

High-Level Meeting Summary
Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan (MAQIP)
Reconvened MAQIP Task Force - Meeting #1
Focus: “2018 Update to the 2009 MAQIP”
February 23, 2018
Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland – Exhibit Room

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Scott McCreary welcomed Task Force members to Meeting #1 of the reconvened MAQIP Task Force to discuss the 2018 update to the 2009 MAQIP. He explained the goals of the meeting: to present informational briefings, present the Port’s proposed menu of emissions control options, and discuss the findings and options. He noted one agenda change – the addition of a presentation by Chelsea Preble, Post-Doctoral Researcher at UC Berkeley, on a study on the effects of California’s drayage truck regulations on truck emissions at the Port of Oakland. A meeting agenda is provided in Appendix A of this document.

The MAQIP Task Force Co-Chairs and Alternates present then introduced themselves:

Chris Lytle, Executive Director of the Port of Oakland (Port)
Andy Garcia, Chairman of the Board of GSC Logistics
Greg Nudd, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer for Policy of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (Alternate for Jack Broadbent, who was not present)
Ms. Margaret Gordon and Brian Beveridge, Co-Chairs of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP)

Task Force Members and Alternates in attendance introduced themselves. Members of the public in attendance then introduced themselves. A list of Task Force Members/Alternates and members of the public present is provided in Appendix B.

Richard Sinkoff, Director of Environmental Programs and Planning at the Port, welcomed attendees and introduced the Port of Oakland Air Quality Team present at the meeting. A list of Port staff present at the meeting is provided in Appendix B.

II. MEETING OBJECTIVES

S. McCreary noted that today’s meeting is the first of two meetings that the Port is convening to fulfill the 2018 MAQIP Update, and reviewed the meeting objectives:

1. Review progress thus far towards the Port’s MAQIP goal of 85% DPM reductions over a 2005 baseline by 2020,
2. Receive an overview of Port business/operations,
3. Receive presentations on emissions reductions modeling and monitoring,
4. Receive a case study on the shore power program,
5. Receive a briefing on potential measures to meet and exceed the 85% target,

6. Receive a presentation on measures to achieve longer-term GHG reductions,
7. Receive feedback from stakeholders and respond to clarifying questions throughout, and
8. Hear from stakeholders on topics that need to be addressed in Meeting #2 on March 29th.

III. INFORMATIONAL BRIEFINGS

Several informational briefings set the context for the MAQIP process, reviewed progress towards emissions reductions and public health goals, and presented options for meeting and exceeding DMP and GHG reduction targets. Presentations are available at:

<http://www.portofoakland.com/community/environmental-stewardship/maritime-air-quality-improvement-plan/>. Brief comments and clarifying questions are noted below each presentation and responses follow the related question in *italics*. Next Steps stemming from discussion are noted in ***bold and italics***. All key discussion points are summarized in Section IV, Key Discussion Themes.

Briefing #1: Summary of Key Findings: Stakeholder Assessment

S. McCreary and M. Cowart presented key findings from CONCUR’s Stakeholder Assessment, conducted December 2017 through January 2018. They explained that in convening collaborative dialogues of this nature, it is considered best practices to conduct a series of confidential interviews with the full range of stakeholders (in this case, these stakeholders are potential Task Force Members and Alternates) to ascertain their knowledge and interest in the planning process (in this case the MAQIP update), and invite concrete suggestions on the content and structure of the upcoming dialogue. They noted that virtually all of today’s agenda topics were driven by the suggestions received in the interviews, as was the two-meeting structure for the 2018 MAQIP Update followed by a longer-term “2020 and Beyond” planning process. See Section IV. Key Discussion Themes, 1 and 2 related to this briefing. The presentation is available on the Port’s website (see link above).

Briefing #2: Development and Operations

C. Lytle provided a briefing on Port development and operations. He explained that the Port includes three lines of business: the seaport, commercial real estate, and the Oakland airport. The largest Port terminal is SSA, accounting for about 60% of Port business. The other marine terminals include TraPac, Everport and Matson. Since 2009-2010 when the Port experienced a decline in volume and revenues, it has seen positive but episodic growth. Growth projections for the next 5 years are at 2.8 – 3.5%. Future growth is due in part to the redevelopment of the former Oakland Army Base (OAB) and the opening of the CenterPoint project.

C. Lytle highlighted several potential initiatives the Port intends to study to further reduce Port-related DPM emissions including, for example: (1) Continuing to build the Port’s intermodal traffic (i.e., movement of cargo by rail), which would shift the burden from trucking and regional freeways; (2) Engaging with shipping lines to encourage them to explore options to equip the remaining Ocean Going Vessels (OGV) that are not

currently capable of plugging in at berth with the capacity to do so (estimates of per/ship cost of ~\$1M per vessel; and (3) Transitioning drayage truck fleets to all-electric tractors, leveraging grant monies through regulatory agencies, where feasible. C. Lytle emphasized that that Port’s projected growth offers the opportunity to explore the feasibility of investing in changes that support both Port businesses and local air quality and health improvements.

Comments and Clarifying Questions:

A. Garcia noted that, with respect to developing clean trucking/clean vessel programs, the Port of Oakland and the Port of Long Beach/LA are far ahead of all other major Pacific gateways in the United States

In response to a question from B. Aboudi on the meaning of the terms “customers”, “stakeholders”, and “partners”. C. Lytle note that while the terms are not mutually exclusive, broadly speaking: customers include Port tenants (including terminal operators); partners include regulators, unions, and the many businesses that use the Port; stakeholders include community members affected by the Port’s activities. [Note: CONCUR and the Port also use the term “stakeholder” to include any organization or individual with an interest in or affected by the Port’s activities].

Briefing #3 Asthma and Cumulative Health Risks in West Oakland

Dr. Muntu Davis, Director of the Alameda County Public Health Department (ACPHD), presented data on the public health impacts of DPM and what is known about changes in health outcomes over the past decade or so. The presentation is available on the Port’s website (see link above).

Comments and Clarifying Questions:

M. Gordon noted that many people have the mistaken impression that gentrification leads to healthier communities and cleaner air, but that this is not the case, in her view. M. Gordon requested that in addition to information about the impacts of DPH on asthma rates, information on other health outcomes be provided. M. Gordon also requested a presentation by West Oakland Health Council (WOHC) to discuss further findings on health outcomes.

Next Steps:

Include a presentation in Meeting #2 by ACPHD on a broader array of health outcomes, pending Co-Chair and Port confirmation.

CONCUR will clarify with WOEIP and ACPHD which health outcomes are of most interest.

Include a presentation in Meeting #2 by WOHC, pending Co-Chair and Port confirmation. CONCUR will clarify with WOEIP and WOHC which topics are of greatest interest.

Introduction to Afternoon Briefings: Closing the Gap and Beyond

R. Sinkoff introduced the next series of presentations on monitoring of current emissions levels, and forecasting to achieve the MAQIP goal of an 85% reduction in DPM by 2020. He emphasized that the emissions reduction measures are potential and not finalized, and are meant to illustrate possible measures to continue to reduce DPM.

Briefing #4: Calculated Emissions Inventory (Ramboll)

Till Stoeckenius, Ramboll, presented the results of Ramboll/Environ’s seaport emissions inventories between 2005 and 2015. The presentation is available on the Port’s website (see link above).

Comments and Clarifying Questions:

G. Nudd: What is the breakdown between the DPM reduction caused by fuel-switches by Ocean Going Vessels (OGVs) and the reductions caused when OGVs plug-in at berth?

Next Step: Port to ask Ramboll to respond to the request for disaggregated data on DPM reductions due to fuel switching v. shore power

In response to a question from M. Davis, T. Stoeckenius explained that TEU stands for twenty-foot equivalent unit, and is a measurement of the amount of cargo transiting through the Port.

B. Beveridge: Please clarify how an expected 85% DPM reduction in truck emissions through technology fixes led to a 98% DPM reduction? T.

Stoeckenius: The 85% number represents an overall goal. Trucks saw a deeper reduction than other source categories due to going into effect of regulations and deployment of new technologies.

B. Aboudi: When measuring ship emissions outside the harbor, do you include only those that call on the Port? T. *Stoeckenius: Yes.*

B. Aboudi: What rail activity is included in the inventory? T. *Stoeckenius: Activity in the BNSF yard is included. The main BNSF line and the activity in the UP Yard (which is not leased from the Port) are not included.*

J. Fine: How are emissions associated with electricity use treated? T. *Stoeckenius: Emissions associated with electricity use are not included in this inventory.*

J. Fine: The uncertainty associated with emissions reductions and resulting health risk reductions should be quantified and presented to this Task Force.

Next Step: CONCUR to follow up with J. Fine to better understand the modeling implications of his request and convey that request to Port staff.

Briefing: Effects of Exhaust After Treatment and Fleet Modernization on Port of Oakland Drayage Truck Emissions.

Chelsea Preble, Post-Doctoral Researcher at UC Berkeley, provided the results of a study she led, *Effects of Particle Filters and Selective Catalytic Reduction on Heavy-Duty*

Diesel Drayage Truck Emissions at the Port of Oakland¹, to monitor emissions from drayage trucks en route to the Port from 2009 – 2015. The presentation is available on the Port's website (see link above).

Comments and Clarifying Questions:

- J. Fine: Do N₂O and NO₂ both contribute to local health risk? *C. Preble: N₂O is a potent GHG but it has no health risk. NO₂ poses potent health implications.*
- G. Nudd: Could opacity tests be used to identify high emitters? *C. Preble: Yes - we were able to identify high emitters by sight because the trucks were emitting a blacker smoke.*
- S. McCreary: What is the timeline for the proposed successor study between UC Berkeley, BAAQMD and CARB to develop an automated platform to identify high emitters? *C. Preble: This would be carried out over the next 18 months to two years.*

Tour Offered of GSC Logistics' Electric Tractor

During the lunch break, A. Garcia invited meeting participants to view GSC Logistics' new Build Your Dream (BYD) fully electric tractor, which was parked outside the meeting room. He explained that the up-front cost of a new fully electric truck is between \$300,000 – 400,000 as compared with the cost of a new diesel tractor at \$125,000 – 140,000 and that this tractor is a demonstration funded by CARB/BAAQMD. The truck will be used for intra-Port activity and GSC logistics hopes to transition their full fleet to electric.

Briefing #5: Compliance Case Study: Shore Power Program

C. Mukai and K. Larson (SSA Terminals) presented a compliance case study on the challenges and successes of the Port's shore power program. The presentation is available on the Port's website (see link above).

Questions and Comments:

- B. Aboudi: Does the ship or terminal pay for electricity when the ship plugs in? *K. Larson: Ships pay SSA Terminals a straight rate for the power, which SSA purchases from the Port. This doesn't cover all of SSA's expenses for providing the power, but it covers the cost of the electricity.*
- B. Aboudi: How is fuel consumption metered? *K. Larson: There is a meter at each substation. The Port provides reports that break down fuel consumption by vessel.*
- B. Beveridge: Have any ships been driven away because of the usage and compliance rules? *C. Lytle: Not yet. We anticipate that more stringent Shore*

¹ Preble, Chelsea V, Timothy R Dallmann, Nathan M Kreisberg, Susanne V Hering, Robert A Harley, and Thomas W Kirchstetter. "Effects of Particle Filters and Selective Catalytic Reduction on Heavy-Duty Diesel Drayage Truck Emissions at the Port of Oakland." *Environmental Science & Technology* 49.14 (2015) 8864 - 8871. LBNL-1003897.

Power regulations will lead vessel owners to use either barges and/or equip their vessels for Shore Power.

- A. Jukes: What has motivated the shift toward larger and higher capacity OGVs?
Answer: Economy of scale motivated that shift – the larger the vessel, the lower the cost per TEU. This means fewer emissions per TEU, as well.
- J. Fine: We need to ensure that shore power is not being provided by the West Oakland jet fuel-powered generating facility, and PG&E should be part of this conversation.²

Briefing #6: Emissions Forecasts and Proposed Control Measures (Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC)

R. Pasek, Starcrest, presented the suite of potential emissions reduction measures that the Port has proposed to meet the MAQIP goal of 85% DPM reductions over a 2005 baseline by 2020.

Questions and Comments:

- Is there any way to apportion emissions from ship fuel vs. truck fuel? C.
Mukai/Randall: This has been tried, but the fuels are very similar, so it is very difficult.
- R. Kidd: Can more be done to reduce emissions from locomotives? R. Pasek:
There are opportunities for cleaner locomotives (e.g. Tier 5), but they would not see emissions reductions in the 2020 timeframe. Locomotives have a long life and are costly, so there is not much turnover of the fleet.
- D. Wheelles added that railroads have worked with Port to bring incentive programs to reduce emissions, and that CARB submitted a petition mid-last year to EPA asking for a Tier 5 Locomotive rule making, but the EPA has yet to respond.
- A stakeholder asked why the present growth scenario has been chosen, as opposed to a growth scenario which would lead to a smaller increase (or even reduction) in GHG emissions. C. Lytle responded that the growth scenario selected is the predicted rate of growth at the Port over the next 5 years.

Presentation: Bridging to the Future: “Diesel Particulate Matter and Beyond”

D. Heinze, reviewed diesel engine NOx and DPM standards required by existing drayage truck and Cargo Handling Equipment (CHE) regulations showing essentially an order of magnitude reduction in allowable emissions. She also looked ahead to future potential applicable CARB regulations. She explained that, due to Senate Bill (SB) 1, drayage truck regulations are about 10 years out, and thus [near-term?] efforts to achieve Zero Emissions will be voluntary. CHE Zero Emissions (ZE) regulations appear to be ARB’s top priority, and could start as soon as 2022.

² PG&E has been invited to participate in the Task Force but has not yet responded to several phone calls and emails.

She explained that moving to ZE equipment requires a feasibility assessment of three factors: technology, operations and cost. Natural gas drayage truck technology and hydrogen technology do not appear feasible and thus ZE electric or Near Zero Emissions (NZE) hybrid technology will be the main focus.

She presented two ZE/NZE projects underway at the Port:

1. GSC Logistics brought its Build Your Dream (BYD) 8TT ZE truck to the meeting. A. Garcia stated that it took BYD five months (since October 2017) to improve the design so BYD could operate it as a drayage truck. The cost of the truck purchase to GSC Logistics was \$0, since CARB/BAAQMD are paying to demonstrate the truck. However, GSC incurred other direct costs, such as insurance, to deploy the demonstration truck.
2. With the Port's substantial assistance in preparing the analysis and the grant application, SSA Terminals submitted a \$5.2 million Carl Moyer application to the BAAQMD to repower 13 diesel powered Rubber Tired Gantry Cranes to hybrid with a 100 hp diesel engine (currently 1000 hp diesel engine). This works for SSA's operation at the Oakland International Container Terminal. However, BAAQMD expressed a desire to meet to discuss the reasons for which SSA did not propose all electric RTGs. A meeting is scheduled for March 9, 2018, at BAAQMD.

IV. KEY DISCUSSION THEMES

1. Response Desired to the Viveka Chen Associates (VCA) 2009 Study: B. Beveridge noted that WOEIP has requested a briefing on the Port's response to the findings of the Maritime Stakeholder Group Outreach Report (Viveka Chen & Associates 2009). B. Beveridge stated that WOEIP requested that the VCA briefing be on the agenda for the MAQIP Task Force meeting. He explained that, in his view, it was fundamental that the Port consider the VCA 2009 findings and brief stakeholders on how these findings had been incorporated into the process. R. Grow stated that the USEPA agreed with this point. R. Grow also noted, that CONCUR's Stakeholder Assessment was not a sufficient replacement for the VCA report. S. McCreary explained that CONCUR's Stakeholder Assessment was intended to inform the re-engagement of the MAQIP Task Force and was not intended as a replacement for the VCA 2009 report, which focused on the development of a successor Maritime Stakeholder Group and on community stakeholder engagement (CSE) at the Port. C. Lytle responded that the Port would provide a response to the VCA report if there were a strong request from stakeholders.

Next Step: Port to provide an overview of the VCA report and its 2015 Supplement at MAQIP Task Force Meeting #2

2. WOEIP and Agency Participation and Response Desired Community Participation Criteria: B. Beveridge stated he had requested a presentation of the UC Berkeley report on diesel truck emissions be added to the agenda at previous times. He noted that the presentation was a late add-on. He also noted that WOEIP provided the Port with a

document outlining Community Participation Criteria³, at the start of the re-launch of the MAQIP, and was awaiting a response. G. Nudd noted that the WOEIP's proposed Community Participation Criteria seemed reasonable, and that given the agency effort to launch AB617, BAAQMD participation in the MAQIP Update process might also be contingent upon a response from the Port to Community Participation Criteria. R. Sinkoff responded that the original 2009 MAQIP was in the "home stretch", and this brief 2018 MAQIP Update is following the same structure as the Original MAQIP process. He noted that the Port was soliciting criteria for engagement from a broad array of stakeholders and would take all stakeholder input into account.

Next Step: Port will provide a response to WOEIP on its Community Participation Criteria in advance of MAQIP Task Force Meeting #2.

3. Emissions Inventory Study Boundaries and Ongoing Discussions with Interagency

Partners: M. Gordon posed several questions regarding the study boundaries set in modeling diesel truck emissions, including (1) why the boundaries were set at the Interstate on-ramps rather than including truck travel on the Interstate (2) which specific on-ramps were included and (3) whether specific and significant truck back-up/idling events were included in the modeling efforts? T. Stoeckenius responded that (1) The decision to create this study boundary was made in 2009, at which time tracking of where trucks travel after the leaving the intersections was not included. Those data are now available, but for consistency and the ability to compare across studies, the same boundaries have been retained; (2) The study boundary includes an average distance that the truck travels from each of the terminals to all of the on-ramps; and (3) Specific events are not included; an average estimate of truck idling is included. R. Sinkoff noted that several questions regarding study boundaries have been raised by the Port's regulatory partners. The Port convened an interagency discussion (which includes the Air District) to consider and examine the emissions inventory modeling protocol. G. Nudd (BAAQMD) noted that the BAAQMD has some concerns regarding the 2017 emissions inventory. D. Wheelles reminded participants that in the original MAQIP, both the Task Force and the Interagency Group were involved in developing the modeling and inventory protocol in partnership with the Port and its consultants.

4. Need for Integration of Localized Monitoring Efforts to Ground Truth Modeling Efforts and Address Exposure and Proximity:

Several Task Force members emphasized that efforts to reduce DPM must be paired with efforts to address exposure and proximity, which are significant factors health impacts in the West Oakland community. M. Gordon emphasized that one monitoring site studied in the Preble et al. 2015 study (see above: *Briefing: Effects of Exhaust After Treatment and Fleet Modernization on Port of Oakland Drayage Truck Emissions*) is less than 1,000 feet from a community, including an affordable housing development, where she lives. She noted that "The reality is that our windowsills have turned from black to dark grey," and that she believes that more focused efforts are needed to truly address the health impacts of air quality. F.

³ "Criteria for Community Participation in the 2018 Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Plan Improvement Plan Update"; provided to the Port on January 8, 2018.

Uennatornwarangoon, EDF, noted that recent mobile monitoring efforts in West Oakland have shown more elevated black carbon levels than those levels measured by stationary monitors. She emphasized that there is a need to look beyond the modeling and stationary monitoring efforts to examine the effects of emissions on the surrounding community. S. McCreary noted that on-going discussions among Task Force Co-Chairs have highlighted the need to need to consider Ramboll’s emissions inventory, which relies on modeling, in context with monitoring, or on-the-ground data collection. He noted that this is intended to be a subject for discussion in Meeting #2 and for exploration in the “2020 and Beyond” conversation.

5. Need for Coordination of Port Efforts with Other City and State Efforts: M. Gordon noted that the efforts at the Port of Oakland to reduce DPM and GHG emissions should coordinate with the joint City-Port Truck Management Plan (TMP) and the Community Air Protection Program (CAPP) developed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) under Assembly Bill (AB) 617. B. Beveridge added that WOEIP is looking for a comprehensive package of plans beyond MAQIP that will reduce the impact of DPM emissions on residents and the region as a whole.

6. Importance of Understanding Why Some Filters Are Not Working Effectively and Taking Steps to Fix The Problem: Task Force members asked C. Preble what she saw as the likely cause of the truck filters that were installed but were not working correctly. C. Preble responded that this could be due to the deterioration of the filters, intentional damage to the filters (unlikely), or lack of proper servicing. B. Aboudi noted that the closest maintenance facility for servicing filters is in East Oakland, which is not convenient for Port drayage truckers. He added that servicing filters is expensive and time consuming (~\$1,000 every 6 months). He stated that, in addition, the appointment system run by terminal operators needed to work more effectively with trucking schedules in order to reduce idling times and improve filter efficiency. C. Lytle suggested that a system be developed to deny a truck access to the Port if the filter were not working effectively. C. Preble emphasized that these trucks were in compliance with regulations (the correct filter is installed), but that that filter was not working effectively. She added that a program to incentivize fixing or servicing filters might be effective. M. Gordon emphasized that the emissions control option must include a mechanism for cleaning filters that are not working properly, and to include a section in the new air quality plan on Operations to address this and other ongoing compliance issues.

Next Step: The Port will consider how to address the recommendation for a local truck maintenance facility in its planning.

7. Need to Carefully Consider Safety Issues and Other Drawbacks of Vessel Speed Reduction: Dave McCloy, SF Bar Pilots stated that a 10 knot (4mph equivalent) Vessel Speed Reduction needs to be carefully considered, as reducing ship speed can lead to safety concerns and could cause scheduling difficulties. He noted that he would be glad to speak offline with the Port and Ramboll to help inform development of a reasonable proposal. C. Lytle stated that safety was a big concern, and the Port would not develop any incentive programs without considering all of the concerns of the SF Bar Pilots. He

added that the idea is to reduce vessel speed beginning outside the Bay (to 20 miles) and that within the Bay, safety would take precedence. G. Nudd noted that VSR might lead to emissions reductions in the vicinity of the Port, but that ships might seek to make up for lost time on their overall voyage, and thus net emissions over the entire trip would not be reduced, which is a concern for the “2020 and Beyond” emissions reductions goals. He also noted that VSR reductions are rather diffuse, so do not address the issue of exposure. B. Brandes noted that most of CMA-CGM vessels comply with existing VSR regulations, unless they are getting out late. If the trip time was further increased by VSR at the Port, the ships would speed up somewhat to make up for lost time, but not significantly.

8. *Desire to better understand next generation shipping technologies and fuels:* Task Force members asked whether there are there any ship propulsion technologies on the horizon that might lead to emissions reductions? J. Berge responded that there are regulations stating that ships constructed in 2016 and later must have a 70+% reduction in NOx compared with those built in 2011. However the market penetration will take years. B. Brandes add that in the longer term there are likely to be advancements in LNG and solar technologies. X. Johnson noted that Federal funding might be available for next generation shipping technologies and fuels, if not with the current administration, then perhaps the next.

9. *Improved incentives for electric vehicles needed:* B. Aboudi noted that incentives for electric vehicles helped cover the cost, but that the state still charged a sales tax based on the value of the vehicle and not the amount paid for it, and that this cost had been a problem for truckers. G. Nudd noted that truckers also needed to pay an income tax on those trucks. B. Aboudi later added that Port power was more expensive than PG&E power –“ if we are going to plug in vehicles, we will need incentives to lower this cost.”

10. *Options for incentivizing full Shore Power Compliance Discussed:* A shipping line emphasized that their company attempted to comply with shore power by having ships equipped, but that it was not always possible to plug in if the shore power vaults and cables were not available or properly spaced. He noted that he hoped there is still the intention to invest in improved shore power capabilities. J. Fine noted that the cost of purchasing power was quite high, and that subsidies for shore power might be needed. X. Johnson asked whether information on which operators called at what rate and levels of compliance were publically available? J. Fine added that this compliance rates associated with shipping names should be posted to incentivize compliance.

Next Step: L. Arreola will provide X. Johnson with latest available maps of Maritime facilities that provide information on marine terminals with shore power capacity and listing of shipping lines by terminal.

V. WRAP-UP AND ADJOURNMENT

R. Sinkoff thanked attendees and noted that the next Task Force Meeting will be held on March 26, 2018 from 10-2, and that the meeting may be followed by an Open House for community members more broadly. He noted that this meeting will be an opportunity to test for support on a revised set of emissions reductions measures, and that the meeting

will also pivot from meeting/exceeding the DPM targets to discussing the “2020 and Beyond Plan” issues and ongoing process to address these issues.

Questions and Comments:

R. Kidd: Will Port Commissioners be invited to attend the next meeting?

Next Step: Port staff to invite Port Commissioners to attend next meeting

S. McCreary thanked participants and adjourned the meeting.

V. NEXT STEPS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR MEETING #2

CONCUR will develop a high level summary of Meeting #1 to be posted on the Port’s website

Port, CONCUR, and Co-Chairs will develop a Meeting #2 Agenda, to include key items raised at this meeting

Include a Port briefing on the Port’s response to the VCA 2009 Study and 2015 CSE study in Agenda for Meeting #2

Port will provide a response to WOEIP Criteria for Engagement in advance of Meeting #2.

Include a presentation in Meeting #2 by ACPHD on a broader array of health outcomes, pending Co-Chair and Port confirmation. CONCUR will clarify with WOEIP and ACPHD which health outcomes are of most interest.

Include a presentation in Meeting #2 by WOHC, pending Co-Chair and Port confirmation. CONCUR will clarify with WOEIP and WOHC which topics are of greatest interest.

Port to ask Ramboll to provide disaggregated data on DPM reductions due to fuel switching v. shore power.

CONCUR to follow up with J. Fine to better understand the modeling implications of his request and convey that request to Port staff.

L. Arreola will provide X. Johnson with latest available maps of Maritime facilities that provide information on marine terminals with shore power capacity and listing of shipping lines by terminal.

The Port will consider how to address the recommendation for a local truck maintenance facility in its planning.

Port staff to invite Port Commissioners to attend next meeting

Upcoming 2018 MAQIP Update Task Force Meetings:

The second MAQIP Task Force meeting will likely be held in the last week of April/first weeks of May 2018, from 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 pm (on a convenient date for most attendees, based upon a DoodlePoll) in the Port of Oakland Exhibit Room at 430 Water Street, Oakland. The meeting will focus on testing for support on a revised set of emissions reductions measures, and a pivot to the “2020 and Beyond Plan” issues and community participation and stakeholder engagement process.

Appendix A: Meeting Agenda

**Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan (MAQIP)
 Reconvened MAQIP Task Force - Meeting #1
 Agenda
 Focus: “2018 Update to the 2009 MAQIP”
 February 23rd, 2018
 Port of Oakland, 530 Water Street, Oakland
 Exhibit Room @ Street Level, near the Water Street entrance**

The meeting will start promptly at 10:00a. Please plan to arrive by 9:45a. We have a full agenda and want to ensure time for discussion.

Agenda Topic	Time
<i>Arrival and greetings</i>	9:45 – 10:00a
<p>I. Opening the Meeting (Scott McCreary, CONCUR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Welcome from the Co-Chairs (All Co-Chairs) b. Brief Introductions: Task Force Members and Alternates (All Task Force Members and Alternates) c. Port of Oakland Air Quality Team (Richard Sinkoff, Port) d. Meeting Objectives (Scott McCreary, CONCUR) 	10:00 – 10:20a
<p>II. Setting the Context: Informational Briefings (Scott McCreary, CONCUR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Briefing #1: <i>Findings of the Pre-Meeting Stakeholder Assessment</i> (Scott McCreary, Meredith Cowart CONCUR) (10 mins) b. Port Business Planning and Operations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Briefing #2: <i>Development and Operations</i> (Chris Lytle, Port) (10-15 mins) c. Local Public Health <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Briefing #3: <i>Health Trends and Data</i> (Dr. Davis, Alameda County Dept. of Public Health) (10-15 mins) d. Clarifying questions (5-10 mins) 	10:20 – 11:05a

<p>III. Closing the Gap and Beyond (Richard Sinkoff, Port)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Briefing #4: <i>Calculated Emissions Inventory</i> (Ramboll) (10-15 mins) b. Briefing #5: <i>Compliance Case Study: Shore Power Program</i> (Catherine Mukai, Port) (10 mins) c. Briefing #6: <i>Emissions Forecasts and Proposed Control Measures</i> (Starcrest Consulting Group, LLC) (10-15 mins) d. Clarifying questions (5-10 mins) 	<p>11:05 – 11:55a</p>
<p>IV. Bridging to the Future: “Diesel Particulate Matter and Beyond” (Diane Heinze, Port)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grants and Incentives b. Clarifying questions 	<p>11:55 – 12:15</p>
<p><i>Lunch - hosted by Port</i></p>	<p><i>12:15 – 12:45p</i></p>
<p>V. Eliciting Input (Scott McCreary, CONCUR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Task Force Members’ Feedback on Proposed Emissions Reduction Measures (30 mins) b. Comments from the Public-at-Large (30 mins) 	<p>12:45 – 1:45p</p>
<p>VI. Summing Up (Scott McCreary, CONCUR)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Highlights and Action Items (Meredith Cowart, CONCUR) b. Key Agenda Topics and Presentations for Meeting 2 c. Closing Comments (TF Members and Co-Chairs) 	<p>1:45 – 2:00p</p>
<p>VII. Adjourn (Scott McCreary, CONCUR)</p>	<p>2:00p</p>

Appendix B: Meeting Participants

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

Chris Lytle, Executive Director of the Port of Oakland
Andy Garcia, Chairman of the Board of GSC Logistics
Greg Nudd, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer for Policy of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) (alternate for Jack Broadbent, who was not present)
Margaret Gordon and Brian Beveridge, Co-Chairs of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project (WOEIP)

2018 MAQIP Update Task Force Members and Alternates in Attendance:

Mike Bandrowski (Member) and Richard Grow (Alternate), USEPA
Bill Aboudi (Member), AB Trucking
Bryan Brandes (Member), CMA-CGM
John Berge (Member), Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Mike Porte (Member), TraPac
Michael Taffet (Member), Oakland Community Neighborhood Association
Ken Larson (Member), SSA Terminals
Paul Konzen (Member) and Joey Martin (Alternate) CVAG
Amanda Marrufo (Member) BSNF, Darcy Wheelles (Alternate), Association of American Railroads and Briana Levy (Alternate), CEA Consulting
Ariana Jukes (Member), Office of Senator Nancy Skinner
Xavier Johnson (Member), Office of Congresswoman Barbara Lee
Ray Kidd (Member), Co-Chair of West Oakland Neighbors
Dr. Muntu Davis (Member) and Anna Lee (Alternate), Alameda County Public Health Department
Michael Murphy (Alternate), Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Roman Berenshteyn (Alternate), Bay Planning Coalition
Matt Nichols (Member), Office of Mayor Libby Schaaf
Kamika Dunlap (Member), Office of Supervisor Nate Miley
Captain Steve Teague and Captain Dave McCloy (Alternates), San Francisco Bar Pilots
Jamie Fine, Environmental Defense Fund

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 Division
Laura Arreola, Community and Customer Relations
John Driscoll, Director of Maritime
Chris Chan, Director/Chief Engineer
Matt Davis, Director of Governmental Affairs
Tim Leong, Environmental Planner/Scientist
Delphine Prevost, Deputy Port Attorney
Diego Gonzalez, Government Affairs Representative

Members of the Facilitation Team in Attendance:

Scott McCreary, CONCUR
Meredith Cowart, CONCUR

Presenters in Attendance:

Randall Pasek, Starcrest
Till Stoekenius, Ramboll
John Grant, Ramboll
Chelsea Preble, UC Berkeley

Members of the Public in Attendance:

Adenike Adeyeye, Earth Justice
Fern Uennatornwarangoon, Environmental Defense Fund
James Dumont, The Grant Farm
Aaron Baker, Baker & Associates
Paul Virgin, Maersk
Agustin Ramirez, ILWU