

| Commenter | Letter Date | Comment(s) |
|--|------------------|--|
| <p>1) Andrea Hricko, USC & Robert Gottlieb, Occidental College</p> | <p>3/11/2005</p> | <p>Presents key recommendations from Feb 25-26 Town Hall meeting in Long Beach at which over 400 were in attendance. Recommendations included:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) make protecting public health a priority in any Goods Movement plan, 2) provide open lines of communication and maximize community input by creating a statewide communications network of stakeholders, 3) slow the development of any "Action Plan" down to allow for sufficient community input, 4) a detailed cost benefit analysis must be done that includes the costs to the local community versus the national commercial benefits, 5) the health and quality of life of Southern Californians must be protected as the ports grow, 6) the "Action Plan" should consider CEQA requirements, 7) consider the Goods Movement industry as a whole and consider local impacts versus national needs, 8) adopt an interstate approach to cleaner fuels, 9) create a risk assessment process for better understanding the potential health impacts associated with moving goods by rail, 10) create a "West Coast goods movement plan," not just a regional or statewide plan, 11) consider only the latest technologies for preventing or reducing pollution so to not commit to outdated emission reduction methods, 12) create a "model" warehouse system to consider the most efficient factors for sustainable "green" development, including stricter zoning regulations and truck routes that protect neighborhoods, 13) provide funds not only for long-term infrastructure improvements, but also for short-term programs that will utilize existing cleaner technologies, 14) charge the true price of gasoline, diesel, and imported goods to help pay for mitigation impacts, 15) invest in alternatives to oil-based fuels and reduce the use of sulfur in fuels, 16) evaluate the true impacts of truck versus rail transportation of goods, 17) create a comprehensive catalog or report of all the existing freight-moving technologies that are less polluting the diesel technologies currently in use, 18) provide incentives and training programs that enable distribution centers to utilize the newest technologies, 19) create a public trust fund that all users pay into to fund cleaner technology, 20) reconsider whether the goods movement is the best economic option for Los Angeles and California given that costs are localized while benefits are national, 21) encourage policy makers to the evidence that the current levels of pollution in Southern California are seriously impacting health, 22) support the NNI legislation, 23) allow no expansion of the ports, or infrastructure accommodating increased international trade until health is prioritized and air pollution reduced, 24) establish clear responsibilities at the ports for regulation and enforcement of policy decisions, 25) hold the ports (tenants and shippers) accountable for the impacts of their industry by having comprehensive accounting to tally the burden of health impacts associated with emissions from ports, 26) consider whether it is necessary to nationalize ports so they are taken out of the hands of local decision makers and private industry, 27) invest in regional public transportation to relieve freeway congestion, 28) the State should offer alternative sources of funding to local governments so they are less dependent on the "warehouse economy" as it currently exists, 29) create a community advisory committee for the combined ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, 30) create buffer zones between neighborhoods and freeways and rail operations, 31) develop and enforce rules prohibiting trucks from idling near sensitive receptors, 32) create a better hazardous spill public notification system, 33) invest in education to provide opportunities for tomorrow's workers be prepared for better paying jobs rather than saying that low-wage logistics jobs are valuable because the workforce is uneducated, 34) use money from the private sector for infrastructure development and mitigation of the effects of goods movement, |

| Commenter | Letter Date | Comment(s) |
|--|------------------|---|
| | | <p>35) create outlets for the community to add their input into scientific research agendas,</p> <p>36) make scientific data available to a broader range of citizens by translating science into formats that can be understood by the general public,</p> <p>37) better utilize the media to provide information about the potential health impacts of pollution and poor air quality, especially in the areas around ports and along the routes of goods movement activities, and</p> <p>38) create environmental education programs so children are better informed about the effects of their environment on their health and on society,</p> |
| <p>2) Coalition for a Safe Environment (Jesse Marquez, Director)</p> | <p>5/31/2005</p> | <p>The CFSE requested that the release of the plan be postponed until more time for public review was allocated. CFSE provided 27 recommendations for inclusion in the Goods Movement Action Plan and the Goods Movement Action Plan process. Those comments were:</p> <p>1) a 90 day public review period for the Final Draft Goods Movement Plan,</p> <p>2) an Environmental Justice Public Hearing in each California County and major city,</p> <p>3) an opportunity for the impacted cities and public to vote on the Goods Movement Plan. There is no public consensus or approval of the Goods Movement Plan since there has been no statewide public review process in each county as a minimum,</p> <p>4) The plan mandate the use of the best available environmental air, land, water, noise, and light pollution control technologies in the State of California and within our ocean borders,</p> <p>5) The plan include accurate Goods Movement growth projections based on the last 3 years data,</p> <p>6) The plan mandate the inclusion of a Feasibility and Cost Analysis and Alternatives Assessment for each project proposal,</p> <p>7) That a comprehensive Port & Goods Movement Cost-Benefit Analysis be included in the plan. The Goods movement Plan makes reference to Mexico losing a quarter of a million jobs and the closing over 500 companies, but makes no reference to an equal amount of California or US losses, The Coalition For A Safe Environment has identified 26 public subsidized cost categories and 18 Environmental Justice Community impact categories,</p> <p>8) The plan include a current baseline of every public health impact and public health care cost and professional Goods Movement growth projection public health impact studies. The Union of Concerned Scientists estimates that the cost of public health care to be a minimum of \$21.5 billion for the State of California and \$10.2 billion for the South Coast Air Quality Management District. These estimates do not include all health cost categories,</p> <p>9) The plan under-go a complete CEQA environmental review as required by law prior to approval and implementation. The current plan fails to identify and mitigate all air, land, water, noise, light pollution, traffic, economic, lost tidelands, wildlife habitats, public property, private property, designated and undesignated superfund sites and public health negative impacts,</p> <p>10) The plan include and accurate and comprehensive Cumulative Impact Analysis for each impacted Environmental Justice Community,</p> <p>11) The plan include a comprehensive Mitigation Plan to minimize or eliminate all negative environmental, public health, traffic, and economic impacts. The coalition For A Safe Environment has identified and submitted 58 mitigation recommendations in the past,</p> <p>12) The plan mandate the use of Best Available Air, Land, Water, Noise & Light Pollution Control Technologies (BACT), low sulfur diesel fuel, bio-diesel fuel, organic fuels and diesel fuel additives. Technology currently exists to eliminate over 70% of all air, land and water pollutants. Shipping companies refused to contract with the first proposed alternative fuel LNG trucking company,</p> <p>13) The plan include a public forum process to allow discussion and adoption of the Best Available Goods Movement Technologies: i.e. Under-Ground Transportation Systems, Automated & OCR Systems, Destination Pre-Sort Stacking System, Ship Drop-to-Rail Technologies, Solar, Electric & Hydrogen Fuel Technologies and other relevant Alternative Technologies,</p> <p>14) The plan include the relocation of all off-Port property and community bordering Inspection Facilities, container Storage Yards, Intermodal Facilities, Distribution Centers, Fumigation Facilities, and Oil, Gas, Fuel & Hazardous Chemical Storage Facilities away from residential communities,</p> <p>15) The plan include recommendations for California and US policy, rule, regulation, law and lease changes recommendations: i.e. Green Ports, Global Warming, Petroleum Fuel Use Reduction,</p> |

| Commenter | Letter Date | Comment(s) |
|---|-------------|--|
| | | <p>16) The plan include international policy, rule, regulation and law changes recommendations: i.e. California/US support and endorsement of MARPOL Annex VI and Kyoto Agreement,</p> <p>17) The plan includes a financing proposal that minimizes the California public subsidizing of private business operations and business growth. The California public will no longer incur billions of dollars of indebtedness annually subsidizing private enterprise traditional cost-of-doing-business,</p> <p>18) The plan includes a proposal to investigate and minimize California Ports receiving merchandize for out-of-state destination. Than California public will no longer subsidize the cost of out-of-state shipments,</p> <p>19) The plan include a proposal for the State of California to initiate a series of forums to investigate and support growth of California manufacturing industries and identify products that can be promoted domestically to reduce foreign import dependence: i.e. Made in USA,</p> <p>20) The plan include a proposal for the State of California to initiate a series of forums to investigate and support sanctions, increased fees and taxes against retailers, wholesalers, distributors, importers, etc. who jeopardize the California and US economy, US manufacturing capability and US market employment,</p> <p>21) The plan does recommend or mandate that shipping companies, importers, wholesalers, distributors, and retailers guarantee that a certain percentage of their cargo will use the Alameda Corridor or Intermodal Facilities in order to have less traffic congestion on public highways, freeways, streets, bridges and impacts on neighboring communities,</p> <p>22) The plan include the building of a new state wide Goods movement Transportation Corridor System independent of the existing public transportation system and paid by the Goods Movement Industry. The include the public recommended and preferred underground electric train, hydrogen fuel or alternative energy transportation network,</p> <p>23) The plan identify and address that the Goods Movement Industry creates and supports an illegal underground trucking support industry which pays legal and illegal drivers and mechanics unequal and marginal salaries, encourages violations of city and state laws, supports unlicensed and uninsured drivers and the use of older more polluting trucks,</p> <p>24) The plan include a long term financing and revenue generation plan. The plan also include an evaluation of profits generated by each Goods Movement Industry sector in order to assess its percentage of contribution toward transportation infrastructure system construction and maintenance costs, environmental and public health mitigation. 2004 Net Profits: Walmart \$10.3 billion, Maersk \$2.8 billion, ConocoPhillips \$8.1 billion, Union Pacific Railroad \$604 million,</p> <p>25) The plan include an alternative recommendation for a moratorium on Port growth at the Port of Los Angeles and Port of Long Beach until all air, land, water, noise, light pollution, traffic, economic, lost tidelands, lost wildlife habitats, public property, private property, designated and undesignated superfund sites and public health negative impacts are mitigated,</p> <p>26) The plan provides no policies and assurances that the goods Movement Industry will comply with anti-corruption, business conflict of interest ethics, violation of human rights laws, the Kyoto Agreement, non-involvement in foreign country politics, third world country exploitation and cultural genocide. Over 50% of California's population has family in third world countries, and</p> <p>27) The plan include provisions for the prevention of imported foreign made merchandize, equipment, vehicles, containers and food products that contain US and internationally recognized carcinogenic and toxic chemicals, compounds, substances, labeling and packaging.</p> |
| 3) Joint Letter from 18 Environmental and EJ Groups (including NRDC, American Lung Association, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Environmental Defense) | 6/25/2005 | <p>1) complete air quality and health impacts analysis including potential health costs associated with any Goods Movement Action Plan needs,</p> <p>2) recommends a CEQA review of the Plan,</p> <p>3) recommends that the public hearing process be expanded, and</p> <p>4) recommends a 90 public review period for the final Plan.</p> |

| Commenter | Letter Date | Comment(s) |
|--|-------------|---|
| 4) Long Beach Alliance for Children with Asthma (Maura Dwyer and Jean Ambruster) | 4/8/2005 | 1) Include additional discussion of the impacts of diesel PM-related asthma, and 2) provide more in depth explanations of the 2005 and 2020 emission estimates for diesel PM associated with off-road equipment, port-related equipment, on-road trucks, gasoline vehicles, and industrial sources. |
| 5) WSPA (Joe Sparano) | 4/25/2005 | 1) include a reference in the Goods Movement Action Plan that highlights the importance of petroleum products in the movement of goods, and 2) recommends a joint study (BT&H and the ARB with the CEC) that assesses the petroleum product moving infrastructure around ports and what (if anything) needs to be done to facilitate the flow of petroleum products through port areas, and 3) recommends considering the development of a Blue Ribbon Task Force that includes a representative of the petroleum industry. |
| 6) California Environmental Associates (for the Association of American Railroads) | 4/13/2005 | The AAR requests revisions at five points of the Goods Movement Action Plan to clarify report elements associated with transloading, growth of rail activity, impacts of future proposed Federal locomotive engine standards, locomotive idling, and near-dock rail. |
| 7) Gateway Cities Council of Governments (represents 27 cities) | 4/15/2005 | Provides six comments requesting that the consideration is given to adequate funding, emission reductions from ocean going vessels, rail safety, project delivery, operational improvements, and requests the inclusion of three infrastructure projects for the Los Angeles area. |
| 8) Port of Los Angeles (Mike DiBernardo) | 4/11/2005 | The Port provided a laundry list of recommended revisions to the Goods Movement Action Plan. ARB management and staff attempted to address those recommendations in subsequent revisions of the Action Plan. |
| 9) SCAQMD | 4/8/2005 | The District requested that the Port of Los Angeles' list of NNI measures be incorporated in the Goods Movement Action Plan and provided extensive discussion on additional emission control strategies for OGVs, locomotives, on-road heavy-duty diesel trucks, CHEs, and CHCs. |
| 10) Transportation Agency for Monterey County | 4/6/2005 | Requests the inclusion of a specific infrastructure improvement project in Monterey County in the Goods Movement Action Plan projects list. |
| 11) Tulare County Association of Governments | 3/29/2005 | Requests the inclusion of a specific infrastructure project in Tulare County in the Goods Movement Action Plan and would like to participate in the development of the revised comprehensive plan. |
| 12) The Port of Stockton | 4/4/2005 | Recommends consideration of studies regarding goods movement in Central Valley and the inclusion of a specific infrastructure project in San Joaquin County in the Goods Movement Action Plan and would like to see a more port-specific analysis of port-related goods movement issues |
| 13) Sheriff of San Benito County | 4/4/2005 | Recommends against the inclusion of longer combination vehicles (LCVs) as a Goods Movement Action Plan-related strategy. |

| Commenter | Letter Date | Comment(s) |
|--------------------------|-------------|---|
| 14) Charlotte Zika | 4/5/2005 | Recommends against the inclusion of LCVs as a Goods Movement Action Plan-related strategy. |
| 15) Barbara Ellul | 4/7/2005 | Recommends against the inclusion of LCVs as a Goods Movement Action Plan-related strategy. |
| 16) Port of Humboldt Bay | 4/22/2005 | Requests that the Port of Humboldt Bay be included in the overall Goods Movement Action Plan strategies and recommends that improvements to the infrastructure in northwest California would provide additional resources in the effort to meet the State's goods movement needs. |
| 17) NRDC | 4/8/2005 | 1) public health and pollution need to be central factors in determining whether the goods movement system should expand, 2) port expansion is not necessarily a good thing, 3) Cal/EPA should be aggressive and recommends that "voluntary" programs be revised such that they become "mandatory" programs, and 4) recommends that any potential increases in premature deaths be included in the Goods Movement Action Plan. |