

Port of Oakland
“Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan”
Task Force Meeting

June 21, 2018
2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.
Waterfront Hotel – Spinnaker I Room
10 Washington St., Jack London Square, Oakland
Final Meeting Summary
(approved 8/22/18)

This summary is organized to initially highlight any key recommendations, agreements and action steps that may require attention, followed by a summary of meeting activities and description of the meeting process.

The agenda and list of attendees is attached to the back of these notes.

Meeting objectives:

- Receive updates on Port of Oakland’s transition from *Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan (MAQIP)* Planning to *Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan*.
- Provide input regarding the public engagement process for the 2020 and Beyond Plan.
- Hear information regarding policies behind the State of California “zero-emissions” goals.
- Share and participate in discussions regarding specific industry strategies and stakeholder interests as we all collaboratively move forward on a pathway to zero emissions.

Meeting Highlights:

- The Port acknowledged its commitment to work with all stakeholders to move towards zero emissions. The duration of time to achieve zero emissions and the current availability of technology and infrastructure versus what may be coming on-line in the near future is a paramount concern for all.
- There are concerns about whether there is sufficient infrastructure at the Port to provide power for new technology and for fully zero emissions operations. There is an expectation of a Port infrastructure study or inventory to begin within the next year.
- Industry, the Port, and other sectors, have concerns regarding the potential loss of jobs if a zero emissions Seaport creates the reliance on automation. Consequently, there are concerns regarding training for future operations and jobs at the Port.
- There are concerns regarding the cost to implement new technology and new systems, or to acquire new equipment. The cost could be detrimental to operations, or sustainability (of Port, or businesses).
- Some in attendance questioned the number of opportunities to review the plan. There was a shared expression from a few community members that three meetings including this Task Force meeting are not enough.

- There is concern about how the planning and development of *2020 and Beyond Plan* overlaps with the requirements of AB 617. A suggestion was made to look at both activities and see where there may be overlaps. AB 617 has some community-specific outcomes due in July 2018 that may impact the Port of Oakland and its work with the larger West Oakland community.
- The Draft Plan will be released on June 29, 2018 with ample time (10 weeks suggested) for public review. Copies of the document and information about the document can be found at <https://www.portofoakland.com/community/environmental-stewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>

(Update 7/24/16: Information about the document and review can be found at URL. Comments on the Draft Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan are due by 5:00 p.m. on **Friday, August 31, 2018**. The Port will present responses to comments at the Seaport Air Quality Task Force Meeting on September 26, 2018.)

- Co-Chairs serve as the steering committee to work closely with the Port to keep abreast of new developments and to provide guidance on behalf of their respective interest groups and constituencies. Task Force members serve as a de facto advisory committee to vet proposed ideas from the Port and / or Co-Chairs and to provide resources and subject specific information.

Meeting Summary:

I. Introduction and Background

Surlene Grant, facilitator, opened the meeting with an overview of the format, followed by comments by the Co-Chairs.

Introduction of the Co-Chairs and Welcome Comments:

- Andy Garcia, Chairman of the Board, GSC Logistics, represents Industry
- Ms. Margaret Gordon, Co-chairperson of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP), representing Community / Environmental Justice
- John Driscoll, Director of Maritime, Port of Oakland – alternate for Chris Lytle, represents Port of Oakland
- Greg Nudd, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer for Policy of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) – alternate for Jack Broadbent, represents BAAQMD
- *Note:* Brian Beveridge, Co-Chairperson of the WOEIP, representing Community / Environmental Justice, was excused due to travel out of the area. He arrived shortly after the welcoming and introductory comments.

Approximately 25 people attended the meeting who represented diverse interests and stakeholder groups. They were joined by several key staff from the Port of Oakland.

The Co-Chairs acknowledged that the meeting provided an opportunity to collectively look at the matter of air quality. The Port desires to remain financially sustainable and to grow. Working together, everyone can help to identify ways to do so given current business and environmental conditions. It was acknowledged that progress has been made in addressing significant concerns regarding air quality while also keeping economic vitality in mind. It is important that everyone continue to work cooperatively as there is a shared sense of urgency for the work to be done.

II. “Zero Emissions” – More than Just “Zero or Nothing”

Cynthia Marvin (CM), Division Chief of the Transportation and Toxics Division at the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

Brief presentation on the move from “near zero-emissions” to “zero emissions” (ZE). Ms. Marvin’s presentation can be found at https://www.portoakland.com/files/PDF/CARB_Marvin-Oakland%20MAQIP-6-21-18.pdf She emphasized the change in technology and regulations over the years that support this shift to ZE. She discussed the intersection of community engagement with the process, the implication of Assembly Bill 617, and incentives that would help to move everyone forward.

- Why is “ZE” important?
 - Made a lot of progress, but Port pollution still harms the community
 - Don’t want to just make the problem better, wants the pollution to go away
 - Do we – as stakeholders, regulators and agency representatives - take incremental steps or push to ZE? When it comes to the freight industry, the goal is zero – zero everywhere where feasible, and near-zero everywhere else.
 - The zero-emission technology exists today.
- There are “Carrots and Sticks” to incentivize change.
 - Carrots:*
 - Money (grants)
 - More support for proposed projects
 - Priority access (e.g., ZE truck lane)
 - Green marketing
 - Sticks:*
 - Regulations
 - Each new piece of equipment needs to be on this ZE path –includes infrastructure requirements
 - All consistent with community input
 - (showed a table of upcoming regs)
- Call to Action
 - There is a choice – whether this group heads to ZE willingly or be made eventually to do it by regulators.
 - Do you want to follow ... or lead?

III. Seaport Air Quality Co-Chairs “Zero Emissions – More than Just “Zero or Nothing”

Following the CARB presentation, each of the Co-Chairs shared remarks regarding how the move to ZE could impact their constituencies, sectors or other concerns.

John Driscoll

- All want to grow the Port, but we want to do this responsibly and sustainably
- Will be challenging, but we can get there
- Will take a lot of money, a lot of time, a lot of innovative technology
- We need to be realistic
- Need to do it in a collaborative and fair and reasonable way
- Current maritime activities – revenue and volume – have been flat

- Not a lot of money, but we are committed to do this
- Looking forward to collaboration with our community, business partners, regulators – the Port can't do it alone

Margaret Gordon

- If we don't upgrade the infrastructure, we cannot have ZE
- Need to address land use issues

Andy Garcia

- Sees his role as a messenger to maritime and transportation industry – including the Railroads, vessel lines, terminal operator, and trucking industry
- Industry is restless – concerned about feasibility, money – but also a question of attitude – attitude one of the most important elements for achieving the goal
- If my colleagues don't embrace ZE, we won't make it to the future
- Confident that great minds and cooperative attitude can accomplish the goal of ZE in time

Greg Nudd

- We now know that there is no "safe" dosage of exposure for fine particulate matter
- The cost of batteries per kilowatt hour is dropping faster than predicted – so it is becoming more feasible to move from combustion to electric power
- We're excited about this process
- Want to see the Port make the commitment to ZE
- We know it'll take time
- We think we can get there

Follow up Questions / Answers to Cynthia Marvin's presentation and the comments from the Co-Chairs.

- ✓ *Doug Bloch, Teamsters: concerned about losing jobs thru automation -- what is CARB's view?*
Cynthia Marvin responded that CARB is prohibited from spending money on automation. ZE does not necessarily mean automation. We need to make sure there are job training opportunities for new jobs
- ✓ *Bill Aboudi, AB Trucking: How does CARB make those decisions? Will there be a panel?*
C. Marvin responded that we don't know on cargo handling side; however, we have decided it's more efficient to make the goal ZE for trucks rather than an intermediate goal.

IV. Overview and Update of Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan

Richard Sinkoff (RS), Environmental Planning and Programs Director, Port of Oakland

Brief presentation to bring everyone up-to-date on the development of the *Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan* ("2020 and Beyond Plan"), the successor plan to the MAQIP. Richard Sinkoff explained that the *2020 and Beyond Plan* moves the Port forward in a direction of ZE. He reviewed the five policy issues of the plan and answered questions from those in the audience. The PowerPoint presentation is available at https://www.portofoakland.com/files/PDF/TF%20Mtg%203_Port%20Presentation.pdf

- The Port is in the planning process to change from the existing MAQIP to the Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan. The previous Task Force meeting initiated the pivot to "2020 and Beyond."
 - We have guiding principles (listed on the agenda)
 - Port Board of Commissioners requested Port staff to present a draft Plan in July.

- We will do so. Then 10 weeks to review the plan
 - Then 2 Task Force meetings in Fall 2018
- Two parts of the Plan – plan development and plan implementation
 - Don't want to wait until plan is perfected before we start on near-term programs and projects (e.g., gantry cranes project)
- Reviewed Plan Development Factors
 - Regulations and policy setting – e.g. ZE came from State Freight Action Plan
 - Need to do a lot of technical studies
 - Build in planning assumptions, e.g., technology development, growth factors, workforce
 - Also includes stakeholder participation
- Policy Issue #1: Near-Zero or Zero Emissions?
 - Plan sets ZE vision
 - But also builds in incremental change – “pathway to zero emissions” – a “glide slope”
- Policy Issue #2 – Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) and/or Greenhouse Gas (GHG) reductions?
 - Plan goals – reduction of both
- Policy Issue #3: Technology preference for electrification, what if there is something other than electrification?
 - Other options: hydrogen, natural gas, but issues with them (e.g., push the pollution problem elsewhere)
 - Electrification predominant technology at the moment
- Policy Issue #4: Are there sufficient resources for implementation and management?
 - Multiple sources of funding
 - Proposing phased implementation
- Policy Issue #5: Planning horizon 2030 and 2050 (State of California GHG targets)? Too far into future?
 - Yes, but three phases – near-term, intermediate-term, long-term
 - Includes concrete 5-year near-term action plan

Questions:

- ✓ *Xavier Johnson, Office of Congresswoman Barbara Lee: Who decided that this was the goal and policy?*
R. Sinkoff replied that no one has decided yet. The staff is working on technical document w/feedback from Co-Chairs. Then the staff will take it to the Board of Commissioners and the public.
- ✓ *Richard Grow, US EPA: So, there is a draft plan that exists right now?*
R. Sinkoff responded that at the time of the meeting there is not a complete draft plan, but there would be in less than two weeks by June 29, 2018.
- ✓ *Follow up from Richard Grow: Who came up with the excerpts in the slide show?*
R. Sinkoff responded that the slide show was created by the Port staff.

V. Public Engagement and the Role and Responsibility of Task Force in the Process

On behalf of the Co-Chairs, Andy Garcia recapped the role of the Co-Chairs and the Task Force based on the outcomes of the Co-Chairs' June 5, 2018, meeting. He also addressed the importance of public engagement. Surlene Grant provided a summary of the roles and responsibilities of each group. Amy

Tharpe, Port of Oakland Director of Social Responsibility followed with comments about the upcoming public meetings.

Andy Garcia

- Role of Co-Chairs
 - As a steering committee
 - Articulate issues to constituencies (in his case, industry)
 - Bring issues and concerns to the Port staff directly
- Role of Task Force
 - You are the community
 - You can give us ideas
 - Important that we hear from you
 - We don't have all the answers
- Shared his story of being a first-generation immigrant – and thanked the participants for their voice to change the White House policy.

Surlene Grant

- Highlighted the responsibility of Task Force members
 - TF members provide resources – knowledge, perspective
 - Will come together for TF at key milestones
 - There is no term of service. You can be involved as long as you want to be involved to represent your stakeholder interests but that we hope all will be represented throughout the course of the work.

Amy Tharpe

- Excited at number of people who attended the meeting
- Want group to identify any gaps, identify resources, help determine ZE timeline
- Two more meetings – in Sept and October/November

VI. Questions and Answers

- ✓ *Ms. Margaret Gordon: how will this planning process coordinate with AB 617 process in West Oakland?*
 - Greg Nudd: Under AB 617, community and the Air District need to develop air quality reduction program – served by a Community Steering Committee. First meeting of the Community Steering Committee will be July 2018.
 - Matt Nichols, Oakland Office of the Mayor: When we coordinate, the coordination will bring new financial resources to Port operations.
- ✓ *Andy Katz, participant with environmental / public health communities.*
 - Doesn't think 2 additional meetings will be enough. The group needed a lot of technical information in the last planning process for the MAQIP.
 - Doesn't think that we have enough information to make decisions that are needed.
- ✓ *Doug Bloch, Teamsters:*
 - Previous MAQIP process provided a lot of basic information. He thinks more information is needed.
 - Surlene Grant responded that that the MAQIP process served as the foundation for this planning process so that perhaps more information was needed initially.

- Doug Bloch: Agreed that it was foundational, but also stated in MAQIP process there was a lot of work about controlling emissions; for example, they did a lot of work regarding retrofitting trucks – diesel trucks. Now, we are talking about ZE. So now we are talking about something else.
- ✓ *M. Gordon:*
 - We don't have a cost analysis about infrastructure. We need one.
 - Does not think we can complete all that is required in 3 meetings. In 3 meetings, will we have a design, know the technology, etc., all in one package, all completed and tied?
- ✓ *Amy Tharpe: Asked if the AB 617 Steering Committee should be a part of this meeting? Should their members be in this process.?*
 - M. Gordon responded “no” on behalf of her organization which is also very key to the AB 617 process.
- ✓ *A. Tharpe:* Requested that if during the breakout in small groups for the dialogue, people could state what information they believe is needed or that they would like to see.
- ✓ *Brian Beveridge:* What are the key questions we need to address in those upcoming meetings? Wants to be able to weigh-in on feasibility – or at least wants to know who was in the room and where the decisions on feasibility came from, who studied it, whose interests were represented.
- ✓ *Bill Aboudi, AB Trucking:* Concerned about funding. In last process we lost funding, some people worked against getting funding.

VII. Port Planning and Zero Emissions and Your Interests Dialogue and Discussion

This section of the meeting segued to small group discussion and dialogue.

During the transition to the small groups there was a five-minute break for participants to review a state-of-the-art, electric “yard truck (“hostler”) used at the Port.

Upon reconvening, the attendees met in groups of 5 to 8 individuals. Each group consisted of a mix of stakeholders and interest groups so that the conversations encompassed different viewpoints. Guiding questions:

- How Zero Emissions may benefit or impact your particular industry or sector?
- What could help implement the ZE effort in regards to the Port's planning process? and
- What type of data or information are needed for the process of developing the plan, or for implementation of the plan?

Responses to the questions were recorded and collected by student interns.

Overarching Question: What type of data/information is needed to see from the new plan?

- Must ensure the plan is cost effective
- Needs to see a layout of financial plan
- Is there a real estate or infrastructure layout?
- Are there means to turn the equipment around once the switch to zero emissions is made?
- How will the equipment being replaced be properly disposed of?
- What are the tradeoffs for health and emissions?

- How will the movement of the trucks be affected?
- What would the metric to measure progress of the initiative? - (We should be using a common metric for the whole community)
- What do we want to achieve specifically? (For example: would it be equipment based or the number of electric chargers that are put in)
- What would be the ideal alignment with regulatory and community? – (There would need to be buffers between residents and logistic opportunities put in place)
- How will new regulations affect education and the change programs that are already in place, mainly for high school and community colleges.
- How soon do we need to reach zero emission?
- How different is zero emission versus Tier 4?
- Is there State buy back and will there be benefits/credit for being ahead of the curve?
- Is it possible for the road to zero emissions to be incremental? - (Map out the path: envelope sealed on zero, or language to start positive conversation?)
- What are the regulations, list of measures, existing/potential incentives to make the switch?
- What are we trying to eliminate and what is the feasibility of a zero emissions Port?
- What will happen if the deadline is not met?
- Will there be a credit for what we've done? (regarding the Tier 4 investments)
- What actions is the Port willing to take in conjunction to help their customers?
- Time frame for each section of the industry, sources of funding
- How can the business stay competitive with others who do not have to invest in making the switch to zero emissions?
- How will the Port's plan mesh with AB 617?

- What is the Port going to do to support the tenants shift?

- Will the program compliment the unions?
- Heavy haul and long distance not suited for electrification
- Diesel-hybrid technology is cost effective
- Will we allow the existing machines to finish their projected lifetime or roll out new fleet of zero emission machinery?
- Important to note that different terminals are more amenable due to the # of workers – the machines would need to be recharged at some point, wouldn't be able to do back to back shifts which would impact productivity
- Necessary to institute an operational labor agreement
- Electricity is the best option; hydrogen isn't the preferred option due to cost and environmental impacts so we need to invest our efforts in trying to figure out how to make zero emissions work
- We need to get engineers/scientists to explain in upcoming discussions the technology (pros and cons) so that we may be better informed; their expertise could provide clarity

- The Port has opportunity to generate power on site which can also be an economic opportunity in terms of electric power
- Amount of time needed to charge will impact how quickly zero emissions will be available for implementation; we need to improve chargers so that we can entice people
- Currently, manufacturers have different outlets for charging; we need to press for government intervention for regulation of a standard outlet that manufacturers are required to produce so that people will be more attracted to using
- State buy back? Credit for being ahead of the curve?
- We'd need \$ to purchase all new equipment – Will we allow the existing machines to finish their projected lifetime or roll out new fleet of zero emission machinery
- Does the Port currently have interns doing trade work type of jobs?
- On-board Diagnostic OBD-I and OBD-II: Government intervened when differences in certain car parts presented issues, occurred due to monopolization of fields and at the beginning of the technology's debut
- Charging automotive market just started, we need to be proactive in convincing fleet managers to buy more than what they normally would aka "oversizing"
- Three main factors will influence the timeline: Availability of technology, infrastructure, budget; the different factors have different timelines and we need to somehow engage the three
- Consumers want to try it and see if it works and the problem is that they don't purchase in high volumes; we need to get consumers to purchase in higher volumes b/c then it will attract more consumers and contribute to the funding necessary to improve the existing technology
- Heavy haul and long distance not suited for electrification
- Diesel-hybrid technology is cost effective
- Can do a lot more with near zero for the same amount of money as that of zero
- Electrical grid cannot support full electrification? How will the grid be assessed?
- What actions is the Port willing to take in conjunction to help their customers?
- Regulations, list of measures, existing/potential incentives to make the switch- Scale of emissions inventory
 - There would need to be buffers between residents and logistic opportunities put in place.
 - The shape of the Port prevents some progress because of the footprint constraints
 - How long will electric energy be sustainable?
 - Would there be pushback from truck drivers? Would they feel like guinea pigs having to test out the new regulated vehicles?

VIII. Report Out/Sharing of Themes and Recommendations

Brianna, Port Intern

- Making sure plan is cost-effective and having an efficient financial layout plan
- Is there a real estate layout and infrastructure to go along with the project?
- Are there means to turn equipment around once the switch is made from diesel to ZE?

Sara, Port Intern

- Talked about whether there would be pushback from truck drivers – would they feel like guinea pigs? Not really, they enjoy trying new trucks
- Need for Port interns in trade areas

Alex, Port Intern

- Concern if there would be credit for being ahead of the curve (e.g., for trucks going to renewable energy)
- Need a clear definition for feasibility and cost effectiveness

Brazile, Intern for Congresswoman Barbara Lee

- ZE goal will be challenged by engineering, technological and financing limitations
- Keep land use efficiency in mind
- How long will this all take? Impacted by all technology and financing
- Government standardization – will the port be able to come up with own standardization plan?
- Need interface between research and industry

Toni, Port Intern, added:

- Regarding the interface between research and industry – we need to incorporate more expertise into these conversations, need fill the gap

Diane, Port Intern

- What if technology isn't there?
- What if funding doesn't come through?
- Infrastructure is important
- Talked about the drawback of ZE compared to near zero emissions, which now seems more attractive

IX. Closing Remarks

In preparing to close the meeting, Surlene Grant asked for an evaluation of the meeting content and format because it was her first full meeting with the group. As PG&E, as an organization, was singled out in the final comments, the PG&E representative was provided time to respond. Followed by final remarks by the Co-Chairs.

- Positive:
 - Mixing up tables: good cross-section, good conversation,
 - Conciseness of presentations
 - Participants had a positive attitude about the goal
 - Show-and-tell
 - Port policy of ZE
- To change/think about for future meetings:
 - Need to make sure we capture the pros AND cons in the report – not all agree – e.g., sure, we agree with Teamsters, don't want to lose jobs – but we have a business to run.
 - Concerned about funding.
 - Want funding source information
 - In future, get background information ahead of time

- Expand group to include industry leader of EV and community partners in education and training (e.g., community colleges)
- Didn't have an intense enough conversation about infrastructure and getting off the grid. Didn't hear anything from PG&E.
- Need information from interagency working group about funding incentives

✓ *Will Quinn, Representative from PG&E:*

- Great to see all the passion in the room
- Just received \$220 million for state-wide fleet-ready charging program for medium and heavy-duty trucks – just starting that program now, picking target sites, happy to go into more detail later
- Still trying to understand the market demand for electric trucks and the role infrastructure plays in that

Final Remarks from Co-Chairs:

- Brian Beveridge: Will be pushing for more details in future meetings. Need to read the plan draft to see what we need to know – encouraging all Co-Chairs to read it to prepare ourselves to structure future meetings.
- Greg Nudd: Port's technical work needs to be ahead of the curve, needs to be done first in order to inform the plan – would be helpful to do limited releases of working drafts.
- Andy Garcia: Thanked everyone for their participation – lots of character, commitment dedication. We are all trying to make our community better.
- Margaret Gordon: Thanked the interns for taking her challenge to serve as table note takers – good to see fresh minds and young faces. Thanked PG&E representative for speaking up. She will continue to challenge. Appreciate the consistent participation from the representatives of Alameda County Supervisors Keith Carson and Nate Miley, and Congresswoman Barbara Lee. Nice to have elected officials connected to this process.
- John Driscoll: We need to use this data/input from community, that's our intent. Looking to next meetings to do that. Maybe that's a challenge. But we will make the commitment to use the data from the community and give it to the Board. The process will continue. Thanked everybody for their efforts.

Meeting concluded at 5 p.m.

Port of Oakland
“Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan”
June 21, 2018

2:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Waterfront Hotel – Spinnaker I Room
 10 Washington St., Jack London Square, Oakland

Agenda

The meeting will start promptly at 2 p.m. Please plan to arrive by 1:45 p.m. We have a full agenda and want to ensure that everyone is seated and prepared to begin at 2 p.m. Refreshments will be served. *Thank you for your consideration.*

Meeting Objectives:

- Receive updates on Port of Oakland’s transition from MAQIP Planning to Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan.
- Provide input regarding the public engagement process for the 2020 and Beyond Plan.
- Hear information regarding policies behind the State of California “zero-emissions” goals.
- Share and participate in discussions regarding specific industry strategies and stakeholder interests as we all collaboratively move forward on a pathway to zero emissions.

	Topic and Presenter	Time
INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND		2-2:20p.m
I.	Call to Order and Introductions Agenda Review Welcome	15 mins Surlene Grant, Facilitator Committee Co-Chairs
II.	Meeting Purpose and Framework “ <i>Changing Times and the Pathway to Zero Emissions</i> ”	5 mins John Driscoll, Maritime Director, Port of Oakland
GUIDING PRINCIPLE – LEARNING TOGETHER		2:20-3 p.m.
III.	“Zero Emissions” – More than Just “Zero or Nothing”	15 min Cynthia Marvin, Division Chief, Transportation and Toxics, California Air Resources Board
IV.	Seaport Air Quality Co-Chairs “Zero Emissions” – More Than Just “Zero or Nothing”	10 min <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Port – John Driscoll • Industry – Andy Garcia • Community Focus – Margaret Gordon • BAAQMD – Greg Nudd
V.	Question-and-Answer Period	15 mins ALL - Surlene Grant

CURRENT PLANNING – UPDATE and SOLICITING INPUT			3 – 3:30 pm
VI.	Overview and Update of Seaport Air Quality 2020 and Beyond Plan	Richard Sinkoff, Environmental Planning and Programs Director, Port of Oakland	15 min
VII.	Public Engagement and the Role and Responsibility of Task Force in the Process	Co-Chair Andy Garcia Amy Tharpe, Director of Social Responsibility, Port of Oakland	5 min
VIII.	Questions and Answers	All - Surlene Grant	10 mins
GUIDING PRINCIPLE – INFORMATION SHARING			3:30 -5 p.m.
IX.	Port Planning and Zero Emissions and Your Interests Group instructions for Dialogue segment <i>(Also short meeting break to view equipment)</i>	Surlene Grant, Facilitator	10 mins
X.	Dialogue and Discussion	Facilitators and All	1 hour
XI.	Report Out / Sharing Themes and Recommendations	Surlene Grant and All	10 mis
XII.	Closing Remarks Next steps	Surlene Grant, Co-Chairs	10 mins

Meeting Information: To minimize printing, a limited number of presentation handouts will be provided at the meeting. All presentations will be available on the Port of Oakland’s Air Quality website at: <https://www.portofoakland.com/community/environmentalstewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>

Guiding Principles: Guiding principles are the values which apply throughout the planning process, including plan development, public participation and implementation. These are proposed guiding principles:

- Planning is a joint fact-finding and co-learning process
- All stakeholders share the desire to develop knowledge and capacity to promote informed decision-making
- The pursuit of near-term “wins” adds value to long-term planning
- Pragmatic and practical solutions advance Plan progress
- Strong partnerships are a critical element of Plan implementation

Rules of Engagement:

- Use conversational courtesy.
 - “I agree to listen to you, and you in turn agree to listen to me.”
- Be respectful of differences. Disagreements are okay, personal attacks are not.
- Every conversation in the room will be to the topic at hand.
 - Cell phone conversations and visiting will be done away from meeting room

Attendees

2018 MAQIP Update Task Force Co-Chairs and Alternates in Attendance:

Margaret Gordon, Co-Chair, West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP)
Andy Garcia, Chairman of the Board, GSC Logistics
John Driscoll, Maritime Director, Port of Oakland
Greg Nudd, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer for Policy, Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)
Brian Beveridge, Co-Chair, WOEIP (last half of meeting)

2018 MAQIP Update Task Force Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Bill Aboudi, AB Trucking
Dave O'Neal, TraPac, Inc.
Roman Berenshteyn, Bay Planning Coalition
Doug Bloch, Teamsters Joint Council 7 SF Bay Area
Bryan Brandes, CMA-CGM
Tracy Cheung, Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)
Anna Lee, Alameda County Public Health Dept.
Richard Grow, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Xavier Johnson, Office of Congresswoman Barbara Lee
Matt Nichols, Office of Oakland City Mayor Libby Schaaf
Paul Konzen (Member) and Joey Martins (Alternate) CVAG
Ken Larson, SSA Terminals
John McLaurin, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (PMSA)
Amy Shrago, Office of Supervisor Keith Carson
Chris Shimoda, California Trucking Association
Peter Okurowski, CEA Consulting (representing UP & BNSF Railways)

Port of Oakland Staff in Attendance:

Richard Sinkoff, Director of Environmental Programs and Planning
Diane Heinze, Port Environmental Supervisor
Catherine Mukai, Port Associate Environmental Planner/Scientist
Amy Tharpe, Director of the Social Responsibility
Laura Arreola, Community Relations
Julina Bonilla, Workforce Development Manager
Matt Davis, Director of Governmental Affairs
Basil Wong, Manager of Utilities Administration
Tim Leong, Maritime Project Administrator
Luana Espana, Port Assistant Management Analyst
Khamly Chuop, Port Associate Environmental Planner/Scientist
Andrea Gardner, Port Associate Environmental Planner/Scientist
Diana Servin Ayala, Port Intern
Breanna Madison, Port Intern
Antoneil Carter, Port Intern
Sara Hakala, Port Intern
Alex Pineda, Port Intern

Members of the Facilitation Team in Attendance:

Surlene Grant, Principal, Envirocom Communications Services
Malka Kopell, Principal, Malka R. Kopell Consulting

Members of the Public in Attendance (including presenters and staff of Task Force member organizations):

Milt Merritt, American Maritime Navigation Services (AMNAV)

Cynthia Marvin, California Air Resources Control Board (CARB; presenter)

David Quiros, CARB

Michael Murphy, BAAQMD

Will Quinn, PG&E

Susanne von Rosenberg, GAIA Consulting, Inc. (Consultant to the Port of Oakland)

Andy Katz, Sierra Club

Elizabeth Yura, BAAQMD