

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE PORT OF LOS ANGELES AND U.S.ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
SAN PEDRO WATERFRONT PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OF
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2007, 6:00 P.M.

Reported by:
Christina Montana
CSR No. 11884

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

THE PORT OF LOS ANGELES AND U.S.ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
SAN PEDRO WATERFRONT PROJECT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

Public Scoping Meeting taken on behalf of The Port
of Los Angeles and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at 601
South Palos Verdes Street, San Pedro, California, at
6:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 23, 2007, before Christina
Montana, a Certified Shorthand Reporter, License No. 11884,
within the County of Los Angeles, State of California.

23
24
25

3

1 APPEARANCES:
2
3 Port of Los Angeles:
Dr. Ralph Appy
4 Jan Rebstock Green
Michael Cham
5
6 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers:
Dr. Aaron Allen
7 Dr. Spencer MacNeil
8
Jones & Stokes:
9 Chad Beckstrom
10
Speakers:
11 James A. Whitt
John Papadakis
12 Brian Harrison
June Burlingame Smith
13 Kathleen Woodfield
Joe Marino
14 Sean Conlon
John Thomas
15 Dennis Piotrowski
J. Ayala, M.D.
16 Maureen Blaney
Deborah Powers
17 John G. Miller, M.D.
Rich Pavlick
18 Amy Thornberry
Tom Politeo
19 John Pitts
Sue Castillo
20 Peter Warren
Dick Pawlowski
21 Al Perisho
Ray Patricao
22 Daniel Nord
John Mattson
23 Kara McLeod
Janet Gunter
24 Frank Borden
John Royal
25

4

1 TUESDAY, JANUARY 23, 2007, 6:10 P.M.
2 SAN PEDRO, CALIFORNIA
3
4

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

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

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

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

25 Okay. I guess the consensus is that people want

5

1 to hear me talk. So if maybe we can all settle and we'll
2 get going. Okay.

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

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

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

22 So that was the Bridge to Breakwater Project, and
23 this NOP/NOI that we're doing tonight is, if you would,
24 kind of a replacement of that previous Scoping Meeting we
25 had. So that's -- that's Item No. 1.

1 Item No. 2 is I had a comment from Joe Marino
2 that came up to me tonight and said, "Gee, aren't we going
3 to be doing the 22nd Street enhancement we talked about at
4 the last public meeting?"

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

18 So this project then is something that will
19 happen that we're talking about tonight is something that's
20 going to happen in the future in addition or on top of
21 that. There are a couple little conflicts possibly in the
22 future. Nonetheless, we're going forward on that.

23 Any of you who think we were reneging on that,
24 that was what was approved and about a, what, 48 million
25 dollar -- 44 million dollar project that we're doing. So

1 for any of you that are concerned about us not moving
2 forward on anything, that's not the case. We're going
3 forward on that.

4 The purpose we have here tonight is to receive
5 your comments; and, generally at this point in time, we'd
6 like to hear about the big-picture items. We'd like to
7 hear about -- well, what is a -- what is a mitigation that
8 you need to do for the environmental effects?

9 Maybe there are some environmental effects that
10 you think we need to look at that we haven't, that we
11 didn't identify in our notice that we sent out to -- that
12 was available to everybody. Maybe you think there are some
13 alternatives you think we should look at. Instead of doing
14 part of this, you should do something different. Those are
15 the types of comments we're really interested in getting
16 from you tonight.

17 It's called a Scoping Meeting because we're
18 scoping out how we prepare the next document, which will be
19 called a Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Draft
20 Environmental Impact Report. It will be a very large

21 document and will take us quite a while to prepare,
22 probably -- how long? At least ten days, right?
23 This fall we'll have a draft document out. That
24 was a joke, the ten days, for those of who are familiar
25 with what our environmental documents look like these

8

1 days. Yeah.
2 So having said that, what I want to do now is I
3 want to do some brief introductions. My name is Ralph
4 Appy. I'm the Director of the Environmental Division for
5 the Port of Los Angeles.
6 Starting from your right, my left, is Jan
7 Rebstock Green, who is the Project Manager. She works for
8 me in the Environmental Division, and she is the Project
9 Manager for the environmental portion of it.
10 This is Michael Cham. He's also with the Port,
11 with the Port Planning Division. He's been doing the
12 planning associated with the Project and actually what the
13 Project is. You're going to hear a little later about the
14 description of the Project.
15 Next to my right is a very important person,
16 Dr. Aaron Allen. He is the Head of Regulatory, correct,
17 for -- the North Coast Section Chief for the U.S. Army
18 Corps of Engineers.
19 Next to him is Dr. Spencer MacNeil, who is also
20 with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; and he's the
21 Project manager for this on the Corps. He's Jan's
22 counterpart, if you would, for the Project.
23 Next is Chad Beckstrom. He's with a company
24 called Jones & Stokes, and they are the environmental
25 consulting team that's going to be doing a lot of the

9

1 technical work for the Port. They act as staff for the
2 Corps and to the Port in preparation of this. There's a
3 lot of work involved in these.
4 A couple other people that are present here --
5 Gregory Fritter -- Felterer for U.S. Army Corps of
6 Engineers. Are you there, way in the back?
7 He's the Public Relations with the Corps of
8 Engineers.
9 Also there's Lillian Deloza right here, who helps
10 us with our planning.
11 So if you have any comment cards, make sure you
12 get them to Lillian, if you would. She'll deliver them
13 here. Before I move on here, I just want to make sure
14 that, if you do want to speak tonight, you need to fill out
15 one of those public comment cards. We get them up here in

16 front, and then we go through them.
17 I'll talk a little bit more about some rules that
18 we have. So if every one of you were to speak for three
19 minutes or ten minutes tonight, we'd be here for a very
20 long time. So we do have some time limitations. So what
21 we're going to do tonight the objectives of the meeting
22 tonight is, No. 1, we're going to provide some information
23 about the Project and some of the alternatives we're
24 looking at and -- does that slide up there?
25 Good. We're asking you to really help the Corps

10

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

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

10 DR. MAC NEIL: Good evening.

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

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

24 A Notice of Intent for the draft EIS/EIR for the
25 revised project design was published in the Federal

11

1 Register on December 22, 2006. The Corps will accept any
2 written comments concerning the scope of this draft
3 document and the Public Notice for the San Pedro Waterfront
4 Project until February 28, 2007. You still have a lot of
5 time to provide comments on this document.

6 Under our Federal Permit Program the Corps of
7 Engineers is responsible for regulating the discharge of
8 dredged and fill materials in waters of the United States.
9 You'll be noticing, when I'm discussing our jurisdiction,
10 everything we're going to be concerned with is

11 predominantly in the actual water. That's where our
12 jurisdiction comes from under Section 404 of the
13 Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors
14 Act.

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

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

12

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

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

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

24 We're right at the beginning of the process.
25 This is really your opportunity to participate in what's

13

1 actually going to go into this document. One thing I want
2 to emphasize is all the comments that we get both at the
3 Scoping Meeting and as part of the Public Hearing for the
4 Draft EIS/EIR will be given careful consideration under our
5 permit review process. So we certainly encourage everybody

6 that has comments to provide them.

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

10 MS. GREEN REBSTOCK: Thanks, everyone.

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

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

14

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

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

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

21 Okay. So we're here at the Scoping Meeting. We
22 issued the NOP on December 22nd, 2006. There was a 66-day
23 public review period, which we're in the middle of. That
24 will terminate on February 28, so you have until the end of
25 next month to submit your comments. Then we're going to

15

1 move forward to preparing the Draft, and this is what a lot
2 of people refer to as the black-box period where you don't
3 really hear a lot from us while we're doing our analysis.

4 Then a Draft document will emerge, and we're
5 looking at late fall to circulate that. That will be at
6 least a 45-day public-comment period again. You'll get
7 another chance to read some of our evaluations and
8 conclusions and comment then.

9 Then we will have a Public Meeting at that time
10 and bring this to the Board of Harbor Commissioners, which
11 is then faced with the decision to approve the CEQA
12 analysis for the Project and whether to approve or deny the
13 Project at that time. Then they would hopefully certify
14 the EIR/EIS.

15 Okay. So if you slip to the next slide, I've
16 kind of covered that time frame here. We're looking at
17 hopefully an approved document in spring of 2008.

18 Sure. Okay. And so just to cover a little bit
19 of what we've done to notice the NOP/NOI, we've sent out --
20 again, we've had over a 60-day public comment period.
21 We've sent copies to the County Clerk and the State
22 Clearing House, which notifies all the State agencies that
23 might have an interest.

24 It's been posted in the Federal Register, and
25 we've sent out postcards to notice 72,000 people within the

16

1 immediate area. This was translated into Spanish. The
2 public notice was also posted on the Port website. We've
3 made it available at the Info Center.

4 And also I wanted to mention that we did issue a
5 revision to the NOP late last week. You should be
6 receiving it in the mail this week. We also have it posted
7 on the Port website.

8 It just provides a little bit more information
9 about the Red Car line extensions. We did discuss it
10 briefly in the NOP/NOI, but we wanted to give a little more
11 detail about what the potential impacts might be if we move
12 forward with that to give you a little bit more information
13 to comment on.

14 Okay. So let's just briefly cover what kinds of
15 issues would we be looking at in the EIR/EIS. We're going
16 to be looking at impacts to aesthetics. An example might
17 be, if we do decide to extend the Red Car line, that will
18 require a system of catenary poles and lines and what they
19 might look like, what kind of viewsheds might be affected,
20 air quality, how that might be impacted with the
21 construction of a new cruise terminal in the Outer Harbor,
22 biological resources, cultural resources.

23 We have the Ralph J. Scott, which is a National
24 Historic Landmark, and one of the project elements is to
25 construct a museum for its display. We want to make sure

1 we're doing that in a way that lets it keep its landmark
2 status.

3 We're going to be looking at impacts to geology
4 and soils, hazardous -- hazards and hazardous materials,
5 hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise,
6 population and housing, public services, recreation,
7 socioeconomics, transportation and traffic, utilities and
8 service systems, and environmental justice issues.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22 MR. CHAM: Thank you.

23 As Jan said, I'm going to be talking a little bit

24 about the project elements and talking about what we're
25 going to be putting in and what we're proposing to do.

19

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

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

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

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

20

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

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

14 If you notice, we have a few harbor water cuts as
15 well. The first one I want to talk about is the
16 North Harbor Cut, as Jan is pointing out there. It's 8.7
17 acres. That provides an opportunity to -- we have an
18 existing promenade over there. What that would do is

19 provide an area for a variety of small crafts to come in
20 and kind of move in and out and attract people there.
21 We're planning to put some tugboats there. We can relocate
22 the Lane Victory there and have visiting vessels stop there
23 as well.

24 If you move a little bit to the south, we have a
25 Downtown Harbor Cut. That Downtown Harbor Cut is directly

21

1 next to the Downtown San Pedro area, so this is a very key
2 area for us. If we want to have people come, we want to
3 have the access points where the people are. This cut will
4 be 1.56 acres. We plan to have topsail vessels there, port
5 vessels, visiting ships. As part of this cut, there will
6 be some parking demolition -- some existing parking
7 demolition.

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

19 There's John S. Gibson Park in the Downtown
20 Harbor area. That will be a 1.61 acre park between Fifth
21 and Sixth Street. There's going to be a town square area.
22 This will be at the foot of Sixth Street and directly next
23 to the Maritime Museum.

24 This is going to be a good area to have event
25 space. There's going to be surface parking and that can be

22

1 a place where you can hold functions. I know there's been
2 talk around with other agencies talking about farmers
3 market, something small or something exciting that you can
4 have events there as well.

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

10 Going south a little bit, there's another harbor
11 cut which is the Seventh Street Harbor Cut. That's a
12 smaller water cut, .36 acres. We'll have visiting vessels
13 come visit there as well.

14 Directly next to that we want to attract people
15 to the Seventh Street Pier, which will be a public dock.
16 It will extend a little bit into the water. It will be a
17 nice place for you to walk.

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

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

23

1 150,000 square feet and do only a net increase of 37,000.
2 Really that is just to expand a few of the existing
3 businesses that are doing well, International Cafe,
4 San Pedro Fish Market.

5 Ports O'Call Restaurant and L.A. Sport Fishing
6 are going to be potentially relocated and also expanded to
7 accommodate the waterfront promenade so it can be right
8 where the water is.

9 Next to the Ports O'Call, we have the Jankovich
10 tank farm lease renewal. This is going to be up for
11 20-year renewal, and really the intent here is to upgrade
12 the facilities and make sure it complies with the Port Risk
13 Management Plan, eliminating hazards to vulnerable
14 resources nearby.

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

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

25 If you notice, those are right where the cuts

24

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

6 There's also a major linkage area at the
7 13th Street. That's a little bit different. There's a
8 bluff area there as many of you know. The concept here is

9 we may -- we're looking into perhaps a pedestrian bridge,
10 perhaps a structure that would terrace down that you could
11 also use to come down into the Ports O'Call area.

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

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

25 Obviously, there's going to be a terminal there.

25

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

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

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

21 One exciting thing we've been talking about in
22 terms of bringing people up and down through the San Pedro
23 waterfront is the Red Car. Obviously, there's going to be
24 a need to maintain those -- the Red Cars, and we're
25 proposing a Red Car maintenance facility -- not just a

26

1 maintenance facility but also have a dual use of a museum
2 so people can come and take a look at that as well.

3 What we have is a 30,000 square foot site, and

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

12 Next to that maintenance facility would be a
13 20,000 square foot exterior service yard. The idea would
14 be that we would have this structure over two existing
15 tracks, and the storage tracks that are currently there
16 that would not be part of this Project would be relocated
17 to the new Pier A yard.

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

23 Now, we have some transportation improvements as
24 well that I want to touch upon. The major transportation
25 improvement would be along Sampson Way. Harbor Boulevard

27

1 would not be expanded as part of this Project. What
2 we're -- what we're hoping to do is to expand Sampson Way
3 and really bring the traffic through internally through the
4 port, so Jan can highlight the way Sampson Way goes down
5 all the way through 22nd Street all the way, wraps around,
6 goes to 22nd Street there. The way this is configured
7 would not interrupt the construction of the previous
8 project that we're talking about, which would be the park
9 on the 22nd Street site.

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

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

16 I'm going to go to the next slide here and touch
17 upon the alternative elements, which are a few. First of
18 all, if you'll notice, there's only one cruise berth on the
19 Outer Harbor. That would be strictly the replacement
20 berth, and there would be no new berth. This would kind of
21 change the mix of how much parking we're going to need. We
22 are investigating the same sites through that. There may
23 not be a need for structures -- as much two-story
24 structures. We could probably emphasize the surface
25 parking on that.

28

1 Another difference in the alternative, we are
2 looking at different sites for the Red Line maintenance and
3 museum. One would be there in Warehouse 1. The second
4 would be by the S.P. slip, right there.

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

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

19 DR. APPY: Thanks, Michael.

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

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

29

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

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

15 Finally we also -- you can submit comments by
16 e-mail. So you have the e-mail address up there as well.
17 When you send those e-mails, make sure you do it in a
18 letter format. One of the problems we have with e-mails is
19 people will send them, and we won't have a residence
20 address or anything like that. So sometimes it's difficult
21 to get back to you -- or a phone number in case we need to
22 reach you. When you send the e-mail comments, do it in a
23 letter format, either as part of the e-mail itself or as an
24 attachment. Put your name, address, and phone number in
25 there. That would be very helpful to us.

1 Having said that, we're now going to open up for
2 public comment. And we have -- in some cases we have sent
3 out -- when we sent out the notice, we said, for the people
4 wanted to speak for organizations, they could come and
5 speak for a little bit longer time. The idea behind that
6 is we have one person coming and speaking for ten or
7 fifteen people or more.

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

15 Is James here?

16 Yes.

17 MR. WHITT: I'm not sure which way I should be facing,
18 but I guess I'll -- okay.

19 DR. APPY: That's it?

20 MR. WHITT: Thank you.

21 I want to express my appreciation for being able
22 to come forth this evening and present a few comments from
23 our organization. We represent the U.S.S. Los Angeles
24 CA-135 Association, and most of our interests revolve
25 around those monuments and artifacts that we have located

1 in Gibson Park and Los Angeles Maritime Museum. That's
2 kind of our focus.

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

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

14 However, after reviewing the information that was
15 given to us -- it was excellent, but somewhat really hard
16 to decipher. I have to admit I learned coming here
17 tonight; and just looking at the maps that you had, it's a
18 little bit more obvious to me what I wish I could have seen
19 after reviewing the CD. But the -- I'll try to stay with
20 the important things.

21 What strikes me is that there is a proposed --
22 the proposals of having two very significant cuts made on
23 both sides of the Maritime Museum. That -- I'm not an
24 engineer, and I don't present myself as such. However,
25 what I do know about that building is that it's -- it's

32

1 very old. It's a very historical building and much loved
2 by the community. It was built during the 1940s. I
3 believe it was on fill land. I'm not too sure on the
4 history of that, but I have to assume that, you know, a lot
5 of things have changed since then.

6 It's an older structure, and the cuts come so
7 close to the museum on both sides that I think that one has
8 to take a real close look at that. I'm sure there will be
9 a lot of other speakers that follow me that may repeat what
10 I'm saying, but those are big cuts and especially the one
11 on the north side. It's pretty wide, and I think that you
12 really have to address that to see -- to make sure that the
13 integrity of that building is not somehow jeopardized.

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

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

33

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

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

10 I noticed that, probably on the positive side,
11 that parking structure, as its proposed, really supports
12 very well the Catalina Express and Lane Victory, but I
13 don't know -- everybody else has to ride the trolley.

14 I really think that has to be reviewed. I just
15 can't see that being a positive way for a lot of people to

16 get around, and perhaps there's something I don't
17 understand. Maybe there's some surface parking provisions
18 there that I'm not aware of. If that is the case, I would
19 retract what I'm saying. As I review that map, I don't see
20 that.

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

34

1 concerned about where those would go.

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

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

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

21 DR. APPY: Next speaker, John Papadakis.

22 One other thing I would like to also ask. If
23 there's anybody here who has -- sometimes we'll have
24 speakers that have children that come with them. If any of
25 you are in that situation, we'd like to have the children

35

1 be able to get out of here at a reasonable hour tonight.
2 If you come up, let me know who you are; and we'll try to
3 move those speaker cards up. Thank you.

4 MR. PAPADAKIS: Folks, I'm angry. Please forgive my
5 anger. I've never heard so much B.S. in my life.

6 Do we all look that stupid?

7 We must really look stupid to you folks in that
8 panel. This department is returning to the Dark Ages.
9 We're getting tortured again by your representations. The
10 Bridge to the Breakwater Project -- I didn't know it was

11 the intention to change the meaning and gutting the purpose
12 of the whole thing. I happen to know something about it.
13 I'm the founder of it.

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

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

25 And this plan, Bridge to the Breakwater Plan --

36

1 remember it?

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

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

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

22 Otherwise, we're just going to be a minimum wage
23 community with a longshoreman's job. And if you can get
24 that, great. If you can't, you're a minimum-wage person.
25 Now, that's the purpose of the plan.

37

1 It was to remove -- the first of this plan was to
2 remove all the heavy industry between the bridge and the
3 breakwater. It was an environmental plan, and the wonder
4 was the fact that the politicians committed to it. Now
5 they're reneging on that.

6 Ask them when they're going to remove the tank
7 farm, when the heavy trucking will stop along Harbor
8 Boulevard. Ask them. They don't have an answer for you
9 because they don't intend to move it. It's contaminated
10 and leaking and it's immoral to leave it for another
11 generation in 20 years to clean it up.

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

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

38

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

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

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

22 I've never spoken out in anger against people in
23 office, but I've had it up to here now. I've asked for
24 private meetings with the commissioners, and I've been
25 completely ignored. I have to come before the public and

39

1 ask you to stand and fight for what is right on this
2 waterfront. This is the "West Side Story," ladies and
3 gentlemen; and you must stand up for your territory right
4 now and get it into your head and your hearts that you have
5 to demand the Bridge to the Breakwater, the principles that
6 went with it.

7 By the way, the five principles are this:

8 No. 1, eradicate the heavy industry between the
9 bridge and the breakwater and the heavy trucking on Harbor
10 Boulevard;

11 No. 2, establish a grand and broad European-style
12 promenade that is next to the water from the bridge to the
13 breakwater;

14 No. 3, that it is continuous;

15 No. 4, architecturally distinctive;

16 And, No. 5, that it must be built on a statewide
17 scale.

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

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

40

1 impossible task."

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

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

10 Thank you.

11 DR. APPY: Thank you, John.

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

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

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

24 We certainly would be concerned about any water
25 cuts being made that might affect the integrity of the

1 building -- structural integrity of the building because
2 that would be very important for its continuation.

3 While we applaud the intent of the Proposed
4 Project, that is, to increase public access to the
5 waterfront, we at the museum are seeing an immediate
6 negative impact on our operation. The proposed water
7 cuts -- two in particular adjacent to the museum will
8 impact adversely our parking situation.

9 Now, this alone will have a drastic effect on
10 museum visitors. Currently about 8,000 a month visit the
11 museum, including young school children and very often
12 senior citizens, some of whom are incapacitated or with
13 disabilities. we would like to bring that to your
14 attention.

15 The alternative parking that has been suggested
16 is really not near enough to the museum to be effective. I
17 mean, for people to have to move some distance in order to
18 visit would certainly be -- would certainly be a negative
19 aspect of the situation of the parking. With increasing
20 cruise capacity projected, including the recently announced
21 return of the Disney Magic for another season in 2008,
22 another dimension is added to the particular parking
23 situation.

24 We hope that these matters can be addressed in a
25 more favorable way than is currently proposed in the

1 Waterfront Project; and I'm, as I say, pleased to have this
2 opportunity of speaking tonight.

3 I thank you very kindly.

4 DR. APPY: Thank you, Brian.

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

7 MS. BURLINGAME SMITH: Thank you.

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

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

21 During these five years the committee has held
22 numerous meetings, worked with its own master planning
23 consultant to form a framework Master Plan for the Bridge

24 to the Breakwater, and submitted nine recommendations which
25 went through a vigorous community process to the Board. As

43

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

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

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

18 These items include the following:

19 The number of cruise berths, if any, at Kaiser
20 Point;

21 Building a cruise terminal at Kaiser Point;

22 Extension of the Jankovich fuel dock tanks at
23 Ports O'Call and elimination of a full fisherman's park on
24 that point;

25 Elimination of parking at the Maritime Museum

44

1 because of the Downtown Harbor water cut;

2 Elimination of the third cruise ship berth

3 because of the North Harbor water cut;

4 Narrowing of Harbor Boulevard in the alternative
5 to one lane;

6 Elimination of a parking nexus with Downtown
7 San Pedro;

8 Basic infrastructure for a 30-year build-out in
9 the 30-year plan without designated uses so environmental
10 impacts cannot be studied;

11 Parking structure and traffic flows designed only
12 for port business uses but not local, casual, or business
13 needs;

14 Parking nexus with Downtown San Pedro Westways
15 terminal removal;

16 Warehouse 1 peninsula uses;

17 Cruise berth and terminal on Pier 1 or
18 Warehouse 1 peninsula, not Kaiser Point;

19 Relocation of the boat ramp from Cabrillo Beach;
20 Proposed Cabrillo Marina Phase 2 Project now
21 requiring a supplemental EIR and co-equal analysis of the
22 alternative.
23 These questions bring up a very serious issue.
24 That issue is is the port piecemealing the EIR/EIS approach
25 to planning and building its San Pedro Bridge to Breakwater

45

1 Plan?
2 Four years ago SMWM, the planning consultant who
3 coordinated the plan subcommittee, said that we had a
4 choice to make. Either treat the project space as open
5 space and park first and add the commercial and business
6 aspects or reverse the process and treat the area as
7 commercial first with parks and open space incidental
8 appendages to those sites.
9 Clearly, the Port is operating on the second
10 model of planning, but the Port's plan will not create a
11 great public space that draws visitors to its waterfront to
12 relax and enjoy. It runs counter to the original intent of
13 building a great promenade along the waterfront that will
14 attract visitors.
15 It does not adequately address or build a
16 synergistic relationship with Downtown San Pedro
17 businesses. To the contrary, the current plan is a
18 drive-by plan. Drive by the waterfront. Drive by Downtown
19 San Pedro. Drive by the museums, monuments, restaurants
20 and shops to get to a cruise ship where dreams of happiness
21 will be found in far away foreign playgrounds.
22 The vision here does not achieve the very purpose
23 Bridge to Breakwater was initiated. San Pedro is a
24 artistic, historic community that has enormous business and
25 family potential, but this drive-by plan leaves us high and

46

1 dry on our own shores creeping along choking arteries
2 hoping some cruise passengers will drive in, not by,
3 leaving us all trying to find a parking space so we can
4 enjoy a stroll along the waterfront and keep our businesses
5 alive.
6 It's a cookie-cutter version of other close-by
7 ports and marinas, but it does not enhance nor take
8 advantage of what San Pedro uniquely has to offer: its
9 heritage, character, and creativity. And it does not
10 provide for possible Olympics in the year 2016.
11 This is the Port's preferred plan, not the
12 community's. No mitigation measures in the EIR/EIS could
13 conceivably provide solutions for the aesthetic, business,

14 and health problems for the citizens who live and work
15 here. And no mitigation measures will provide tourist
16 incentives to come relax and enjoy all the amenities of
17 San Pedro as well as the Los Angeles waterfront.

18 Thank you.

19 DR. APPY: Thank you, June.

20 Next speaker, Kathleen Woodfield?

21 MS. WOODFIELD: I'm taller than June.

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

25 I'm extremely concerned about the fact that

47

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

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

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

14 Yes? Okay.

15 I think that this EIR should include a full study
16 of the future growth of the cruise industry because I think
17 there's an assumption that the cruise industry is going to
18 grow to such a capacity that we need to -- I don't know --
19 double, quadruple our cruise terminals -- cruise berths.
20 Excuse me. I don't know if that's really been
21 substantiated by a study, and I think that needs to be.

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

48

1 I think that this project should include the
2 cleaning of Cabrillo Beach and bringing it to an A rating.
3 I think this EIR should include a study of the
4 evacuation -- the whole evacuation plan for this area. If
5 you're going to bring in this many more cruise ships,
6 you're going to need to evacuate -- I don't know -- maybe
7 up to four cruise ships each having 5,000 passengers.
8 That's a serious issue that needs to be looked at.

9 I also find this EIR really to be a vehicle for
10 expanding the cruise industry and the Port's Master Plan
11 says this is a recreational-use area. And I would like you
12 to please justify the Port's assertion that this is
13 recreational use and not industry use, as this is a vehicle
14 for growing the cruise ship industry.

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

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

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

49

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

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

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

12 Thank you very much.

13 DR. APPY: Thank you.

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

23 So we tried to make up that difference, and
24 there's certainly no hidden agenda. Otherwise, we would
25 have made it a 30- or 45-day period. I think there's

50

1 really been a lot of time to review the notice.

2 Next commenter, Joe Marino.

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

4 do that.

5 And followed by Sean Conlon.

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

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

19 Now, historically, we had many recreational areas
20 for our young people east of Gaffey. For those of you who
21 have been in San Pedro for quite a number of years, you'll
22 probably remember these; and, for some of you that have
23 not, let me enlighten you with the names of the fields and
24 recreational facilities that we had here in San Pedro east
25 of Gaffey, just east of Gaffey: Trona Field, Navy Field,

51

1 Sports Field, Admiral A Gym, Anderson Memorial Gymnasium,
2 Dillon Field, and the YMCA located on Beacon Street.

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

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

12 What are we doing about it?

13 I've gone around as a town beggar. I'm always
14 pleading and being an advocate of youth recreation. All I
15 can say is when is it all going to happen?

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

19 Now, you can invite all these people to buy all
20 these condos, but where are they going to recreate?

21 Are you going to have a bike path?

22 22nd Street is an empty area, and I'm glad to
23 hear that we're going to have a green light and something
24 is going to happen there before the end of the year. I'd
25 like to see it happen. The San Pedro Youth Coalition would

52

1 like to see it happen before the end of the year. We'd
2 like to see it happen before summer so we can get the young
3 people down there playing on those fields.
4 So my plea is -- my plea is make it a priority
5 because we have shortchanged the youth of our community too
6 long, and we cannot continue to do that. So as the town
7 beggar, I beg you again and I beg as I've begged in the
8 past. Get it done and get it done immediately.
9 Thank you very much.
10 DR. APPY: Okay. Sean Colin -- Conlon followed by
11 John Thomas.
12 Get up here a little quicker maybe?
13 MR. CONLON: It's the life of a weekend soccer
14 warrior. Knock on wood, Ralph.
15 To paraphrase one of the first speakers, I'm
16 frustrated. As I was reading through this, I was seeing
17 things like linkages, access to water, promenades, open
18 space. Then, as you flip the page, you see "expand the
19 cruise ship facilities and related parking to respond to an
20 increasing" -- "increasing existing and forecasted
21 demands."
22 Since when is that part of the Bridge to
23 Breakwater?
24 I don't know. I feel like we've been handed -- I
25 feel like we've been handed one of those bills you hear

53

1 about in Congress where they're going to build schools but
2 somebody's tacked onto it a price support for Wisconsin
3 cheese. You can't say no to the schools. You can't say no
4 to the schools, but you end up voting for cheese
5 subsidies.
6 Well, to me, this whole port -- this whole cruise
7 berth at Kaiser Point is something that shouldn't even be
8 part of the discussion right now. It's going to bog
9 everything down. It's the cheese subsidies. We don't need
10 cheese subsidies in what we're talking about today.
11 I think we need to separate the Kaiser Point
12 cruise ship berths to the discussion of the real Bridge to
13 Breakwater. It will be a lively discussion, I can tell you
14 that, the cruise ships at Kaiser Point, but right now it's
15 going to bog down everything that we're trying to do with
16 Bridge to Breakwater.
17 So my request here is real simple. Let's divide
18 the project into the real Bridge to Breakwater. Then, if
19 we want to talk about cruise ships at Kaiser Point, let's
20 do that at a separate venue. That will be a lively
21 discussion, but that's not what we're hear to talk about.
22 We're here to talk about the Bridge to Breakwater.
23 Thanks.
24 DR. APPY: Thank you. John Thomas followed by Dennis
25 Piotrowski.

1 MR. THOMAS: I appreciate the opportunity to have a
2 chance to speak tonight, but I'd like to start out with a
3 question.

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

8 DR. APPY: I don't know your question.

9 Which plan?

10 This one or the Bridge to Breakwater or what?

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

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

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

19 MR. THOMAS: Okay. Well, if you've got that much
20 money, I think I'd like to see the Harbor Commission and
21 the Harbor Department work on something that we need to
22 start out as far as the promenade is concerned. That would
23 be simply extending the San Pedro Red Car line, which is on
24 the tracks -- the existing tracks that the Red Car line is
25 on just happen to go straight up to the Green Car line at

1 the 105 and the 110 Freeways. That way, the people of
2 San Pedro can have mass public transit from Downtown
3 San Pedro to the Metrorail line.

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

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

17 The second other -- the second suggestion I'd
18 like to make is that -- well, I can see right here where
19 you want to cut into the land here -- you're going to be
20 removing a lot of land that could be used for recreational

21 purposes, public events, music shows, concerts, plays.
22 Also you're opening up areas in the middle of a
23 crowded location, if a lot of people show up, where
24 somebody could just show up with a speedboat loaded with
25 explosives and machine guns and ammo and, you know, use it

56

1 to stage a terrorist attack unimpeded and then just turn
2 around and head on out and head to another location and do
3 the same thing.
4 To me, it's ridiculous -- that whole idea and the
5 environmental problems involved, the costs. I would
6 suggest that it would be -- a much better plan would be to
7 simply put a bike path and a boardwalk and the -- move the
8 slips out a little bit and put that boardwalk between the
9 Maritime Museum all the way down to the end of Ports O'Call
10 with a little bike path on it. And that would act as a
11 buffer zone along with the slips that would be out about,
12 what, 25 feet further out into the harbor to prevent people
13 from ramming into Ports O'Call with a speedboat, whether
14 it's Buford Furrow working for the KKK or Ahkmed working
15 for Al Qaeda.
16 What's the difference?
17 You know, this would definitely be a very
18 important anti-terrorist application; and I believe also
19 that, if you've got enough money to do this, you can also
20 fund the biodiesel fuel depot that is being proposed right
21 now.
22 You can log on, if anybody in the audience is
23 interested, to the primafuel.com. That's the company in
24 charge of the project to distribute 60 million gallons of
25 biodiesel clean-burning fuel here in the Ports of

57

1 Los Angeles and Long Beach per year. Or you can get
2 further information by logging onto the www.BioBeetle.com.
3 That's all small letters except for the two Bs. Ask for
4 Joe Blackburn to give you further information on the
5 biodiesel -- biodiesel projects and the local distribution
6 work that is being set up.
7 This can be used for school buses, city buses,
8 trash trucks, trucks, tractor trailer rigs, dock cranes,
9 shipyard equipment and container haulers, fork-lifts, small
10 water craft, large ships, trains, power generators, private
11 vehicles.
12 Collectively, this would reduce the overall
13 emissions in the harbor complex here by 5 to 98 percent
14 overnight at a cost of \$1.75 to \$2.00 a gallon depending on
15 whether you want the warm-weather formula or the

16 cold-weather formula to prevent anti -- to prevent gelling
17 in the fuel tanks.

18 Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

19 DR. APPY: Thank you.

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

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

58

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

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

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

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

59

1 share our wonderful history of this community.

2 Thank you.

3 DR. APPY: Thank you, Dennis.

4 Dr. Ayala followed by Maureen Blaney.

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

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

9 I'm not a -- familiar with anything here, but I
10 am familiar with the air quality. I've been a doctor for

11 almost 15 years. I just retired to do this full-time
12 because of children, and I commend the guy talking about
13 the youth.

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

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

25 As a world-renowned medical doctor and a chemist,

60

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

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

16 This product is well-tested. It is EPA
17 registered and approved. It works for combustion chamber
18 engines. This product can be used in gasoline, diesel,
19 biodiesel, ethanol blend. It also works for both new and
20 older vehicles and can be used in many types of off-road
21 equipment, such as cargoships, boats, trucks, 18-wheelers,
22 generators, Weedeaters, lawn mowers, construction
23 equipment, et cetera, et cetera.

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

61

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

5 If we don't resolve this in a fashionable manner,

6 over 1.5 million children around the world is getting
7 asthma because of the diesel particulates. We spent over
8 80 million dollars in fuel, and we actually saved 10
9 percent in Africa. Look that up.

10 Thank you.

11 DR. APPY: Thank you very much.

12 Maureen Blaney followed by Deborah Powers.

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

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

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

25 I received some information just basically

62

1 cutting news January 22nd that there are major
2 organizations and companies that are forming an alliance
3 called the United States Climate Action Partnership. These
4 organizations include things like Alcoa, BP America,
5 Caterpillar, Dupont, General Electric, Pacific Gas and
6 Electric. It goes on.

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

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

23 Another point that I have is that we're looking
24 at this project here, and at the same time there are
25 concurrent or simultaneous projects that are not

63

1 necessarily being mentioned. But I believe there's a
2 synergistic approach that occurs when you have multiple
3 projects being proposed at the same time, one being the
4 China shipping cranes, the six new cranes that's going to
5 be more work going on at the same time, adding to your
6 noise as well as your pollution.

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

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

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

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

64

1 MS. BLANEY: Sure.

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

10 DR. APPY: Deborah --

11 MS. BLANEY: Thank you.

12 DR. APPY: Okay. Thank you.

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

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

23 Deb?

24 MS. POWERS: My name is Deb Powers. I'd like to
25 acknowledge everyone from being here tonight. Just

1 encourage you to keep on coming out and fight the good
2 fight.

3 L.A. Harbor is already one of the busiest harbors
4 in the world, and we live with those impacts day-to-day.
5 I'm concerned about local air quality in San Pedro,
6 especially when I can smell it when I walk out my door in
7 the morning, every morning pretty much lately, or when I
8 see the yellowish-green haze over, you know, the harbor
9 when I'm driving home after work.

10 I'm concerned about the water quality of Inner
11 Cabrillo Beach, which received F scores; and I'm concerned
12 about changes to the waterfront quality on the Outer
13 Cabrillo Beach by this increased harbor use, dredging and
14 so forth.

15 I'm disturbed about the idea of an Outer Harbor
16 cruise ship terminal, the visual impacts, the traffic
17 impacts, the increased parking lots and concrete, and
18 increased noise levels.

19 I disagree with development that doesn't serve
20 the local community. We should start with the community
21 needs and innovatively create a Waterfront Plan that the
22 the residents can support and which will genuinely increase
23 our quality of life. I think the Bridge to Breakwater
24 Waterfront Plan seemed more in the aims -- or more in line
25 with such aims.

1 There are a lot of other things I'm concerned
2 about, but, to me, a vibrant waterfront is where you can
3 smell the salty, coastal breezes on those still mornings.
4 It doesn't reek of pollution, and you can hear the seals
5 barking when the wind's blowing just right or sometimes you
6 can hear the buoy bells ringing.

7 I like having open spaces to ponder without
8 cruise ships cruising by. I like the uninhibited views
9 from the cliff's edge and, when I'm sitting out at the
10 Outer Cabrillo Beach surfing, watching the dolphins and the
11 seals cruise by.

12 I like going to yoga class at the Cabrillo Beach
13 Bathhouse and being able to hear the ocean crashing on the
14 shore. Those are my ideas of a vibrant waterfront.

15 Thanks for your time.

16 DR. APPY: Thank you. Thank you, Deborah.

17 The next speaker, Dr. John Miller followed by
18 Rich Pavlick.

19 DR. MILLER: Good evening. Thank you for this
20 opportunity to speak. I appreciate that you have extended
21 the comment period to 60 days.

22 One thing that -- I'll try to say something
23 positive. I do like the Sampson Way improvement on this,

24 but there are a lot of other issues. One thing that's not
25 clear to me is that it appears there's no Master Plan

67

1 here.

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

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

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

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

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

68

1 of pollution that a container ship call produces.

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

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

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

18 Secondly -- you know, bad news just really drops

19 demand on that industry, but secondly, the business model
20 of this cruise ship industry is a problem for local
21 businesses because the whole business model involves
22 getting the passenger into the entirely contained
23 environment where, if you want to buy a tube of toothpaste,
24 you buy it from Disney or whatever the cruise ship operator
25 is. It's very tough to get away from the company and get

69

1 out of their facility and actually go into a community
2 wherever their boat is docked unless you're on one of those
3 approved tours that you have to pay the cruise ship company
4 for.

5 Thank you.

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

12 Rich Pavlick followed by Amy Thornberry.

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

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

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

70

1 with this project.

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

10 In addition to that, you know, when we started
11 this whole thing, it was like we're going to -- the Port
12 said, "We're going to give the waterfront back to the
13 public."

14 God, I'm still waiting for that. It's a -- the
15 only thing they didn't mention that they were going to keep
16 the Jankovich lease renewal tank farm here. They're going
17 to keep Westways tank farm here. They're going to add some
18 cruise ship lines and so forth on this waterfront.

19 We're going to give it back to you, but we're
20 going to give it back to you with all the stuff that earns
21 us some money that we can pay our bills with. That's our
22 giving the waterfront back to the public.

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

71

1 with -- or actually, you know, Los Angeles but San Pedro
2 proper with the waterfront. I don't see that here.

3 You know, I have to agree with John Papadakis.
4 Where is the grand plan for waterfront?

5 The only limitations I would put on this grand
6 plan is, you know, we have to be considerate of air
7 pollution, water pollution, traffic congestion, parking
8 congestion, light and noise pollution. In other words,
9 take all these into account but give us a grand plan. Give
10 us something other than an expanded cruise ship terminal
11 plan.

12 You know, what's -- you know, I'm going to make
13 this real short. After looking at this grand plan, what's
14 looking good to me is Project Alternative No. 2,
15 No Project/No Action. I hate to say that, but I just -- if
16 this is the plan, let's do something else.

17 Thank you.

18 DR. APPY: Thank you.

19 Amy Thornberry followed by Tom Politeo.

20 MS. THORNBERRY: Hello. I'm totally opposed to adding
21 a new cruise ship berth. I think the reason that that has
22 become part of the plan is because nobody else comes to our
23 port to visit it, that it's physically sickening to breathe
24 our air. So the only people that you see maybe down there
25 are the few hapless tourists who are trapped here. They

72

1 have no idea what kind of noxious pit they're being dropped
2 off at and you see them wandering lost with regret like,
3 "This is California? I can't breathe."

4 They lose -- I have a daughter. She's four and a
5 half years old. She loves the Red Car trolley, but if we
6 play down there, we both lose our voice. I will have to
7 leave here. I'm 41 years old. I'm an ex-competitive
8 swimmer. I have enormous, strong lungs. This year my

9 doctor says I have asthma. I cannot stay here unless the
10 air is cleaned up.

11 DR. APPY: Tom Politeo followed by John Pitts.

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

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

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

73

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

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

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

19 What we need is a waterfront that, you know, is
20 going to give us the opportunity to access nature, to have
21 shaded walkways for pedestrians and cyclists. We need a
22 waterfront that offers something for everyone -- for
23 families, for seniors, for joggers, for art lovers, for
24 children, for music lovers, for sailboat users, for
25 mariners, kayakers, and maybe even equestrians, a place

74

1 where they can all come and enjoy San Pedro Bay in many
2 different ways.

3 We need a waterfront that attracts people to get

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

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

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

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

75

1 Thank you very much.

2 DR. APPY: Thank you.

3 If we could, we have a person here that is taking
4 down every word; and I think the hands are growing a little
5 tired. So what I'd like to do is give our court reporter a
6 little break here so what I'd like to recommend is that we
7 pause here for about ten minutes and we'll be back and
8 start again with John Pitts at five minutes after 8:00.

9 Okay?

10 Thank you very much.

11 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

12 DR. APPY: We have approximately 15 speaker cards
13 left. At three minutes each, that comes to about 45
14 minutes so just to kind of give you what's left for the
15 evening. Then we'll have some concluding comments.

16 So to start again, John, thank you very much for
17 your patience. You knew you were up next. John Pitts
18 followed by Sue Castillo.

19 MR. PITTS: Thank you, and thank you very much for the
20 opportunity to make a presentation this evening and to
21 comment on the presentation made.

22 My name is John Pitts, and I'm proud to be the
23 elected president of the American Merchant Marine Veterans
24 Memorial Committee representing the memorial at Sixth and
25 Harbor or Harbor and Ted Kezersky Way.

76

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

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

15 Is that going to affect it even further?

16 Is it going to affect other things in the area,
17 particularly the Maritime Museum?

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

25 I hear a lot of talk about trying to develop a

77

1 downtown area that's akin to a jewel. I'd like to stop for
2 a minute and say we have a jewel. There's people that
3 enjoy living here. There's people that enjoy working
4 here.

5 Could it be improved?

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

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

21 I appreciate having the option and not just
22 looking at one plan, but there's an awful lot of attention
23 given to Plan 1 or Alternative No. 1, but right behind it
24 is Alternative No. 2 and then we have the major plan. It's
25 rather confusing to me.

1 I wish that there was a little bit more attention
2 paid to the downtown area being something that's always in
3 my mind -- reminded me of San Pedro is a pair of jeans.
4 You might not want to wear it for a formal dinner, but it's
5 nice to come home and get into. San Pedro is a nice
6 community; and, yes, it could be improved. And if you
7 listen to the comments, I think there's a thread of
8 commonality to all of them.

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

12 So thank you very much.

13 DR. APPY: Thank you.

14 Sue Castillo followed by Peter Warren.

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

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

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

1 process. I don't call that piecemealing.

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

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

19 I want to see a full examination of all the
20 impacts on the Cabrillo Bay there, the pollution, you know,

21 the safety to the small boats entering and leaving the
22 marina, and also just the loss of rare, nonindustrialized
23 natural public recreation space that this is. So I look
24 forward to that being very well examined.
25 Thank you.

80

1 DR. APPY: Thank you, Sue.
2 Peter Warren.
3 MR. WARREN: I have a --
4 DR. APPY: Let me get the next one. Sorry, Peter.
5 And followed by Dick Pawlowski.
6 MR. WARREN: I Applaud the last speaker and the
7 comments by John Papadakis and June Smith and John Miller.
8 I think they're exactly right.
9 I was here the other night for the BIZMO meeting
10 in this hall. I expected self-interest and greed to be
11 portrayed by the person presenting the project there
12 because that's what you expect from someone who is
13 developing in his own interest. I expect a lot more from
14 our own Harbor Department and our own city and our own
15 bureaucracy.
16 We deserve vision and an effort by them to serve
17 the larger community and larger interests here, not to sell
18 our precious harbor and waterfront to industry. And I
19 consider the cruise ship an industrial use, not to sell
20 this out in the hope that tourists will come, not probably
21 here but to hotels in downtown and that will fill the bed
22 and help the city fill its coffers.
23 To echo what John and some other people have
24 said, this is a bad idea we've seen before; and it's made
25 worse because over the years we've criticized this and yet

81

1 it's come back. The public has been ignored despite years
2 of work and comment. Other people have discussed that.
3 This is really urban planning without
4 imagination. It is ugly. It's pedestrian. It draws on
5 none of our natural resources to share it with the public.
6 It doesn't attract people and sell the waterfront.
7 Instead, you know, to the public, it sells it to big
8 business. To paraphrase June, it's a cruise drive-by.
9 The basic idea we should have here is we should
10 be segregating along our waterfront. It's in the Harbor
11 Department's own Master Plan. Industrial, commercial, and
12 recreational environmental uses. We had that at one time
13 in some of the previous plans. Instead what we have here
14 is something that pollutes -- and I'll take your wording --
15 not the Outer Harbor, but Cabrillo Bay.

16 It both ruins the Outer Harbor and Cabrillo Bay
17 at the same time it hurts downtown. It takes away, if you
18 want to have cruise ship, business away from downtown. It
19 brings traffic, instead of off the bridge and right to the
20 cruise terminals, all through downtown with more cars and
21 more pollution and more buses.

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

82

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

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

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

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

83

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

5 DR APPY: Peter --

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

8 Instead, they have segregated things. Now the
9 terminals are over here. The cruise ships are over there.
10 And the people have the waterfront, and they can fly over

11 it in a cable car.

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

16 DR. APPY: Peter --

17 MR. WARREN: We have --

18 DR. APPY: -- can you close, please?

19 MR. WARREN: -- the Maritime Museum -- I am closing
20 now. I'm on my last --

21 DR. APPY: Thank you.

22 MR. WARREN: -- eighth of a page.

23 We have the Maritime Museum, the Cabrillo Beach,
24 the Cabrillo Museum and Pier. We have White Point Park,
25 the preserve, the park, the beach, Point Ferman Park, Point

84

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

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

12 DR. APPY: Peter --

13 MR. WARREN: -- because pollution is growing.

14 DR. APPY: I guess we'll just continue, but I really
15 appreciate you trying to keep it into the three minutes.

16 I think he made some really good comments, but
17 think about the phrase of them. Try to keep them shorter,
18 or I have to activate that trap door.

19 Dick Pawlowski is next.

20 MR. PAWLOWSKI: My name is Dick Pawlowski. I'm a
21 longtime resident.

22 This is the first time this has been proposed in
23 front of a group of people that are longtime residents.
24 This is something that will help mitigate some of the stuff
25 that's being planned since they may not do that park and

85

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

5 Everybody can scoff. It does make economic sense

6 from the point of view where we can revitalize the business
7 district. We can use this all the time regardless of what
8 the Port does. This is important. Regardless of what the
9 Port of L.A. has up their sleeve or what they do with the
10 cruise ships, this is something we need.

11 I think if the Port was wise enough to tie into
12 what we're thinking here and analyze this, you come up a
13 solution and it does make sense for them to say, you know
14 what? We might be able to mitigate and use some of this
15 stuff along with this and say we'll help do this.

16 And the street's already there. We just don't
17 need the asphalt. We just need some more proper planning
18 to get this thing done. And I'd like to have you all visit
19 NewSanPedro.com. Pretty simple -- NewSanPedro.com and
20 there's more information there about all the parking and
21 that stuff works.

22 Thank you.

23 DR. APPY: Thank you very much. Thanks, Dick.

24 Al Perisho followed by Ray Patricao, different
25 spellings.

86

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.
18 We had that trouble. That's just the way the harbor is
19 there.

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

87

1 bit or cutting back on it. That's your biggest danger for
2 safety of the residents of this community. When that goes,
3 you know, you'll know about it. Remember, the Sansinena
4 blew up all the windows facing east up there on west of
5 that area.

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

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

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

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

88

1 DR. APPY: You're doing pretty good.

2 MR. PERISHO: I talked about the unstable area there
3 where you're making those cuts.

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

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

19 DR. APPY: Thank you.

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

24 They need more activity --

25 DR. APPY: Thank you.

1 MR. PERISHO: -- not the cruise terminals.
 2 DR. APPY: Thank you.
 3 Okay. Ray followed by Daniel Nord.
 4 MR. PATRICA0: Good evening, folks. That last guy's
 5 my son.
 6 Don't he look good?
 7 DR. APPY: Yeah.
 8 MR. PATRICA0: Anyway, I don't know what the hell I'm
 9 doing here tonight really, but the -- I wrote a few notes.
 10 DR. APPY: Me too.
 11 MR. PATRICA0: I came in here baffled, and I'm more
 12 baffled. Too much paperwork, too many damn things going
 13 on, let me tell you.
 14 But I'm going to start off with Joe Marino.
 15 He made a hell of a speech. I'm for him 100 percent.
 16 If that project's got the green light, get the
 17 damn thing going. Let's not wait for anything. I've been
 18 involved in a thing at Peck Park trying to get something
 19 for the youth.
 20 What do I get from the City?
 21 Nothing, nothing. Nobody's interested because
 22 it's not political. It's not religious. There's no money
 23 to be made for somebody. It's a shame.
 24 Joe Marino, you did a hell of a speech; and I'm
 25 for you.

1 The other thing is the cut-outs. These harbors
 2 are all manmade, all filled in. They cut down hills. They
 3 shaved the hills to fill it in. Now we want to cut it
 4 out. We want to fool with the memorials.
 5 Why don't we leave some things like they are?
 6 God. So the cut-outs are -- somebody said, oh,
 7 you can hang out down there.
 8 Hell, what are 80-year-old guys going to hang out
 9 for?
 10 What is there to hang out for?
 11 You going to watch some guy in a boat?
 12 God, I can't get into a kayak now with all
 13 that -- all that B.S., you know.
 14 And the parking -- you know that's the No. 1
 15 problem in the world. We're not the only town with a
 16 parking problem. It's the only parking -- and it's easy to
 17 put another parking lot over in Timbuktu and tell some
 18 people to walk from over there.
 19 Now what do you do -- what about the recreation?
 20 What do you do in that town?
 21 You walk and eat, walk and eat.
 22 What else is there to do down there?
 23 We need the thing -- another thing -- this -- the

24 names you people come up with. Kaiser Point -- that's a
25 nasty name on the waterfront. They were the biggest

91

1 polluters in the history of San Pedro, that Kaiser bulk
2 outfit.

3 That's Outer Harbor. The water is Hurricane
4 Gulch and Cabrillo Beach. All these other names -- old
5 time Pedro -- they know Hurricane Gulch and Outer Harbor.

6 Bottom line, some people have dreams, but it
7 looks to me like somebody had a God damned nightmare here.

8 DR. APPY: Thanks, Ray.

9 Daniel Nord followed by John Mattson.

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

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

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

21 You've already received hundreds of letters and
22 heard countless hours of testimony from community members
23 who object to this kind of development in the Outer Harbor,
24 but Port staff continues relentlessly pursuing this
25 polluting, degrading, industrially expanding agenda

92

1 serving, quote, projected growth in the cruise ship
2 industry, unquote, which will benefit a few and leave the
3 majority of our population with a decimated Outer Harbor
4 and dash hopes for healthy economic revival in the
5 surrounding communities.

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

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

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

18 Where is the model of the terminal?

19 Where are the plans?
20 Why are you withholding these from the public?
21 Who is behind it?
22 I don't think anybody is supposed to be making
23 these plans and these deals before the public and
24 environmental review process takes place.
25 The NOP document for this proposed project lists

93

1 significant negative impacts in aesthetic, air quality,
2 biological, noise, light, security, traffic, economic, and
3 almost every other area, but many negative impacts are
4 poorly delineated or not mentioned at all.
5 For example, it appears that the Outer Harbor is
6 being proposed as the berth site because of new super-sized
7 ships that are bigger than the biggest that we've seen.
8 They can't possibly maneuver in the existing situation near
9 the bridge. These ships will dwarf the entire landscape of
10 the outer harbor and nearby residences. I don't remember
11 any mention of massive ships in the NOP document, which
12 sites only two- to three-story buildings and minimal
13 obstructions to views.
14 In fact, your document states that, quote, "The
15 proposed project is not visible because buildings and
16 parking structures could potentially obstruct views from
17 surrounding areas."
18 "The proposed project is not visible because of
19 intervening topography and/or development and that," quote,
20 "proposed project features including multi-story buildings
21 and parking structures could potentially obstruct views
22 from surrounding areas."
23 But where are the super-sized cruise ships as
24 tall as a skyscraper and as long as a city block?
25 They're flat little outlines on a piece of

94

1 paper. You're responsible to put this very real image in
2 front of the eyes of the public. Arial drawings without
3 lines of cruise ships are deceptive. You have a long way
4 to go with this document and with your community relations
5 process.
6 I'll provide you with extensive written comments
7 and I'm sure you will get plenty of others at this meeting.
8 I want to ask Port staff to create an option that includes
9 other positive aspects of the plan or the original
10 lower-density plan, but leaves out destruction of our Outer
11 Harbor. Right now the alternatives set forth are either
12 one berth or two berths in the Outer Harbor.
13 Let's not be fooled. The current scenario

14 implies that, if we don't add those cruise terminals,
15 ships, and parking lots, we can't have the other stuff.
16 The community can demand development and improvements
17 without destroying the Outer Harbor or Cabrillo Bay, as Sue
18 Castillo put it, and our hope for a healthy and profitable
19 future.

20 Thank you.

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

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

95

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

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

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

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

20 Now, I look at you folks -- have you gone out to
21 Long Beach onto their terminal?

22 You get out there where there's the Queen Mary,
23 and they have their cruise ship terminal, lots and lots of
24 parking lots. Everywhere you look is parking lots, a huge
25 parking structure, a collection of dingy little shops

96

1 selling trinkets and that's it.

2 Have you guys gone and looked?

3 Is that what you want here?

4 I'd say no thank you. The only way they could
5 possibly make that work would be to put some sort of mass
6 transit, park people other places, and have a tram system.
7 That would work to bring people in. It works at
8 Disneyland. It works at the Getty Museum, speaking of

9 museums, but this idea of turning this whole area into big
10 parking structures and parking lots, I'm sorry. I think
11 this is just absurd.

12 DR. APPY: Kara McLeod followed by Janet Gunter.

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

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

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

97

1 Wasn't that a swell idea?

2 Where did that go?

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

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

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

98

1 made it worse.

2 I would really like to know what happened to the
3 22nd Street Park, that big, beautiful park that we were all

4 promised as part of the Bridge to Breakwater original plan.
5 That's come up again and again, the 22nd Street Park that
6 people have said over and over again that we'd really like
7 this park.

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

16 Now, the last thing I want to tell you is I grew
17 up in South Orange County as a matter of fact. I lived in
18 a lot of waterfront cities across Southern California. I
19 would dearly love you to go to Dana Point or Newport Beach
20 or Venice and tell them that you think that the best use of
21 area that's immediately adjacent to a waterfront is to put
22 2,600 parking spaces in flat open parking. The least you
23 could do is underground it so that that space is usable to,
24 I don't know. What's the word I'm looking for? People.

25 I don't need more storage space for cars next to

99

1 the water. Oh, see, I was trying to be good and watch the
2 little blinky thing.

3 Thanks very much.

4 DR. APPY: Thank you, Carol.

5 Janet Gunter followed by Debbie Fox.

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

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

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

24 This is interesting because I did a whole 180.

25 In 1997 I was with San Pedro Revitalization Corporation as

100

1 vice-president with a shop downtown and really was in the
2 arena of promoting cruise line business because I saw that
3 as a venue for, you know, rehabilitating and revitalizing
4 the downtown area. I spent a lot of hours. I surveyed the
5 cruise terminal operators and found out they graded L.A. as
6 the worst port in the nation for port of embarkation
7 disembarkation for their customers.

8 So I went on a little bit of a tirade. I think
9 Ralph probably remembers, and it made front-page news and
10 it was -- they were on the hot seat. Princess Cruises, all
11 these people said they would move elsewhere; and the Port
12 and Chamber and everybody else said I was a damn liar. It
13 wasn't going to happen.

14 The next thing I know -- it was Carnival Cruises,
15 and they did move. And they moved to Long Beach, and they
16 paid one million dollars out of their own pocket to do so.
17 I learned about port pollution. I learned that the air
18 quality was so significant and so horrible that we're
19 living in this environment. We cannot continue to
20 pollute.

21 These ships are the single largest polluters. If
22 you plug in while you're here, that's great, but that's a
23 small percentage of the pollutants. You've got water
24 quality problems. You've got air pollution problems. You
25 can't do anything unless you get that at bay first. You've

101

1 got to take care of those problems and then think about
2 increasing all of this at a later point.

3 But -- and the other thing is unfortunately the
4 City of Los Angeles can't plan. The strategy -- the
5 planning strategy is not here. This project is not
6 disjointed if you have a grand plan, but there is no grand
7 plan that you're building toward. If you're doing it in
8 segments toward a certain goal, that's different. This is
9 segmented, disjointed.

10 You haven't moved your chemical facilities.
11 They're in the middle of this. They're nearest the point.
12 You've got one of the single largest chemicals housed
13 there, which is vinyl acetate monomer, most explosive jet
14 fuel facility. It's going to be there for 20 more years.
15 This doesn't make sense.

16 God bless you all, but we've got to do better.
17 As you've seen, this is a big issue. You've got a lot of
18 problems, and you can't do it without a conscience. And
19 you can't do it without a plan that makes sense.

20 Thank you.

21 DR. APPY: Thank you.

22 Debbie Fox followed by Chris Fox. Okay. Frank
23 Borden followed by Ruben Peneyora. Okay. And Frank
24 Borden. All right. Okay. Frank followed by John Royal.

25 MR. BORDEN: Thank you. Frank Borden, resident of

1 San Pedro and retired from L.A. City Fire Department and
2 Director of Operations of our Fire Department's Historical
3 Society. I just want to say that society and myself
4 support the placement of the Ralph J. Scott, which is a
5 National Historic Landmark vessel, one of the few in the
6 whole country -- the placement of the vessel near its last
7 assignment at Fire Station 112.

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

15 Thank you.

16 DR. APPY: Thank you.

17 John Royal.

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

23 I support what Dennis said, John Pitts, Ray
24 Patricao, Al Perisho, all you guys, Joe Marino, but the one
25 thing I want to bring out here very strongly -- I was

1 president of the Harbor Commission under Sam Muerty. The
2 night that the Sansinena blew up, I was in Slav Hall,
3 Yugoslav American Hall where 400 people were celebrating a
4 Christmas party. When the Sansinena blew up, all the
5 windows got shattered. If it wasn't for the huge drapes,
6 400 people would have been blinded there. And the
7 pandemonium really hit the fan.

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

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

20 And now talking about all this stuff is fine, but

21 it's like Jeff Sunra said, money is the mother of politics
22 and I smell a lot of politics in here.
23 Getting back to the Sansinena and what happened,
24 I think the Harbor Department promised everybody years ago
25 -- I forget how many -- that they were going to remove all

104

1 them tank farms and all that other dangerous stuff out and
2 move it over to Terminal Island and get it out of this area
3 here. That posed a great, great danger to the harbor.
4 Now you're worried about terrorists and
5 terrorism, and we've been living with terrorism since
6 then. I think, if we don't do something about that, all
7 this other stuff is superfluous because, if you have
8 another Sansinena thing and the tank farms go up out there,
9 you're going to lose the whole God damned harbor because I
10 was there when the Macky went up and when the Sansinena --
11 and I tell you, you want to talk about a scared rabbit.
12 You should have been down there. It was no fun
13 watching a fire under the docks, and I can't praise the
14 firemen enough for the work they did that night until
15 daylight the next day. And now I hear here in this chicken
16 S proposal that they want to give Jankovich another 20 God
17 damned years on there.
18 Who the hell smoked the marijuana down here? Not
19 me. Anyhow, I got a lot more to say, but I'm going to put
20 a lot of this stuff in writing. I can B.S. with the rest
21 of them. Right now I'm a little bit hot. I'll get off the
22 mike right now. I support what Dennis said, the volunteer
23 from the Marine Museum, John Pitts, Ray Patricao. I
24 support all these guys. I support all you people who have
25 your concerns.

105

1 No. 1 is getting rid of the fuel depots and tank
2 farms. They want to make cuts down there from Kennedy's
3 Russian out to the pilot station. Get rid of all them God
4 damned tank farms, and they can cut ten God damned slips
5 down in there.
6 DR. APPY: Thank you, John.
7 That concludes our speakers. Before you go, I'd
8 like to also draw your attention again -- can you put up
9 the locations and places that you can comment on this in
10 addition to your verbal comments tonight. Please feel free
11 to submit written comments to us and thank you very much
12 for coming.
13
14 (Whereupon, this proceeding was
15 concluded at 8:59 p.m.)

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

* * *

