the potential impacts might be if we move
forward with that to give you a little bit more information
to comment on.
Okay. So let's just briefly cover what kinds of
issues would we be looking at in the EIR/EIS. We're going
to be looking at impacts to aesthetics. An example might
be, if we do decide to extend the Red Car line, that will
require a system of catenary poles and lines and what they
might look like, what kind of viewsheds might be affected,
air quality, how that might be impacted with the
construction of a new cruise terminal in the Outer Harbor,
biological resources, cultural resources.
We have the Ralph J. Scott, which is a National
Historic Landmark, and one of the project elements is to
construct a museum for its display. We want to make sure
we're doing that in a way that lets it keep its landmark status. We're going to be looking at impacts to geology and soils, hazardous -- hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, socioeconomics, transportation and traffic, utilities and service systems, and environmental justice issues.

Okay. So briefly I'll go through what some of the project objectives were. We are looking at trying to link public spaces along the waterfront and create public access to the waterfront. Again, this prospect of a grand promenade is still part of the Project and creating the California Coastal Trail, getting alternate routes to that.

We want to provide a variety of waterfront uses -- this kind of speaks to the water cuts that are proposed -- and enhance visitor-serving commercial opportunities in Ports O'Call area.

There is some commercial development as still part of the Project focused in Ports O'Call. We want to expand our cruise ship facilities to meet current and future demands, and we want to create a berth for Catalina Express and Island Express and relocate the S.S. Lane Victory.

This talks a little bit about the purpose and need under NEPA. I won't go into that in too much detail. I think Aaron already kind of spoke to that.

Now I'll just give you an overview of what the EIR/EIS is going to focus on, which, of course, is the proposed Project, which Michael Cham is going to go into a little more detail in a moment. We are looking at three alternatives which we will do a co-equal analysis on.

One is the Project Alternative No. 1, which he'll be going into more detail on, the No Project/No Action, which would mean the Project would not move forward so existing conditions would still remain. And then you have the No Federal Action Baseline, which is -- we would -- the Port could implement those parts of the Project elements which would not require a permit from the Army Corps. You could conceive of a Project with no water cuts and no construction of the cruise facilities. Again, each Project alternative will be analyzed co-equally.

Okay. I'm going to turn it over to Michael Cham now. He'll go into a little more detail about the specific project elements of the Proposed Project.

MR. CHAM: Thank you.

As Jan said, I'm going to be talking a little bit
about the project elements and talking about what we're
going to be putting in and what we're proposing to do.

What we have here is the map of the project
boundary and the elements in the Project. Before I kind of
start with that, I really want to emphasize our intentions
and the focus of this entire Project. That really is to
provide public access to the Port of Los Angeles. We're a
very successful commercial port. We want to build upon our
great waterfront here and really provide opportunities for
people to come enjoy the water and main channel here.

Another objective is really to provide the
infrastructure improvements for future opportunities. We
want to put the bones in. We want to draw
opportunities, businesses to come. The way to do that is,
as a public agency, we start with the infrastructure and
the market responds.

We also want to -- third, I want to highlight we
really want to expand upon an opportunity here with a
growing cruise market. We want to capitalize on that as
well as provide opportunities for that cruise market to,
not only benefit the Port, but also the local community of
San Pedro connecting those passengers to the Port as well
as the cruise terminal but also the local community and
spend their tourist dollars here.

With that, I'm going to start with the red area.
If you notice on the map, you see a network of red. What
that really is is a grand promenade. I know there's been a

lot of talk about that. The key is, if you want to bring
people there, you need to have somewhere for them to walk.
You need to have someplace exciting for them to view the
port.

What we've tried to do is, especially along the
northern part going through Ports O'Call, all of that is --
all that promenade is directly against the water. With the
construction of that promenade, we can bring people and
they would have views of the water that would not be
restricted or would not be blocked. That would -- also, we
would have kind of different water activities and different
uses to make it a vibrant place for it to come, make it an
enjoyable place for them to come as well.

If you notice, we have a few harbor water cuts as
well. The first one I want to talk about is the
North Harbor Cut, as Jan is pointing out there. It's 8.7
acres. That provides an opportunity to -- we have an
existing promenade over there. What that would do is
provide an area for a variety of small crafts to come in and kind of move in and out and attract people there. We're planning to put some tugboats there. We can relocate the Lane Victory there and have visiting vessels stop there as well.

If you move a little bit to the south, we have a Downtown Harbor Cut. That Downtown Harbor Cut is directly next to the Downtown San Pedro area, so this is a very key area for us. If we want to have people come, we want to have the access points where the people are. This cut will be 1.56 acres. We plan to have topsail vessels there, port vessels, visiting ships. As part of this cut, there will be some parking demolition -- some existing parking demolition.

Also, in conjunction with the promenade and that Downtown Harbor Cut, we have some programs that we think will also attract other people as well. There's going to be a downtown water feature. This is not to be confused with the feature all the way down -- the water feature that's going to be at Swinford, which is approved and is going to be constructed this year. But at the Downtown Harbor area, we want to have another key place for people to come and, you know, really -- if you've seen -- a lot of you are -- the water feature really attracts people. It's a really fun place to hang out.

There's John S. Gibson Park in the Downtown Harbor area. That will be a 1.61 acre park between Fifth and Sixth Street. There's going to be a town square area. This will be at the foot of Sixth Street and directly next to the Maritime Museum. This is going to be a good area to have event space. There's going to be surface parking and that can be a place where you can hold functions. I know there's been talk around with other agencies talking about farmers market, something small or something exciting that you can have events there as well.

Of course, we're also going to provide a Ralph J. Scott historic fire boat display to the existing Ralph J. Scott. It's a multi-level display structure that covers and protects the vessel but is really also another visual cue that can help bring other people over.

Going south a little bit, there's another harbor cut which is the Seventh Street Harbor Cut. That's a smaller water cut, .36 acres. We'll have visiting vessels come visit there as well.
Directly next to that we want to attract people to the Seventh Street Pier, which will be a public dock. It will extend a little bit into the water. It will be a nice place for you to walk.

If you look at the promenade, it goes from the downtown area all the way through into the Ports O'Call. At Ports O'Call, we plan to -- I mean, Ports O'Call is a real opportunity. I think there are some businesses that are really thriving. There are others we can improve upon.

As part of this project, we just want to do a little bit and build upon the existing 150 square feet --

150,000 square feet and do only a net increase of 37,000.
Really that is just to expand a few of the existing businesses that are doing well, International Cafe, San Pedro Fish Market.
Ports O'Call Restaurant and L.A. Sport Fishing are going to be potentially relocated and also expanded to accommodate the waterfront promenade so it can be right where the water is.

Next to the Ports O'Call, we have the Jankovich tank farm lease renewal. This is going to be up for 20-year renewal, and really the intent here is to upgrade the facilities and make sure it complies with the Port Risk Management Plan, eliminating hazards to vulnerable resources nearby.

If we're going to be building these things on the Port side, we want to make sure there are easy ways for people to get there. We want to make sure there are linkages to the community of San Pedro. We've been working with the City Planning -- CRA as well as City Planning Department.

And we've together come up with a few areas where we can have pedestrian crossings, you know, urban design, landscaping that really invites people. And those areas will be on First Street, Third Street, Seventh Street.

If you notice, those are right where the cuts are. So what we've done is we've placed the water cuts strategically where the people will be coming in so, as you come into the city of San Pedro, as you walk to the waterfront area, the water's closer. You see it quicker. It attracts you faster.

There's also a major linkage area at the 13th Street. That's a little bit different. There's a bluff area there as many of you know. The concept here is
we may -- we're looking into perhaps a pedestrian bridge, perhaps a structure that would terrace down that you could also use to come down into the Ports O'Call area.

As part of this Project, we are going to be relocating Catalina Express and Island Express. They're currently at Berth 96 and we're shifting them down to Berth 95 where Lane Victory is now. But as I had stated, Lane Victory is supposed to be moved to North Harbor cut.

Now I'm going to talk a little bit about the Outer Harbor cruise terminal located down there with Berths 45 and 50. One of the -- one of the Berths there that are going to be down there is a replacement of an existing berth that we're going to lose based upon the North Harbor water cut. There's a second berth down there that will be brand-new as well. There will be two down there, one replacement, one brand-new. Obviously, there's going to be a terminal there.

We're thinking about a two-story terminal, about 200,000 square feet to process by the outer cruise. This outer cruise will also have parking needs as well. That's something that we are working with the City Planning and CRA as well on trying to find the best areas for that. We're investigating a few separate sites.

Obviously, there could be some surface parking out in the Outer Harbor. We're also -- down -- down in the Outer Harbor. We're also looking at Sampson Way. We're looking at surface parking and perhaps a small two- or three-story structure. We're also looking at the Knoll Drive/Front Street area as well as the existing CalTrans Park and Ride spot and perhaps a structure at the inner cruise area.

Right now the surface area -- if it was all surface parking, it would be able to accommodate the inner cruise parking needs, but not necessarily the outer cruise. I'll touch upon the alternatives, but Alternative 1 would have only one cruise terminal in the outer berth, but I'll touch upon that in a second.

One exciting thing we've been talking about in terms of bringing people up and down through the San Pedro waterfront is the Red Car. Obviously, there's going to be a need to maintain those -- the Red Cars, and we're proposing a Red Car maintenance facility -- not just a maintenance facility but also have a dual use of a museum so people can come and take a look at that as well.

What we have is a 30,000 square foot site, and
we're thinking of putting it at the 13th Street bluff site. That would be the building where people can come and go down the bluff in a safe manner, and it wouldn't -- the nice thing about this idea is that the structure would not block any views, which is really nice. It would help -- it would increase public access and not block any views and really solve an issue with -- that we had with bringing people down from that area.

Next to that maintenance facility would be a 20,000 square foot exterior service yard. The idea would be that we would have this structure over two existing tracks, and the storage tracks that are currently there that would not be part of this Project would be relocated to the new Pier A yard.

Now, that's going to be the maintenance and museum. The actual Red Car line expansion lines would be going to -- we're investigating going out to Warehouse 1, the Outer Harbor, and all the way down to the beach, Cabrillo Beach.

Now, we have some transportation improvements as well that I want to touch upon. The major transportation improvement would be along Sampson Way. Harbor Boulevard would not be expanded as part of this Project. What we're -- what we're hoping to do is to expand Sampson Way and really bring the traffic through internally through the port, so Jan can highlight the way Sampson Way goes down all the way through 22nd Street all the way, wraps around, goes to 22nd Street there. The way this is configured would not interrupt the construction of the previous project that we're talking about, which would be the park on the 22nd Street site.

Exactly. That's a good point. Minor would stay in place as is.

On Harbor itself, while there's no expansion, we do intend to -- as part of this Project, to provide landscaping on the western side and really kind of have the landscape be inviting, have people come over as well.

I'm going to go to the next slide here and touch upon the alternative elements, which are a few. First of all, if you'll notice, there's only one cruise berth on the Outer Harbor. That would be strictly the replacement berth, and there would be no new berth. This would kind of change the mix of how much parking we're going to need. We are investigating the same sites through that. There may not be a need for structures -- as much two-story structures. We could probably emphasize the surface parking on that.
Another difference in the alternative, we are looking at different sites for the Red Line maintenance and museum. One would be there in Warehouse 1. The second would be by the S.P. slip, right there.

The third element that I want to talk about for this alternative is that Harbor Boulevard itself would not be increased or expanded, but it would actually go -- after Seventh Street it would flow into one lane -- one lane going -- one lane going each way, of course. What we would do with that extra space is really provide a public amenity, add a green belt, add a jogging trail. That's another way we can emphasize the traffic away from the residential community and encourage it to come along Sampson on the port side itself.

Those are the highlights of the Project description. At this point I'm going to give the mike back to Ralph, who is going to start the comment period and provide us with some guidelines on that.

DR. APPY: Thanks, Michael.

So we want to hear from you. We're getting closer to that part. You've listened to us. Now's our chance to listen to you.

Just to let you know what things are occurring, we will have oral comments. A transcript's going to be made of tonight. This is all being recorded.

So that transcript will be available, and we will make it available to everybody. It will be placed on our website. If you want to see a record of who said what here tonight, that will be made available to you. We're going to have it on our website so you're welcome to come there and look at it.

Again, if you want to speak tonight, you need to fill out one of these white comment cards. Then also you can comment by submitting mail. So every vehicle you want to use to submit comments is acceptable, and we have handed out here or up here you can see what the address is to U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Send it to them. It will get to both of us. So go ahead and do that. We'll share the comments.

Finally we also -- you can submit comments by e-mail. So you have the e-mail address up there as well. When you send those e-mails, make sure you do it in a letter format. One of the problems we have with e-mails is people will send them, and we won't have a residence address or anything like that. So sometimes it's difficult to get back to you -- or a phone number in case we need to reach you. When you send the e-mail comments, do it in a letter format, either as part of the e-mail itself or as an attachment. Put your name, address, and phone number in there. That would be very helpful to us.
Having said that, we're now going to open up for public comment. And we have -- in some cases we have sent out -- when we sent out the notice, we said, for the people wanted to speak for organizations, they could come and speak for a little bit longer time. The idea behind that is we have one person coming and speaking for ten or fifteen people or more.

So with that, we have three parties tonight who have requested ten minutes; and we have a fourth one perhaps here. So those people will come up, and I'll call those first. Then after that we're going to allow three minutes for speaking. Our first commenter is James A. Whitt of the U.S.S. Los Angeles Association who will be our first speaker.

Is James here?
Yes.

MR. WHITT: I'm not sure which way I should be facing, but I guess I'll -- okay.
DR. APPY: That's it?
MR. WHITT: Thank you.

I want to express my appreciation for being able to come forth this evening and present a few comments from our organization. We represent the U.S.S. Los Angeles CA-135 Association, and most of our interests revolve around those monuments and artifacts that we have located in Gibson Park and Los Angeles Maritime Museum. That's kind of our focus.

We were involved in the Public Meetings that took place last year and did our best to contribute and make our -- make our concerns known at that time. We're happy to do that again this evening.

The concerns that we have somewhat parallel those of last year, except our assumption -- our understanding is that we don't have to be too concerned about the -- what is currently exists in Gibson Park because my understanding is that that's been resolved and pretty much will be maintained in its present configuration. We're pleased with that. We certainly hope that doesn't change.

However, after reviewing the information that was given to us -- it was excellent, but somewhat really hard to decipher. I have to admit I learned coming here tonight; and just looking at the maps that you had, it's a little bit more obvious to me what I wish I could have seen after reviewing the CD. But the -- I'll try to stay with the important things.
What strikes me is that there is a proposed --
the proposals of having two very significant cuts made on
both sides of the Maritime Museum. That -- I'm not an
engineer, and I don't present myself as such. However,
what I do know about that building is that it's -- it's
very old. It's a very historical building and much loved
by the community. It was built during the 1940s. I
believe it was on fill land. I'm not too sure on the
history of that, but I have to assume that, you know, a lot
of things have changed since then.
It's an older structure, and the cuts come so
close to the museum on both sides that I think that one has
to take a real close look at that. I'm sure there will be
a lot of other speakers that follow me that may repeat what
I'm saying, but those are big cuts and especially the one
on the north side. It's pretty wide, and I think that you
really have to address that to see -- to make sure that the
integrity of that building is not somehow jeopardized.

Sometimes just the power of the piles being
driven in the ground can do marvelous things and -- or
maybe infamous things. So without belaboring that, I think
we'll probably submit more written comments on that at the
appropriate time. That's probably Problem No. 1. Just to
recap, I'm referring to the demolition, excavation,
dredging, and pile driving that would occur around that
museum.

In addition to that, I -- I'm trying to figure
out one thing about the parking. I heard -- I heard it
mentioned earlier that one of the objectives of this
Project -- these proposals are to provide public access to

that area to make sure that the public can get in through
the promenade, I would presume, and have the use of the
area.

However, the way it's configured, the parking is
halfway to Vincent Thomas Bridge. Not everybody can ride
the trolly, and it seems to me that that there should be a
review made of the tremendous distance that parking
structure is from the -- we'll call it the town square,
which is really the furthest to the south.

I noticed that, probably on the positive side,
that parking structure, as its proposed, really supports
very well the Catalina Express and Lane Victory, but I
don't know -- everybody else has to ride the trolly.
I really think that has to be reviewed. I just
can't see that being a positive way for a lot of people to
get around, and perhaps there's something I don't understand. Maybe there's some surface parking provisions there that I'm not aware of. If that is the case, I would retract what I'm saying. As I review that map, I don't see that.

Furthermore -- this is probably a minor thing that I'm sure could be worked out, but there are many artifacts in front of the Maritime Museum that, I guess, is going to be the town square. I'm -- maybe this is the wrong phase to address that, but I think we would be concerned about where those would go.

Now, the only one that we're directly involved with the bow peak, which is on the south side of the museum. Although it's not mentioned in this report, it seems like that would be taken away to accommodate is that the Seventh Street cut, I guess you'd call that. We're wondering where that bow peak goes. It's a rather large structure. Perhaps that's already been -- maybe there are some recommendations. We would certainly want to be involved in that. It seems to me from looking for that, that's right where the piles are going to be driven prior to the cutting in on that south side.

I don't want to take a lot of time here because I'm sure there are some other speakers that have a lot more to say than I do, but those are the three things: the potential instability and integrity of the Maritime Museum, the parking, and the location of the artifacts adjacent to the museum.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak this evening.

DR. APPY: Next speaker, John Papadakis.

One other thing I would like to also ask. If there's anybody here who has -- sometimes we'll have speakers that have children that come with them. If any of you are in that situation, we'd like to have the children be able to get out of here at a reasonable hour tonight. If you come up, let me know who you are; and we'll try to move those speaker cards up. Thank you.

MR. PAPADAKIS: Folks, I'm angry. Please forgive my anger. I've never heard so much B.S. in my life. Do we all look that stupid?

We must really look stupid to you folks in that panel. This department is returning to the Dark Ages. We're getting tortured again by your representations. The Bridge to the Breakwater Project -- I didn't know it was
the intention to change the meaning and gutting the purpose of the whole thing. I happen to know something about it. I'm the founder of it.

The southern portion of L.A. is the poorest portion of the city. It doesn't figure when you have such a wealthy harbor and such a great resource near the water in California that we would be the poorest portion of L.A. City.

So when I became Chairman of an economic development corporation, I took my job seriously. I said, I've got to come up with a plan that changes the economic fortunes of the people of the southern portion of L.A., the majority of which are blacks and Latinos and deserve economic justice.

And this plan, Bridge to the Breakwater Plan --

remember it?

It is an old relic now. Nobody talks about it anymore. They talk about the Bridge to the Breakwater Plan -- they talk about L.A. Waterfront Plan. They're going to pick and choose what they're going to do about it.

It's this. This is the Bridge to the Breakwater Plan. If you put your proposal up there, I'll show you the differences between what you're proposing and asking us to accept and talk about all the little doodads of it instead of going after the grand vision, a thing that is in the Master Plan that two mayors, that Mayor Riordan, Mayor Hahn, both of their commissions, Alan Lowenthal, and everyone supported 100 percent in this community coming forward. Foremost, it's an environmental plan.

Now, you can argue, you know, about what you want to see between the bridge and the breakwater. I want to see an urban waterfront Mecca that reverses the economic condition of this area because this area can't feed itself. It has to become a great waterfront attraction for us to be a viable economic community.

Otherwise, we're just going to be a minimum wage community with a longshoreman's job. And if you can get that, great. If you can't, you're a minimum-wage person.

Now, that's the purpose of the plan.

It was to remove -- the first of this plan was to remove all the heavy industry between the bridge and the breakwater. It was an environmental plan, and the wonder was the fact that the politicians committed to it. Now they're reneging on that.
Ask them when they're going to remove the tank farm, when the heavy trucking will stop along Harbor Boulevard. Ask them. They don't have an answer for you because they don't intend to move it. It's contaminated and leaking and it's immoral to leave it for another generation in 20 years to clean it up.

Now, I challenge all of you to stand up for Bridge to the Breakwater Program. It's not San Pedro against Wilmington. It's not San Pedro against Harbor City. We're L.A. City, and we need to be adopted in a fine manner and bring the power of the City here. I don't see any of the Harbor Commissioners here. I don't see the leader of the harbor here. I don't see other leaders that are supposed to be here.

Fight for the Bridge to the Breakwater as envisioned whose first principle was to remove the heavy industry between the bridge and the breakwater, including the trucking up and down Harbor Boulevard so Harbor Boulevard becomes a family-business and people-safe boulevard for people to cross and get to the waterfront.

You can't move chemicals at 3:00 o'clock in the morning in and out of our city and tell us you have an environmental plan.

I respect the people on the panel. They're doing their best with the directives they're getting from people above them, but I don't believe in the leadership that exists right now. It's deceitful. They're robbing you of your future. They're robbing your children of their future by not removing the heavy industry between the bridge and the breakwater and not committing to it and telling you when they're going to do it.

This was the plan that's part of the Master Plan. Right now I'm delighted that Mr. Mossler's suit against the Port has been reinstated because he is calling out the fact that in the late '70s they changed their Master Plan to rid the west side of the channel of heavy industry so that we could recapture our waterfront, not just for San Pedro, but for Wilmington, for the harbor area, for the people of the city and the state. They all deserve to have a waterfront. We have a great waterfront.

Great things can be made of it.

I've never spoken out in anger against people in office, but I've had it up to here now. I've asked for private meetings with the commissioners, and I've been completely ignored. I have to come before the public and
ask you to stand and fight for what is right on this waterfront. This is the "West Side Story," ladies and gentlemen; and you must stand up for your territory right now and get it into your head and your hearts that you have to demand the Bridge to the Breakwater, the principles that went with it.

By the way, the five principles are this: No. 1, eradicate the heavy industry between the bridge and the breakwater and the heavy trucking on Harbor Boulevard; No. 2, establish a grand and broad European-style promenade that is next to the water from the bridge to the breakwater; No. 3, that it is continuous; No. 4, architecturally distinctive; And, No. 5, that it must be built on a statewide scale.

Folks, the waterfront belongs to the people of the State of California. The key to our economic survival and being a good community with youth sports and everything else is good employment and well-paying jobs, which is the quality of life. Okay?

The Port is talking about cleaning all the air. The Port -- the mayor talks about fixing all the schools. He's going to do everything very Don Quixote-ish -- "the impossible task."

Here's something concrete and real that's happening. We can see the transformations because just a mile of the promenade is built. We can see our downtown being cleaned up. You know, that was the work of other people that they're reneging on and not wanting to continue.

Once again, I have respect for the people behind me, but I have to cry foul.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Thank you, John.

Next we have Brian Harrison, who is representing Los Angeles Maritime Museum.

MR. HARRISON: I'd like to say good evening. Happy to be here to represent the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, the Foundation Board of Directors. I have some prepared notes. I have an excuse. I've been retired twelve years, and I'm out of touch with this sort of activity.

Mr. Whitt referred to some of our concerns in terms of the integrity of the building where the Maritime Museum is located. That is of a real concern. And particularly the museum building is on the National Register, and it's rather unique in that respect.

We certainly would be concerned about any water cuts being made that might affect the integrity of the
building -- structural integrity of the building because that would be very important for its continuation. While we applaud the intent of the Proposed Project, that is, to increase public access to the waterfront, we at the museum are seeing an immediate negative impact on our operation. The proposed water cuts -- two in particular adjacent to the museum will impact adversely our parking situation. Now, this alone will have a drastic effect on museum visitors. Currently about 8,000 a month visit the museum, including young school children and very often senior citizens, some of whom are incapacitated or with disabilities. we would like to bring that to your attention.

The alternative parking that has been suggested is really not near enough to the museum to be effective. I mean, for people to have to move some distance in order to visit would certainly be -- would certainly be a negative aspect of the situation of the parking. With increasing cruise capacity projected, including the recently announced return of the Disney Magic for another season in 2008, another dimension is added to the particular parking situation. We hope that these matters can be addressed in a more favorable way than is currently proposed in the Waterfront Project; and I'm, as I say, pleased to have this opportunity of speaking tonight.

I thank you very kindly.

DR. APPY: Thank you, Brian.

Next, representing the Port Community Advisory Committee, June Burlingame Smith.

MS. BURLINGAME SMITH: Thank you.

I also prepared remarks because I wanted to keep it in the ten minutes, and it's hard to summarize five years of work that's been done by the PCAC on this project, but I'll try. Five years ago this month the Port Community Advisory Committee was established as a standing committee in the Board of Harbor Commissioners in order to effectively serve both the community and the port subcommittees that were established.

One of those was a Waterfront Planning Committee that soon was expanded to two, one serving San Pedro, one serving Wilmington. I was elected chair of that original committee and have served as Chair of the San Pedro Subcommittee since its inception.

During these five years the committee has held numerous meetings, worked with its own master planning consultant to form a framework Master Plan for the Bridge
to the Breakwater, and submitted nine recommendations which
went through a vigorous community process to the Board. As

of Jan 4, 2007, all nine have been acted upon by the
Board.

Only one, which was held for almost a year, has
been rejected. That was because the staff declared it moot
after having decided not to include the lower density
alternative in the recently released Bridge to Breakwater
EIR/EIS.

The alternative in the current EIR/EIS is not the
prior lower density plan, nor does it replace it. For the
record, the Port's plan has not gone through the PCAC
process so there is no recommendation from PCAC on the
current EIR/EIS. However, in the past discussions and
motions, the community raised serious questions about the
vision, the scope, the process, and benefits to both the
community and to the port. Some of those concerns are
relevant to the newly proposed Bridge to Breakwater
Project.

These items include the following:
The number of cruise berths, if any, at Kaiser
Point;
Building a cruise terminal at Kaiser Point;
Extension of the Jankovich fuel dock tanks at
Ports O'Call and elimination of a full fisherman's park on
that point;
Elimination of parking at the Maritime Museum

because of the Downtown Harbor water cut;
Elimination of the third cruise ship berth
because of the North Harbor water cut;
Narrowing of Harbor Boulevard in the alternative
to one lane;
Elimination of a parking nexus with Downtown
San Pedro;
Basic infrastructure for a 30-year build-out in
the 30-year plan without designated uses so environmental
impacts cannot be studied;
Parking structure and traffic flows designed only
for port business uses but not local, casual, or business
needs;
Parking nexus with Downtown San Pedro Westways
terminal removal;
Warehouse 1 peninsula uses;
Cruise berth and terminal on Pier 1 or
Warehouse 1 peninsula, not Kaiser Point;
Relocation of the boat ramp from Cabrillo Beach; Proposed Cabrillo Marina Phase 2 Project now requiring a supplemental EIR and co-equal analysis of the alternative. These questions bring up a very serious issue. That issue is is the port piecemealing the EIR/EIS approach to planning and building its San Pedro Bridge to Breakwater

Four years ago SMWM, the planning consultant who coordinated the plan subcommittee, said that we had a choice to make. Either treat the project space as open space and park first and add the commercial and business aspects or reverse the process and treat the area as commercial first with parks and open space incidental appendages to those sites.

Clearly, the Port is operating on the second model of planning, but the Port's plan will not create a great public space that draws visitors to its waterfront to relax and enjoy. It runs counter to the original intent of building a great promenade along the waterfront that will attract visitors.

It does not adequately address or build a synergistic relationship with Downtown San Pedro businesses. To the contrary, the current plan is a drive-by plan. Drive by the waterfront. Drive by Downtown San Pedro. Drive by the museums, monuments, restaurants and shops to get to a cruise ship where dreams of happiness will be found in far away foreign playgrounds.

The vision here does not achieve the very purpose Bridge to Breakwater was initiated. San Pedro is a artistic, historic community that has enormous business and family potential, but this drive-by plan leaves us high and dry on our own shores creeping along choking arteries hoping some cruise passengers will drive in, not by, leaving us all trying to find a parking space so we can enjoy a stroll along the waterfront and keep our businesses alive.

It's a cookie-cutter version of other close-by ports and marinas, but it does not enhance nor take advantage of what San Pedro uniquely has to offer: its heritage, character, and creativity. And it does not provide for possible Olympics in the year 2016.

This is the Port's preferred plan, not the community's. No mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS could conceivably provide solutions for the aesthetic, business,
and health problems for the citizens who live and work here. And no mitigation measures will provide tourist incentives to come relax and enjoy all the amenities of San Pedro as well as the Los Angeles waterfront.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Thank you, June.

Next speaker, Kathleen Woodfield?

MS. WOODFIELD: I'm taller than June.

Thank you for allowing me to speak early. I appreciate that. I do have my son here, who went to bed late last night because I was at a meeting.

I'm extremely concerned about the fact that there's this new EIR, and apparently I received it -- Draft EIR -- sometime around Christmas. I think the Port should evaluate how much they lose in public comment and public interaction when they put out an EIR at Christmastime. It seems like there are so many months in the year, and why do so many of these EIRs seem to come to us in the holiday season?

I also -- I hope that -- I don't know technically what the process is, but I worry that the comments -- there were hundreds of them before the other EIR -- are going to be discarded.

Good. Thank you. So all the comments from the prior EIR are going to be used for this one as well.

Yes? Okay.

I think that this EIR should include a full study of the future growth of the cruise industry because I think there's an assumption that the cruise industry is going to grow to such a capacity that we need to -- I don't know -- double, quadruple our cruise terminals -- cruise berths.

Excuse me. I don't know if that's really been substantiated by a study, and I think that needs to be.

And it also should evaluate whether such a growth in the cruise industry could be accommodated just by improving our existing cruise ship berths and cruise ship terminal.

I think that this project should include the cleaning of Cabrillo Beach and bringing it to an A rating.

I think this EIR should include a study of the evacuation -- the whole evacuation plan for this area. If you're going to bring in this many more cruise ships, you're going to need to evacuate -- I don't know -- maybe up to four cruise ships each having 5,000 passengers.

That's a serious issue that needs to be looked at.
I also find this EIR really to be a vehicle for expanding the cruise industry and the Port's Master Plan says this is a recreational-use area. And I would like you to please justify the Port's assertion that this is recreational use and not industry use, as this is a vehicle for growing the cruise ship industry.

Outer Harbor should be protected and not be laid waste to port sprawl. I'm sure others will speak on this issue more specifically.

Nothing in this project -- there is nothing in this project that will draw the community, and nothing in this project that is for the community. All -- okay. I did that one.

The cruise berths -- there's just cruise berths, cruise terminal parking lots that serve the cruise ships. This all keeps the public away from the waterfront. The cruise ship patrons either stay on the ship, especially

with Disney, or they are carted away on buses to other points of interest.

There is nothing in this project that will encourage cruise ship patrons to spend their money here in town. And, according to how I read the objectives, that's one of the objectives; and so I don't think you're meeting that objective in this project.

In actuality, what happens is we in this community are left with only the negative impacts of this project and having these cruise berths and the benefits are going to go somewhere else.

Thank you very much.

DR. APPY: Thank you.

Just a little clarification. We understood, when we sent this out, that it was right before Christmas; and that's why we've given in excess of two months for comment on that. At previous meetings, that was kind of normal -- it's -- some agencies allow 30 days. We generally allow 45. Anytime we release something -- we release it over the holidays, we add additional time to it that's taken up so at your leisure you can effectively not look at that notice over the holidays when you're gone.

So we tried to make up that difference, and there's certainly no hidden agenda. Otherwise, we would have made it a 30- or 45-day period. I think there's really been a lot of time to review the notice.

Next commenter, Joe Marino.

Okay. That's a good idea. In fact, I normally
do that.

And followed by Sean Conlon.

MR. MARINO: Thank you very much. And, Dr. Appy,
thank you for your comment earlier in the meeting when you
indicated that the green light was on for proposed
recreation areas for the youth of San Pedro.

Let me give everyone here tonight a little
insight as to some background as far as what the San Pedro
Youth Coalition has proposed over the years. It all
started with me and a few others before the Youth Coalition
was formed. We met with Councilman John Gibson; and then,
when the Youth Coalition was formed, we met with Joan Milke
Flores. We met with Rudy Svornich, and now we're meeting
with Councilwoman Janice Hahn about the urgency and the
need for recreational facilities for our young people.

Now, historically, we had many recreational areas
for our young people east of Gaffey. For those of you who
have been in San Pedro for quite a number of years, you'll
probably remember these; and, for some of you that have
not, let me enlighten you with the names of the fields and
recreational facilities that we had here in San Pedro east
of Gaffey, just east of Gaffey: Trona Field, Navy Field,
Sports Field, Admiral A Gym, Anderson Memorial Gymnasium,
Dillon Field, and the YMCA located on Beacon Street.

We've lost them all. They're all gone. And the
only thing we have now, of course, is the Block Field,
which came in the late '50s.

We're desperate for recreational facilities for
our young people. We don't want them out on the streets.
We have approximately 35,000 people who live east of Gaffey
from bridge to breakwater. Now we're impacting the area
with so much more housing with all these lofts and condos
that are being built. Now the need is even greater.

What are we doing about it?
I've gone around as a town beggar. I'm always
pleading and being an advocate of youth recreation. All I
can say is when is it all going to happen?

When are we going to come to a realization that,
in order to have quality life in San Pedro for the people,
we must go ahead and have recreation?

Now, you can invite all these people to buy all
these condos, but where are they going to recreate?
Are you going to have a bike path?
22nd Street is an empty area, and I'm glad to
hear that we're going to have a green light and something
is going to happen there before the end of the year. I'd
like to see it happen. The San Pedro Youth Coalition would
like to see it happen before the end of the year. We'd like to see it happen before summer so we can get the young people down there playing on those fields.

So my plea is -- my plea is make it a priority because we have shortchanged the youth of our community too long, and we cannot continue to do that. So as the town beggar, I beg you again and I beg as I've begged in the past. Get it done and get it done immediately.

Thank you very much.

DR. APPY: Okay. Sean Colin -- Conlon followed by John Thomas.

Get up here a little quicker maybe?

MR. CONLON: It's the life of a weekend soccer warrior. Knock on wood, Ralph.

To paraphrase one of the first speakers, I'm frustrated. As I was reading through this, I was seeing things like linkages, access to water, promenades, open space. Then, as you flip the page, you see "expand the cruise ship facilities and related parking to respond to an increasing" -- "increasing existing and forecasted demands."

Since when is that part of the Bridge to Breakwater?

I don't know. I feel like we've been handed -- I feel like we've been handed one of those bills you hear about in Congress where they're going to build schools but somebody's tacked onto it a price support for Wisconsin cheese. You can't say no to the schools. You can't say no to the schools, but you end up voting for cheese subsidies.

Well, to me, this whole port -- this whole cruise berth at Kaiser Point is something that shouldn't even be part of the discussion right now. It's going to bog everything down. It's the cheese subsidies. We don't need cheese subsidies in what we're talking about today.

I think we need to separate the Kaiser Point cruise ship berths to the discussion of the real Bridge to Breakwater. It will be a lively discussion, I can tell you that, the cruise ships at Kaiser Point, but right now it's going to bog down everything that we're trying to do with Bridge to Breakwater.

So my request here is real simple. Let's divide the project into the real Bridge to Breakwater. Then, if we want to talk about cruise ships at Kaiser Point, let's do that at a separate venue. That will be a lively discussion, but that's not what we're here to talk about. We're here to talk about the Bridge to Breakwater.

Thanks.

DR. APPY: Thank you. John Thomas followed by Dennis Piotrowski.
MR. THOMAS: I appreciate the opportunity to have a chance to speak tonight, but I'd like to start out with a question.

Can you give everybody here a ballpark figure as to how much your largest plan would cost out of Port funds or taxpayer's money, whatever you're going to be using to do this?

DR. APPY: I don't know your question. Which plan?

This one or the Bridge to Breakwater or what?

MR. THOMAS: Well, yeah, what you're proposing here tonight.

Would you say maybe 100 million, 200 million, half a about?

DR. APPY: We don't -- part of this is we're doing -- that study is going to be in this final document. We'll have that for you, but we just don't have that for you at this time.

MR. THOMAS: Okay. Well, if you've got that much money, I think I'd like to see the Harbor Commission and the Harbor Department work on something that we need to start out as far as the promenade is concerned. That would be simply extending the San Pedro Red Car line, which is on the tracks -- the existing tracks that the Red Car line is on just happen to go straight up to the Green Car line at the 105 and the 110 Freeways. That way, the people of San Pedro can have mass public transit from Downtown San Pedro to the Metrorail line.

There's absolutely no reason why that can't be accomplished. That line is very infrequently used at this point in time for freight shipments. It's just a matter of stringing those electric lines along the existing rail lines so the cars can run back and forth.

Of course, I agree with the proposal to extend it in the other direction to Cabrillo Beach, but we need an electric shuttle system that can cover the entire peninsula. That way, people can jump on an electric shuttle on the other side of the Palos Verdes peninsula and get a ride all the way down to the Red Car line; and you don't have to keep, you know, relying on metro -- you know, rapid transit or they're own cars.

The second other -- the second suggestion I'd like to make is that -- well, I can see right here where you want to cut into the land here -- you're going to be removing a lot of land that could be used for recreational
purposes, public events, music shows, concerts, plays. Also you're opening up areas in the middle of a crowded location, if a lot of people show up, where somebody could just show up with a speedboat loaded with explosives and machine guns and ammo and, you know, use it to stage a terrorist attack unimpeded and then just turn around and head on out and head to another location and do the same thing.

To me, it's ridiculous -- that whole idea and the environmental problems involved, the costs. I would suggest that it would be -- a much better plan would be to simply put a bike path and a boardwalk and the -- move the slips out a little bit and put that boardwalk between the Maritime Museum all the way down to the end of Ports O'Call with a little bike path on it. And that would act as a buffer zone along with the slips that would be out about, what, 25 feet further out into the harbor to prevent people from ramming into Ports O'Call with a speedboat, whether it's Buford Furrow working for the KKK or Ahkmed working for Al Qaeda.

What's the difference?

You know, this would definitely be a very important anti-terrorist application; and I believe also that, if you've got enough money to do this, you can also fund the biodiesel fuel depot that is being proposed right now.

You can log on, if anybody in the audience is interested, to the primafuel.com. That's the company in charge of the project to distribute 60 million gallons of biodiesel clean-burning fuel here in the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach per year. Or you can get further information by logging onto the www.BioBeetle.com. That's all small letters except for the two Bs. Ask for Joe Blackburn to give you further information on the biodiesel -- biodiesel projects and the local distribution work that is being set up.

This can be used for school buses, city buses, trash trucks, trucks, tractor trailer rigs, dock cranes, shipyard equipment and container haulers, fork-lifts, small water craft, large ships, trains, power generators, private vehicles.

Collectively, this would reduce the overall emissions in the harbor complex here by 5 to 98 percent overnight at a cost of $1.75 to $2.00 a gallon depending on whether you want the warm-weather formula or the
cold-weather formula to prevent anti -- to prevent gelling in the fuel tanks.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

DR. APPY: Thank you.

Dennis Piotrowski -- I hope I didn't mess up your name -- and Dr. Ayala -- followed by Dr. Ayala.

MR. PIOTROWSKI: Good evening. My name is Dennis Piotrowski. I'll be brief with my comments. Jim Whitt, Brian Harrison, and June Smith made some good points and touched on what I would like to basically outline tonight.

I'm a resident of San Pedro and have been a volunteer for the Los Angeles Maritime Museum for eight years. During this time I have developed a deep respect for the history of the men and women who have built Los Angeles Harbor and San Pedro Bay. I believe that's what makes our community unique and special. This is why I believe it is extremely important that any changes to the waterfront supports this history and the museum.

With this in mind, I would like to state that, while I'm generally supportive of progress on the San Pedro Waterfront and these -- and some parts of the proposed plan, I do have some serious concerns with the latest proposal -- with certain aspects of the latest proposal.

The latest change, the plans to get rid of the parking behind John Gibson Park for water cuts -- if this occurs, this will badly limit access and hurt attendance at the Maritime Museum, the Merchant Marine Commercial Fishing, U.S.S Los Angeles, ILWU, and the other wonderful monuments in Gibson Park. Fewer people would see and learn about this important San Pedro history.

People want to be able to easily park nearby and visit the museum and the memorials in the park like they've been doing for about 26 years in this location. So please do not get rid of the parking behind Gibson Park. This area should and must remain for easy access for people to share our wonderful history of this community.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Thank you, Dennis.

Dr. Ayala followed by Maureen Blaney.

Too, if you could also remember to try to keep it within the three minutes, I would appreciate it. Thank you.

DR. AYALA: Hi, my name is Dr. Ayala.

I'm not a -- familiar with anything here, but I am familiar with the air quality. I've been a doctor for
almost 15 years. I just retired to do this full-time
because of children, and I commend the guy talking about
the youth.

The impact that we have on this planet is
enormous. People all over the world often say, "We can't
destroy our planet. Our planet is just too big to be
defeated."

Guess again. We are now seeing the ramifications
in the different parts of the world including our
homeland. Long Beach and surrounding areas are among the
top polluted cities in the country. Scientists say, if
two-thirds of our population can reduce emissions and use
proper alternative energy, we can stop global warming and
be able to breathe better here.

As a world-renowned medical doctor and a chemist,

over the years I've been approached with many products of
which I don't and won't endorse. It's easier for people to
point fingers and blame large corporations and government
officials rather than claim self-responsibility for their
own contributions for their own environmental pollution.

It's not about blame or judgment. It's about
growing in our awareness about what we can be doing to
reduce pollution, which emissions are the great contributor
to global warming. I found a solution to our problem. I
have been introduced to a product that works to reduce
emissions by 80 percent guaranteed as well as increase the
engine performance miles by gallon from 7 to 14 percent and
more. I myself and several other colleagues have seen
great results on this product. I feel confident in sharing
this research with others.

This product is well-tested. It is EPA
registered and approved. It works for combustion chamber
engines. This product can be used in gasoline, diesel,
biodiesel, ethanol blend. It also works for both new and
older vehicles and can be used in many types of off-road
equipment, such as cargo ships, boats, trucks, 18-wheelers,
generators, Weed eaters, lawn mowers, construction
equipment, et cetera, et cetera.

Thank you for the opportunity to give a service
to the coastal committee. And hopefully we can get this

matter resolved immediately so we can -- all our children
can smell and breathe clean air because, if you bring in
all those new ships, new developments, it's going to bring
more pollution.

If we don't resolve this in a fashionable manner,
over 1.5 million children around the world is getting asthma because of the diesel particulates. We spent over 80 million dollars in fuel, and we actually saved 10 percent in Africa. Look that up.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Thank you very much.

Maureen Blaney followed by Deborah Powers.

MS. BLANEY: Hello. My name is Maureen Blaney. I too second the information on the Fuel Freedom International.

As a resident though, I hear a lot of other issues that I'm going to take my time to address. We were talking about the quality of air and alternatives. There's a couple of things that I'd like to go over like fostering the inter-agency, that we look at things that other ports may have noticed.

There are other organizations also that I've come across in just taking a general interest in the air. I'd like to mention Environmental Defense as a nonprofit organization that represents over 400,000 members.

I received some information just basically cutting news January 22nd that there are major organizations and companies that are forming an alliance called the United States Climate Action Partnership. These organizations include things like Alcoa, BP America, Caterpillar, Dupont, General Electric, Pacific Gas and Electric. It goes on.

I bring that to your attention to start to look at, as far as resources, where we are putting our resources, others may have already gotten the answers -- to consider what they have too. As far as a lot of the statistics that they have, last year was ranked the hottest year on record; and also America was ranked the top global warming polluter that emitted much of the -- more than European Union, Russia, and Japan combined. And the number of the fire seasons increased by 78 days.

To consider what actions we're impacting with these decisions with increasing -- there are also a large number of ports and websites, reports that I came across. I would just like to mention -- I'm assuming everybody is aware of a lot of things, but there's another one called Clean Ports USA, www.cleanfleetsUSA.net/cleanports, if you can consult some of that.

Another point that I have is that we're looking at this project here, and at the same time there are concurrent or simultaneous projects that are not
necessarily being mentioned. But I believe there's a
synergistic approach that occurs when you have multiple
projects being proposed at the same time, one being the
China shipping cranes, the six new cranes that's going to
be more work going on at the same time, adding to your
noise as well as your pollution.

You also have a Point Vista Project that's being
proposed that's creating traffic and other congestion. So
while we're talking about this and looking at it, are we
really looking at the synergistic approach of what's
happening here?

As far as housing, on Page 55 of this report, it
mentions that there will be no impact because there are no
houses or residential within this project. What I'm not
seeing that might be overlooked and should be possibly
considered is that, when you have no housing that's going
to be relocated here, are the sounds that emanate from it
and the vibrational impact that emanates from it extending
beyond this location?

So the matter of housing within is never affected
because there's no need for new residential housing, but
the neighboring housing -- I don't hear anything about
that.

DR. APPY: Could you finalize now because we have a
lot of speakers here left and we need to get through these.

MS. BLANEY: Sure.

I'd also mention I don't hear anything about
planting trees, which could possibly oxygenate the area as
an alternative. We're looking to clean up the air
quality. As far as non-costly attractions, we talk about a
nice water feature like maybe we have in Vegas or some
other places, but what about something like a peace
labyrinth that people can walk in that's peaceful, quiet,
and calm?

DR. APPY: Deborah --

MS. BLANEY: Thank you.

DR. APPY: Okay. Thank you.

I know I -- it seems rude for me, but really
there's a lot of speakers here tonight. Please try to keep
it to three minutes. I'd really appreciate it. It's not
just for me, but it's for other people here who may want to
come up and speak. So please watch that. I'd appreciate
it.

We have some lights down here. You can watch
them too. When it hits that red light, from now on as I
mentioned before, we're going to start doing the trap door
thing right next to -- just kidding.

DR. APPY: Deb?

MS. POWERS: My name is Deb Powers. I'd like to
acknowledge everyone from being here tonight. Just
encourage you to keep on coming out and fight the good
fight.  L.A. Harbor is already one of the busiest harbors
in the world, and we live with those impacts day-to-day.
I'm concerned about local air quality in San Pedro,
especially when I can smell it when I walk out my door in
the morning, every morning pretty much lately, or when I
see the yellowish-green haze over, you know, the harbor
when I'm driving home after work.
I'm concerned about the water quality of Inner
Cabrillo Beach, which received F scores; and I'm concerned
about changes to the waterfront quality on the Outer
Cabrillo Beach by this increased harbor use, dredging and
so forth.
I'm disturbed about the idea of an Outer Harbor
cruise ship terminal, the visual impacts, the traffic
impacts, the increased parking lots and concrete, and
increased noise levels.
I disagree with development that doesn't serve
the local community. We should start with the community
needs and innovatively create a Waterfront Plan that the
residents can support and which will genuinely increase
our quality of life. I think the Bridge to Breakwater
Waterfront Plan seemed more in the aims -- or more in line
with such aims.

There are a lot of other things I'm concerned
about, but, to me, a vibrant waterfront is where you can
smell the salty, coastal breezes on those still mornings.
It doesn't reek of pollution, and you can hear the seals
barking when the wind's blowing just right or sometimes you
can hear the buoy bells ringing.
I like having open spaces to ponder without
cruise ships cruising by. I like the uninhibited views
from the cliff's edge and, when I'm sitting out at the
Outer Cabrillo Beach surfing, watching the dolphins and the
seals cruise by.
I like going to yoga class at the Cabrillo Beach
Bathhouse and being able to hear the ocean crashing on the
shore. Those are my ideas of a vibrant waterfront.
Thanks for your time.
DR. APPY: Thank you. Thank you, Deborah.
The next speaker, Dr. John Miller followed by
Rich Pavlick.
DR. MILLER: Good evening. Thank you for this
opportunity to speak. I appreciate that you have extended
the comment period to 60 days.
One thing that -- I'll try to say something
positive. I do like the Sampson Way improvement on this,
but there are a lot of other issues. One thing that's not clear to me is that it appears there's no Master Plan here.

Shouldn't the Bridge to Breakwater be our Master Plan?

If it is true there's no Master Plan, then going forward with this may be in conflict with certain regulations of the City of Los Angeles. These are the regulations that a private developer would have to adhere to to get permits. Additionally, this -- this process may constitute piecemealing of this -- of the project here. It may represent piecemealing.

I'm still studying this, but what the -- the plan we see here seems to be a plan to subsidize a private industry, the cruise ship industry.

And I have to say that, for everyone, this project can't have come just from Jan and Dr. Appy and the people at the table here. This has to have come to us from Mayor Villaraigosa via the Board of Harbor Commissioners. This is our mayor failing us. We elected him. He was elected with lots of hope, and this mayor has just decided to just subsidize a private industry at the expense of the rest of this community.

And these guys -- it's not these guys' fault that this plan is so lame looking and so one-sided, but, as we know from the Air Emissions Inventory that the Port did, a cruise ship call produces one and a half times the amount of pollution that a container ship call produces.

I've gone on record many times with concerns on air quality. But a specific question -- you list mitigation measures on Page 15, but then the weasel language has to creep in. It says "using alternative marine power for hoteling emissions at two berths if needed to be implemented by 2011."

So the weasel language is getting in already. But I wonder will berthing or maneuvering of cruise ships, especially at the westernmost area of the existing terminal, interfere with access to existing marinas by boaters?

Finally I'd like to offer a couple precautions about this cruise ship industry. It's an industry, although there seems to be a great demand for now, it's an industry that is at the mercy of bad news, which could change demand in a heartbeat.

Secondly -- you know, bad news just really drops
demand on that industry, but secondly, the business model of this cruise ship industry is a problem for local businesses because the whole business model involves getting the passenger into the entirely contained environment where, if you want to buy a tube of toothpaste, you buy it from Disney or whatever the cruise ship operator is. It's very tough to get away from the company and get out of their facility and actually go into a community wherever their boat is docked unless you're on one of those approved tours that you have to pay the cruise ship company for.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Just want to comment. The words you're talking about refer to whether or not the cruise berth is needed. We're going to be applying all the Clean Air Action Plan requirements at a minimum to these cruise ships when they come in here, John. That's what that language refers to. I appreciate that.

Rich Pavlick followed by Amy Thornberry.

MR. PAVLICK: Hi. Thanks for this opportunity to speak to you about this grand plan.

You know, I got involved with this several years ago. I'm, of course, a San Pedro property owner, also president of Crescent Area Residents Association, and served on other committees and attended meetings.

This whole thing started with Bridge to Breakwater; and we got into this big combat zone about -- let's see. There was the proposed plan by the Harbor, which we considered a high-density plan. Then we countered with a lower-density plan. Then the Harbor came up with a mega-density plan. Then we countered with a green plan. After all this battling, we bumped all that and we come up with this project.

I don't -- you know, I didn't look at this when I got it for Christmas. I'm glad I didn't. It wouldn't have been a hell of a Christmas present. That's for sure. I look at it, and I don't understand what it's all about except it appears to be a plan to expand the cruise ship activities and hope that the cruise ship passengers visit San Pedro so they can spend some of their money. Good luck with that plan.

In addition to that, you know, when we started this whole thing, it was like we're going to -- the Port said, "We're going to give the waterfront back to the public."
God, I'm still waiting for that. It's a -- the only thing they didn't mention that they were going to keep the Jankovich lease renewal tank farm here. They're going to keep Westways tank farm here. They're going to add some cruise ship lines and so forth on this waterfront. We're going to give it back to you, but we're going to give it back to you with all the stuff that earns us some money that we can pay our bills with. That's our giving the waterfront back to the public.

I'm still looking for linkages. We talked about linkages, both physical and actual linkages to Downtown to integrate Downtown San Pedro and the city of San Pedro.

with -- or actually, you know, Los Angeles but San Pedro proper with the waterfront. I don't see that here. You know, I have to agree with John Papadakis. Where is the grand plan for waterfront? The only limitations I would put on this grand plan is, you know, we have to be considerate of air pollution, water pollution, traffic congestion, parking congestion, light and noise pollution. In other words, take all these into account but give us a grand plan. Give us something other than an expanded cruise ship terminal plan. You know, what's -- you know, I'm going to make this real short. After looking at this grand plan, what's looking good to me is Project Alternative No. 2, No Project/No Action. I hate to say that, but I just -- if this is the plan, let's do something else.

Thank you.

Amy Thornberry followed by Tom Politeo.

Hello. I'm totally opposed to adding a new cruise ship berth. I think the reason that that has become part of the plan is because nobody else comes to our port to visit it, that it's physically sickening to breathe our air. So the only people that you see maybe down there are the few hapless tourists who are trapped here. They have no idea what kind of noxious pit they're being dropped off at and you see them wandering lost with regret like, "This is California? I can't breathe."

They lose -- I have a daughter. She's four and a half years old. She loves the Red Car trolly, but if we play down there, we both lose our voice. I will have to leave here. I'm 41 years old. I'm an ex-competitive swimmer. I have enormous, strong lungs. This year my
doctor says I have asthma. I cannot stay here unless the air is cleaned up.

DR. APPY: Tom Politeo followed by John Pitts.

MR. POLITEO: Again, like everything else, thanks for the opportunity to speak here today. I'll try to cut my remarks down. It seems like all these people have said what I want to say.

The lyrics, "When you wish upon a star, makes no difference who you are," evoke a strong egalitarian feeling. Too bad, when it comes to San Pedro Bay, it may be more important if you're Disney than an ordinary resident if you hope to have your dreams come true.

We need to develop the San Pedro/Wilmington Waterfront to support local residents, not just tourists who might come here for a couple hours on a Friday or Monday when they're rushing to or from a cruise ship terminal to get back to their busy workweeks.

If we develop our waterfront as an asset for communities and residents, it will turn out to be an asset for regional users and tourists alike. It can help bring us prosperity then and improve the quality of our life and raise our hopes for the people who have had to stare down and breathe the blight of the nation's largest industrial port.

You know, all around the nation a lot of cities have been playing the condo and artist loft card in their downtown areas; and some of them are starting to have trouble getting those built units bought and sold. What's going -- what are we going to do here that's going to make us different, that's going to be something that is going to be attractive to new prospective residents to move in?

It's not going to be a cruise terminal. You know, those are basically tourist traps. They're a nice place to visit, but they're not the sort of place you want to go back to over and over again.

What we need is a waterfront that, you know, is going to give us the opportunity to access nature, to have shaded walkways for pedestrians and cyclists. We need a waterfront that offers something for everyone -- for families, for seniors, for joggers, for art lovers, for children, for music lovers, for sailboat users, for marinagoers, kayakers, and maybe even equestrians, a place where they can all come and enjoy San Pedro Bay in many different ways.

We need a waterfront that attracts people to get
out of their cars and come and visit San Pedro, not just for a couple hours, but for a couple of days. And I don't see that really as being in this plan. I'd like to see us develop a Mecca for pedestrians rather than something that is catering so much to automobiles down in this area.

Consider that the planners in Beverly Hills are talking about closing down Rodeo Drive to cars because they feel the heat of competition from new pedestrian-oriented developments.

Consider that San Pedro and Wilmington, which are retail-donor communities, which means we spend more of the money that we have here elsewhere, already have a cruise operation and Santa Monica, which all they did was close down part of Third Street, does not. Okay. They're a retail magnate. They get more money coming in -- and they have a lot of money there in the first place -- than their own local people spend.

We want to see people get out of their cars from Cabrillo to Wilmington. We want to move out as many of these parking lots or consolidate them and improve the public transit options down in this area and really make a place where people can come and enjoy the waterfront.

Thank you very much.
Thank you very much for your work and the presentation. It's very well done, and it appears to be thorough to me. But I must say that, in echoing the comments of the people that I heard earlier regarding the Maritime Museum and the parking and the structural concerns, I have the same concerns about bringing water that far up into the area and also about reducing the parking that's available currently.

One of the things that we've experienced in our memorial is that there's a very high water level, and it's causing damage to our walls as well as the only working fountain in the downtown area. That's a big concern, especially if the water is going to be brought from the channel that much closer to the existing memorial.

Is that going to affect it even further? Is it going to affect other things in the area, particularly the Maritime Museum?

The U.S.S. Los Angeles Memorial, the Los Angeles Maritime Museum, and the American Merchant Marine Veterans Memorial have a symbiotic relationship, which was borne of the Bridge to Breakwater meetings. We saw the need to unite and to ensure that that part of the downtown area, that jewel, if you will, were protected and not bifurcated or split up in any way.

I hear a lot of talk about trying to develop a downtown area that's akin to a jewel. I'd like to stop for a minute and say we have a jewel. There's people that enjoy living here. There's people that enjoy working here.

Could it be improved? Absolutely. It could be improved, but I'm very confused, having participated from the first Bridge to Breakwater meeting to the present. It appears as if there's been a hard left that's been made somewhere along the line. There's a lot of things that have been addressed, but there's several things here that have the appearance to me of a patchwork quilt. It almost likes like, here's a patch of land. Let's do something with it. Let's create something here that doesn't exist already for the purpose of doing it rather than having an actual function that I can discern.

While I'm a very big fan of magic, it appears as if, you don't like this one, well, then try Plan No. 2, try Plan No. 3. There's something else in the offing here that we can go to.

I appreciate having the option and not just looking at one plan, but there's an awful lot of attention given to Plan 1 or Alternative No. 1, but right behind it is Alternative No. 2 and then we have the major plan. It's rather confusing to me.
I wish that there was a little bit more attention paid to the downtown area being something that's always in my mind -- reminded me of San Pedro is a pair of jeans. You might not want to wear it for a formal dinner, but it's nice to come home and get into. San Pedro is a nice community; and, yes, it could be improved. And if you listen to the comments, I think there's a thread of commonality to all of them.

I appreciate your efforts in trying to achieve that. I hope with our comments that we can get back to the basics and get something that we can all agree on.

So thank you very much.

Dr. Appy: Thank you.

Sue Castillo followed by Peter Warren.

Ms. Castillo: Hi, I'm Sue Castillo, activity with the Neighbors Council and Sierra Club member, but tonight I'm here just speaking on behalf of myself.

And this plan I do see investment in Downtown San Pedro. I think it's building upon the north promenade that we started. I like the new water cuts. I like the Seventh Street Pier. I like the idea of a plaza at Sixth and Harbor, and the extension of the waterfront promenade along the actual waterway.

It's not that I don't expect the waterfront to be rebuilt all at once. I expect it to be an organic process. I don't call that piecemealing.

However, I do have a big problem with the outer cruise terminal project. I see a huge, huge negative impact on what I call Cabrillo Bay. I don't like to call it Outer Harbor. That sounds sort of industrial. To me, it's a wonderful bay that is used by swimmers, kayakers, all the fishermen and crafts that come in and out of the marina. I see very serious problems in what would it take to put a 20,000 square foot building right there on the rim of the harbor and what's essentially like a 15-story building, a whole city block being built right there at the end of Kaiser Point.

I think that you need seriously examine the alternatives to the cruise terminal there. There's -- it could be placed on the main harbor. You know, keep as much as you can downtown where you really need that type of a development, perhaps even the east channel, but not the bay. Please preserve the bay.

I want to see a full examination of all the impacts on the Cabrillo Bay there, the pollution, you know,
the safety to the small boats entering and leaving the
marina, and also just the loss of rare, nonindustrialized
natural public recreation space that this is. So I look
forward to that being very well examined.

    Thank you.

---

DR. APPY: Thank you, Sue.

    Peter Warren.

MR. WARREN: I have a --

DR. APPY: Let me get the next one. Sorry, Peter.

    And followed by Dick Pawlowski.

MR. WARREN: I Applaud the last speaker and the
comments by John Papadakis and June Smith and John Miller.

    I think they're exactly right.

    I was here the other night for the BIZMO meeting
in this hall. I expected self-interest and greed to be
portrayed by the person presenting the project there
because that's what you expect from someone who is
developing in his own interest. I expect a lot more from
our own Harbor Department and our own city and our own
bureaucracy.

    We deserve vision and an effort by them to serve
the larger community and larger interests here, not to sell
our precious harbor and waterfront to industry. And I
consider the cruise ship an industrial use, not to sell
this out in the hope that tourists will come, not probably
here but to hotels in downtown and that will fill the bed
and help the city fill its coffers.

    To echo what John and some other people have
said, this is a bad idea we've seen before; and it's made
worse because over the years we've criticized this and yet

it's come back. The public has been ignored despite years
of work and comment. Other people have discussed that.

This is really urban planning without
imagination. It is ugly. It's pedestrian. It draws on
none of our natural resources to share it with the public.
It doesn't attract people and sell the waterfront.
Instead, you know, to the public, it sells it to big
business. To paraphrase June, it's a cruise drive-by.

    The basic idea we should have here is we should
be segregating along our waterfront. It's in the Harbor
Department's own Master Plan. Industrial, commercial, and
recreational environmental uses. We had that at one time
in some of the previous plans. Instead what we have here
is something that pollutes -- and I'll take your wording --
not the Outer Harbor, but Cabrillo Bay.
It both ruins the Outer Harbor and Cabrillo Bay at the same time it hurts downtown. It takes away, if you want to have cruise ship, business away from downtown. It brings traffic, instead of off the bridge and right to the cruise terminals, all through downtown with more cars and more pollution and more buses.

We've got the largest growth, 15 percent, in terminal and cargo; and instead of dealing with pollution, we're adding pollution. I think that this scoping has to analyze this from the point of view of light pollution,

sound pollution, air and water pollution. Cruise ships as someone else has said are the most polluting visitors.

When the Pier 400 EIR was done, it failed to even discuss light pollution. I suppose, if I wanted to be sarcastic, I would say the one good thing about this is you won't care about light pollution from Pier 400 anymore if this thing goes in.

Finally, I don't -- I think what's really lacking here is vision. You know, we have a port -- I don't mean this to disparage people who work hard at the Port. It's their job. They're doing -- they're engineering this. They're trying to come up with solutions, but for those of you who like the harbor walkway sandwiched between a railroad track and a huge parking lot almost without the ability to see water, you'll probably love this plan.

What -- and I don't want to just criticize it. I want to offer a little vision here. I think that -- recently I've been to Barcelona, and I've been to Chicago. In Chicago they've created, over the course of 100 years, one of the most beautiful waterfronts along that riverfront. Not only do they have Grant Park that's been there for 50 years, but in the last five years they've built Millennium Park. And if you go there on a weekend, the place is packed. People come. They use the park.

They use the facilities.

One of the things that you see in Barcelona, which I just came back from -- I visited my daughter there. They used to have the hodge podge like you want to create here --

DR APPY: Peter --

MR. WARREN: I'm almost done -- all around the waterfront.

Instead, they have segregated things. Now the terminals are over here. The cruise ships are over there. And the people have the waterfront, and they can fly over
it in a cable car.

Finally -- this should be something that would be a draw to San Pedro, L.A., California, and the U.S. We have in a short space of this area a wonderful opportunity to create a recreational and environmental draw.

DR. APPY: Peter --
MR. WARREN: We have --
DR. APPY: -- can you close, please?
MR. WARREN: -- the Maritime Museum -- I am closing now. I'm on my last --
DR. APPY: Thank you.
MR. WARREN: -- eighth of a page.
We have the Maritime Museum, the Cabrillo Beach, the Cabrillo Museum and Pier. We have White Point Park, the preserve, the park, the beach, Point Ferman Park, Point

Ferman Lighthouse, Angels Park, and the Cultural Center in the Bell, the Bird and Mammal Centers.

What we need to do is take that and Cabrillo Beach and the water cut at Cabrillo Beach and open that up and create a great park. What L.A. needs is more park space. We have some of the fewest park space for residents of any major city in the United States. That will bring people here. That will deal with -- will allow our residents to breathe free instead of adding to what we have now, which is a diesel death zone where 2,500 people die needlessly every year --

DR. APPY: Peter --
MR. WARREN: -- because pollution is growing.
DR. APPY: I guess we'll just continue, but I really appreciate you trying to keep it into the three minutes.
I think he made some really good comments, but think about the phrase of them. Try to keep them shorter, or I have to activate that trap door.
Dick Pawlowski is next.
MR. PAWLOWSKI: My name is Dick Pawlowski. I'm a longtime resident.
This is the first time this has been proposed in front of a group of people that are longtime residents. This is something that will help mitigate some of the stuff that's being planned since they may not do that park and

they're backing away from it. And it's something where we rip out Pacific Avenue from First Street to 22nd Street and put in something similar to April Park. It's about putting back trees. I call it Pacifica Creek.

Everybody can scoff. It does make economic sense
from the point of view where we can revitalize the business
district. We can use this all the time regardless of what
the Port does. This is important. Regardless of what the
Port of L.A. has up their sleeve or what they do with the
cruise ships, this is something we need.
I think if the Port was wise enough to tie into
what we're thinking here and analyze this, you come up a
solution and it does make sense for them to say, you know
what? We might be able to mitigate and use some of this
stuff along with this and say we'll help do this.
And the street's already there. We just don't
need the asphalt. We just need some more proper planning
to get this thing done. And I'd like to have you all visit
NewSanPedro.com. Pretty simple -- NewSanPedro.com and
there's more information there about all the parking and
that stuff works.
Thank you.
DR. APPY: Thank you very much. Thanks, Dick.
Al Perisho followed by Ray Patriciao, different
spellings.

1       MR. PERISHO: My name is Al Perisho. I'm president of
2 the Retirees Club for the Longshoremen Clerks and Shoremen,
3 the ILWU. And we have a vested interest in the monument
4 area over there on Gibson Park. I want to make some
5 comments about that.
6 We're opposed to these cuts. Where you've got
7 the Lane Victory up there, there used to be a hammerhead
8 crane there; and they couldn't keep it functioning because
9 the dock was sinking. And the Harbor Engineers, Corps
10 Engineers ought to look at that. I don't know how many
11 tons of concrete went into the underside of that dock. It
12 never stopped until they took the crane down and moved the
13 terminal.
14 Over there where the cruise terminal is proposed
15 over there -- you call it Kaiser Point. That's Pier 49,
16 one of them is; and the San Sanita is there. That's got
17 such a surge that you can't hold a ship next to the dock. It
18 never stopped until they took the crane down and moved the
19 terminal.
20 When that Sansinena had blown up and, if it had
21 gone the other way and it had -- all that stuff had drifted
22 over there to where that bulk oil terminal is, you wouldn't
23 have to be talking about any of this.
24 So the comment was made that, if I understood it
25 correctly, another 20-year lease, watering it down a little
bit or cutting back on it. That's your biggest danger for safety of the residents of this community. When that goes, you know, you'll know about it. Remember, the Sansinena blew up all the windows facing east up there on west of that area.

But as far as the cruise terminals are concerned, cruise companies come and go. It's like an NFL football team. If you don't give them the right deal, they're going somewhere else. San Diego has cruise ships now. The cruise ships are leaving Vancouver, Canada, and coming to Seattle. Long Beach has cruise ships.

I wouldn't worry about cruise ships. I don't think those tourists spend a dollar in a retail shop in San Pedro. You know, they get on -- in fact, while they're -- when they get down there off the bus, they don't even know where they are. They simply see the ship and they're heading for the Lido Deck where the food is.

So I'm just telling you I think that is an exercise there that you're going to do all of that construction infrastructure and five, ten years from now, it will be something else. They'll be going somewhere else. You've got a berthing problem there. You've got a depth problem and everything else.

Let me see now because I wasn't going to say anything here, but I talked about --

DR. APPY: You're doing pretty good.
MR. PERISHO: I talked about the unstable area there where you're making those cuts.

That parking lot -- until you've got -- if you just leave it like it is there instead of those cuts, you won't have that problem. Where you're talking about putting the Lane Victory, that's a big problem there when you start excavating and pile driving and everything and you're taking away our parking for the museum. You're taking away our parking.

There's a lot of people that aren't capable of going that far, and the Red Car stops there. We can get on it. Earlier one of the presenters said that, well, if we need more parking, we're going to put it over there along the waterfront where the cruise terminal is now. That's good property for -- that's close to the waterfront. We don't need a parking structure there. Let's keep what we've got.

DR. APPY: Thank you.
MR. PERISHO: I'll quit right now. I think you better take another look at it. I think everybody here is on the beam. And I like the boys club. Joe Marino, what he said about the youth of this community, they need more space. They need more activity --

DR. APPY: Thank you.
MR. PERISHO: -- not the cruise terminals.
DR. APPY: Thank you.
Okay. Ray followed by Daniel Nord.
MR. PATRICAO: Good evening, folks. That last guy's
my son.
Don't he look good?
DR. APPY: Yeah.
MR. PATRICAO: Anyway, I don't know what the hell I'm
doing here tonight really, but the -- I wrote a few notes.
DR. APPY: Me too.
MR. PATRICAO: I came in here baffled, and I'm more
baffled. Too much paperwork, too many damn things going
on, let me tell you.
But I'm going to start off with Joe Marino.
He made a hell of a speech. I'm for him 100 percent.
If that project's got the green light, get the
damn thing going. Let's not wait for anything. I've been
involved in a thing at Peck Park trying to get something
for the youth.
What do I get from the City?
Nothing, nothing. Nobody's interested because
it's not political. It's not religious. There's no money
to be made for somebody. It's a shame.
Joe Marino, you did a hell of a speech; and I'm
for you.

The other thing is the cut-outs. These harbors
are all manmade, all filled in. They cut down hills. They
shaved the hills to fill it in. Now we want to cut it
out. We want to fool with the memorials.
Why don't we leave some things like they are?
God. So the cut-outs are -- somebody said, oh,
you can hang out down there.
Hell, what are 80-year-old guys going to hang out
for?
What is there to hang out for?
You going to watch some guy in a boat?
God, I can't get into a kayak now with all
that -- all that B.S., you know.
And the parking -- you know that's the No. 1
problem in the world. We're not the only town with a
parking problem. It's the only parking -- and it's easy to
put another parking lot over in Timbuktu and tell some
people to walk from over there.
Now what do you do -- what about the recreation?
What do you do in that town?
You walk and eat, walk and eat.
What else is there to do down there?
We need the thing -- another thing -- this -- the
names you people come up with. Kaiser Point -- that's a nasty name on the waterfront. They were the biggest polluters in the history of San Pedro, that Kaiser bulk outfit.

That's Outer Harbor. The water is Hurricane Gulch and Cabrillo Beach. All these other names -- old time Pedro -- they know Hurricane Gulch and Outer Harbor. Bottom line, some people have dreams, but it looks to me like somebody had a God damned nightmare here.

DR. APPY: Thanks, Ray.

Daniel Nord followed by John Mattson.

MR. NORD: Can I still have my three minutes while I figure out how to raise this thing here?

Thank you. Okay. This waterfront plan was released to the public on December 22nd while all of us were preoccupied with the holiday season, and as a result the average community member is unaware of this new B to B Plan that's on the table. And sorry, Ralph. I don't think that's an accident.

It's been established that this new plan focuses on the expansion of cruise ship business in the Outer Harbor near Cabrillo beach.

You've already received hundreds of letters and heard countless hours of testimony from community members who object to this kind of development in the Outer Harbor, but Port staff continues relentlessly pursuing this polluting, degrading, industrially expanding agenda serving, quote, projected growth in the cruise ship industry, unquote, which will benefit a few and leave the majority of our population with a decimated Outer Harbor and dash hopes for healthy economic revival in the surrounding communities.

Well, the report states that, quote, "The project area is located in an industrialized area within the port."

That statement was cut and pasted from the last NOP, a convenient justification to ignore that there are actually thousands of people living here. That's just plain insulting. I understand that plans for the new super cruise ship terminal have already been designed and promises have already been made to major cruise lines with hopes of winning their business.

I was at a Chamber of Commerce meeting two years ago when many were licking their chops at the Disney Cruise deal.

Where is the model of the terminal?
Where are the plans?

Why are you withholding these from the public?

I don't think anybody is supposed to be making these plans and these deals before the public and environmental review process takes place.

The NOP document for this proposed project lists significant negative impacts in aesthetic, air quality, biological, noise, light, security, traffic, economic, and almost every other area, but many negative impacts are poorly delineated or not mentioned at all.

For example, it appears that the Outer Harbor is being proposed as the berth site because of new super-sized ships that are bigger than the biggest that we've seen. They can't possibly maneuver in the existing situation near the bridge. These ships will dwarf the entire landscape of the outer harbor and nearby residences. I don't remember any mention of massive ships in the NOP document, which sites only two- to three-story buildings and minimal obstructions to views.

In fact, your document states that, quote, "The proposed project is not visible because buildings and parking structures could potentially obstruct views from surrounding areas."

"The proposed project is not visible because of intervening topography and/or development and that," quote, "proposed project features including multi-story buildings and parking structures could potentially obstruct views from surrounding areas."

But where are the super-sized cruise ships as tall as a skyscraper and as long as a city block?

They're flat little outlines on a piece of paper. You're responsible to put this very real image in front of the eyes of the public. Arial drawings without lines of cruise ships are deceptive. You have a long way to go with this document and with your community relations process.

I'll provide you with extensive written comments and I'm sure you will get plenty of others at this meeting. I want to ask Port staff to create an option that includes other positive aspects of the plan or the original lower-density plan, but leaves out destruction of our Outer Harbor. Right now the alternatives set forth are either one berth or two berths in the Outer Harbor.

Let's not be fooled. The current scenario
implies that, if we don't add those cruise terminals, ships, and parking lots, we can't have the other stuff. The community can demand development and improvements without destroying the Outer Harbor or Cabrillo Bay, as Sue Castillo put it, and our hope for a healthy and profitable future.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: John -- John Mattson followed by Kara McLeod.

MR. MATTSON: Yes. I'm rather disturbed that this thing seemed to have come -- more or less been dropped on us. I think the term is predetermination as a done deal

almost. We've -- we're talking about the linkages. Well, you're supposed to link it with the city, Downtown San Pedro.

I'm on the CRA Community Committee. We haven't heard of this. It hasn't been discussed with us. If there's going to be linkage, you have to link it to something.

Now, the CRA committee meets here in these very rooms the first Wednesday of every month. I urge all of you -- you know, everybody reacts. Woah, we're dealing with the Port. We've got to turn up.

The CRA is the one that's making decisions on the H-2. They're the ones making decisions on the bank loft. They're the ones approving changing the districting to triple the density in areas. They're the ones approving projects to tear down historic buildings. They're the ones making as much difference as this port project is ever going to make. Please turn up on Wednesday nights and see what these people are up to.

Now, I look at you folks -- have you gone out to Long Beach onto their terminal? You get out there where there's the Queen Mary, and they have their cruise ship terminal, lots and lots of parking lots. Everywhere you look is parking lots, a huge parking structure, a collection of dingy little shops selling trinkets and that's it.

Have you guys gone and looked?

Is that what you want here?

I'd say no thank you. The only way they could possibly make that work would be to put some sort of mass transit, park people other places, and have a tram system. That would work to bring people in. It works at Disneyland. It works at the Getty Museum, speaking of
museums, but this idea of turning this whole area into big parking structures and parking lots, I'm sorry. I think this is just absurd.

DR. APPY: Kara McLeod followed by Janet Gunter.

MS. MC LEOD: Hi, I am Kara McLeod. Those of you who have come to these meetings have probably seen me before and -- oh, good. Here's the little blinky light thing. I was going to ask you where it was.

I wanted to say there's one or two things about the plan that I think are lovely. I actually personally like the water cuts. I think that putting a big parking lot directly next to the water is, well, ridiculous. So the water cuts I think are swell. I'm very happy to see that the idea of rerouting Harbor Boulevard has been abandoned. But I have some questions.

What happened to the extension of our Red Car line out to the beach?

Wasn't that a swell idea?

Where did that go?

And I'm pretty sure that previously we had been promised the removal of all the industry, and suddenly there's an extension -- a 20-year extension on the tank farm. I don't want the tank farm there. I'm pretty sure that nobody else in the room would like the tank farm there.

Kaiser Point -- Kaiser Point is a wonderful place. It has the potential to be a great vista. It has the potential to be a wonderful spot for the public, a great place to put recreational areas, a lot of things we need in this area. And now it's going to be completely and totally privatized because nobody can tell me in the current environment in the post 9/11 that there is going to be any access out there for anyone except the people paying to be on the cruise lines.

And it's going to further exacerbate a serious problem we already have in town. Our current cruise terminal is isolated. There's nowhere -- no way to get anywhere if you're there on a cruise. You can't go downtown to buy a cup of coffee while you're waiting in the lines there to get on the cruise terminal. There's no transportation. There's no way to get there. Put it on Kaiser Point, and you've taken a bad problem and you've made it worse.

I would really like to know what happened to the 22nd Street Park, that big, beautiful park that we were all
promised as part of the Bridge to Breakwater original plan. That's come up again and again, the 22nd Street Park that people have said over and over again that we'd really like this park.

One of the major oppositions to the rerouting of Harbor Boulevard was to preserve that area as open space. Now it's been significantly reduced to a little sliver of what it used to be, and I find the idea of a grassy median down the center of Harbor Boulevard as park space as completely and utterly ludicrous. Nobody can tell me that a highway median is practical jog path space. That's ridiculous. I'm not stupid.

Now, the last thing I want to tell you is I grew up in South Orange County as a matter of fact. I lived in a lot of waterfront cities across Southern California. I would dearly love you to go to Dana Point or Newport Beach or Venice and tell them that you think that the best use of area that's immediately adjacent to a waterfront is to put 2,600 parking spaces in flat open parking. The least you could do is underground it so that that space is usable to, I don't know. What's the word I'm looking for? People.

I don't need more storage space for cars next to the water. Oh, see, I was trying to be good and watch the little blinky thing.

Thanks very much.

DR. APPY: Thank you, Carol.

Janet Gunter followed by Debbie Fox.

MS. GUNTER: Easier to do it this way. Gee, Ralph, I really feel sorry for you guys tonight. Talk about taking a beating. I really do. I know that this is not easy to take, but I gotta say I'm proud of everybody because -- my notes are so disorganized now because everybody's touched on points that I don't want to continue to repeat over and over.

I was appointed to the Bridge to Breakwater Committee when it first started, and I was there for three or four meetings. And, you know, I guess I've been around long enough that, as I'm looking at it and as cynical as I am, I'm figuring that what really the Port wants out of this is a new cruise terminal at the point.

That was a few years ago now, and I just stopped going because I felt I have enough hours I waste. I don't need to waste more pursuing all the work they had done and all the options that they had come up with and then to have it rendered useless and torn out from their hands.

This is interesting because I did a whole 180. In 1997 I was with San Pedro Revitalization Corporation as
vice-president with a shop downtown and really was in the
arena of promoting cruise line business because I saw that
as a venue for, you know, rehabilitating and revitalizing
the downtown area. I spent a lot of hours. I surveyed the
cruise terminal operators and found out they graded L.A. as
the worst port in the nation for port of embarkation
disembarkation for their customers.
So I went on a little bit of a tirade. I think
Ralph probably remembers, and it made front-page news and
it was -- they were on the hot seat. Princess Cruises, all
these people said they would move elsewhere; and the Port
and Chamber and everybody else said I was a damn liar. It
wasn't going to happen.
The next thing I know -- it was Carnival Cruises,
and they did move. And they moved to Long Beach, and they
paid one million dollars out of their own pocket to do so.
I learned about port pollution. I learned that the air
quality was so significant and so horrible that we're
living in this environment. We cannot continue to
pollute.
These ships are the single largest polluters. If
you plug in while you're here, that's great, but that's a
small percentage of the pollutants. You've got water
quality problems. You've got air pollution problems. You
can't do anything unless you get that at bay first. You've
got to take care of those problems and then think about
increasing all of this at a later point.
But -- and the other thing is unfortunately the
City of Los Angeles can't plan. The strategy -- the
planning strategy is not here. This project is not
disjointed if you have a grand plan, but there is no grand
plan that you're building toward. If you're doing it in
segments toward a certain goal, that's different. This is
segmented, disjointed.
You haven't moved your chemical facilities.
They're in the middle of this. They're nearest the point.
You've got one of the single largest chemicals housed
there, which is vinyl acetate monomer, most explosive jet
fuel facility. It's going to be there for 20 more years.
This doesn't make sense.
God bless you all, but we've got to do better.
As you've seen, this is a big issue. You've got a lot of
problems, and you can't do it without a conscience. And
you can't do it without a plan that makes sense.
Thank you.
DR. APPY: Thank you.
Debbie Fox followed by Chris Fox. Okay. Frank
Borden followed by Ruben Peneyora. Okay. And Frank
Borden. All right. Okay. Frank followed by John Royal.
MR. BORDEN: Thank you. Frank Borden, resident of
San Pedro and retired from L.A. City Fire Department and Director of Operations of our Fire Department's Historical Society. I just want to say that society and myself support the placement of the Ralph J. Scott, which is a National Historic Landmark vessel, one of the few in the whole country -- the placement of the vessel near its last assignment at Fire Station 112.

We're very much pleased with that. It goes along with the recommendation of the committee that worked for two years to present a plan, a preservation plan for the vessel. That goes along with that recommendation so we're very, very pleased. We're ready to work with the Port and other people to get that vessel placed in the building where it belongs.

Thank you.

DR. APPY: Thank you.

John Royal.

MR. ROYAL: Thank you. Good evening. I -- I'll be very brief here. My name is John Royal. I've been in San Pedro since 1928. Came over with Columbus. I want to say I'm going to speak to only one issue because the rest of the stuff is a bunch of superfluous B.S.

I support what Dennis said, John Pitts, Ray Patricio, Al Perisho, all you guys, Joe Marino, but the one thing I want to bring out here very strongly -- I was president of the Harbor Commission under Sam Muerty. The night that the Sansinena blew up, I was in Slav Hall, Yugoslav American Hall where 400 people were celebrating a Christmas party. When the Sansinena blew up, all the windows got shattered. If it wasn't for the huge drapes, 400 people would have been blinded there. And the pandemonium really hit the fan.

I immediately got ahold of Sam Pete, the Port Warden. He got ahold of local police officers. I must say the police department done a yeoman's job and corralling and stopping the lookie-loos who wanted to get down there. And the fire department did one hell of a job containing that fire.

It went down to Outer Harbor there, and it got under piers. And we were sweating big apples all night because, if that fire had gone down to where Jankovich facility was and at the tanker terminal down near the tanks, the tank farm, we'd have had another Texas City incident on our hands.

And now talking about all this stuff is fine, but
it's like Jeff Sunra said, money is the mother of politics and I smell a lot of politics in here.

Getting back to the Sansinena and what happened, I think the Harbor Department promised everybody years ago -- I forget how many -- that they were going to remove all

them tank farms and all that other dangerous stuff out and move it over to Terminal Island and get it out of this area here. That posed a great, great danger to the harbor.

Now you're worried about terrorists and terrorism, and we've been living with terrorism since then. I think, if we don't do something about that, all this other stuff is superfluous because, if you have another Sansinena thing and the tank farms go up out there, you're going to lose the whole God damned harbor because I was there when the Macky went up and when the Sansinena -- and I tell you, you want to talk about a scared rabbit.

You should have been down there. It was no fun watching a fire under the docks, and I can't praise the firemen enough for the work they did that night until daylight the next day. And now I hear here in this chicken S proposal that they want to give Jankovich another 20 God damned years on there.

Who the hell smoked the marijuana down here? Not me. Anyhow, I got a lot more to say, but I'm going to put a lot of this stuff in writing. I can B.S. with the rest of them. Right now I'm a little bit hot. I'll get off the mike right now. I support what Dennis said, the volunteer from the Marine Museum, John Pitts, Ray Patricao. I support all these guys. I support all you people who have your concerns.

No. 1 is getting rid of the fuel depots and tank farms. They want to make cuts down there from Kennedy's Russian out to the pilot station. Get rid of all them God damned tank farms, and they can cut ten God damned slips down in there.

DR. APPY: Thank you, John.

That concludes our speakers. Before you go, I'd like to also draw your attention again -- can you put up the locations and places that you can comment on this in addition to your verbal comments tonight. Please feel free to submit written comments to us and thank you very much for coming.

(Whereupon, this proceeding was concluded at 8:59 p.m.)