



FIGURE 4 The Alameda Corridor project schedule.

The Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority has requested \$332 million in federal assistance for the Alameda Corridor. While the feasibility of obtaining additional federal funds is by no means certain, federal assistance is clearly justified. The Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles play a vital role in international trade, economic development, as well as national defense. Thus, there is a strong argument for specific federal attention to this project in the next highway re-authorization bill.

Conclusion

While seeking to expand their role in international trade, the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles are paying careful attention to community concerns about potentially adverse impacts of port growth, such as increased traffic congestion and air pollution. The Alameda Corridor represents a "win-win" solution for all concerned. The project will result in significant improvements to air quality and regional mobility, and assure continued economic development associated with port growth.

Southern California is not the only region in the United States attempting to meet the challenges of port growth through improvements in inland transportation facilities. Other areas could potentially benefit from similar consolidation efforts where more than one rail

carrier is involved. Other port areas could also benefit from the consensus-building process that has been used in Southern California. Developing and implementing a complex plan such as the Alameda Corridor requires an extensive communications network, and a structured approach to resolving conflicts among governmental agencies and the private sector. The Alameda Corridor Transportation Authority can perhaps be seen as a model for other port areas facing similar challenges.

Energy and Port Access

Jerry A. Aspland, President
 ARCO Marine, Inc.

Introduction

Today my comments will be about energy. And as a ship operator, I find that in many of these forums, all we talk about is containers, real estate, and money, but we very seldom talk about the ship operator and what happens when policies are made within port authorities that may affect the ship operator.

Additionally, as you may know, a couple of years ago we had a very tragic affair in the state of Alaska, and to say the least, the transportation of hazardous materials and oil has been under the microscope ever since.

Perhaps today I will irritate some people, but as long as it gets people to think, I'm very happy. And in fact to start off, as a third generation Californian, I just figured out how to solve all these problems of access and containers. All those containers that come through our golden state of California, and wish to get out of the state, should be charged a big tariff. The receipts would be placed in our state coffers, there would be less pollution and fewer automobiles and trucks on the highways. Now I'll probably hear something about that later on, but I think that's a wonderful idea, because my taxes are getting too high.

Energy and Transportation Facilities

Let's talk about energy first. Consumption of energy in the United States continues to grow. I don't think the present situation in the Middle East is going to make one iota of difference. There's plenty of oil around. But consumption continues to grow. Gasoline use on the West Coast is increasing at about three percent; across the nation, it's about 1.5 percent. And as long as that continues, it will be necessary to import energy.

In the U.S., crude is dwindling, and as a result you're going to see more crude imported. We're now back to approaching the 50 percent mark of imported crude to meet our energy needs. This means foreign-flagged vessels. This also means we're going to have to have improved port facilities.

Along with the same issue of energy, we also have the issue of hazardous substances and chemicals. They're going to increase. We just had a very interesting conversation in our port complex about "cold ironing." We're going to shut down the boilers and the engines and plug in a great big, long electric cord, and that big, long electric cord is going to cut down the amount of pollution. I think it's a novel idea, but the Coast Guard recently said that you cannot cold iron any ship that has hazardous materials or energy.

Then a very interesting fact was learned which was that eighty-five percent of all ships coming into the port complex have hazardous substances aboard. In containers, however else they're hauling them, but they're there.

So I hope today to just offer some ideas about energy, and hazardous substances and chemicals, as they affect your port complex. As you plan, you think about it.

In energy handling, of course, we need a dock or a mooring. Moorings are becoming a very easy way in fact to move very large amounts of energy.

Pipelines. The Alameda Corridor Project and many of your ports will be faced with what to do about pipelines.

Many pipelines are old and may need to be replaced, and as you develop your projects you might want to set aside land for pipeline corridors.

Storage tanks. Where are we going to have the storage tanks for the surge? Are we going to pump all the way? Or, are you going to leave space in your port complex so that we can store oil?

Last is truck transportation. In my opinion, local port authorities are not interested in energy, chemicals, hazardous waste in the aspects of safety of port operation. Quite frankly, I don't think anybody cares until we have an accident. I think it's time to think about the handling of these commodities.

At the same time, operators need to think about safe handling. We go on every day doing our job, but we have let safety kind of go by the wayside. Why do we have these attitudes?

One reason is that the facilities are in place. They've been there for a long, long time. Our particular facility, an ARCO facility within the Port of Long Beach, has been there since 1925.

Many facilities are owned by oil companies, therefore the local port authorities say well, "That's not my problem. Why should I get involved?"

Also, port authorities are not required to supply these places with service. In other words, the ship comes in, the ship leaves, maybe there is some fire protection that the city or the port authority might supply. There might be fireboats. There may be some type of health and safety plan put in for that port. But in general, I think if you look around, there is very little thought going into these issues.

Public Demand for Safety

As a result of major oil spills, major accidents at shoreside complexes -- that's petroleum, chemical, hazardous waste groups, peoples' right to know and the general public perception that marine transportation is bad -- the public now demands safe transportation and storage of energy products.

If you go out and ask people about ships, the people who handle energy products, you will find in general that they're not very well thought of.

Demands by the public are for accountability and responsibility. They want to know who's going to be accountable and who's going to be responsible. It is no longer just the accountability and the responsibility of, in fact, the ship owner. Everyone has to share.

Now I realize that some of these issues are rather basic. But in fact, we don't pay too much attention them. People don't want to get hurt. We take it for granted, but we don't pay very much attention to them.

In addition, today, with the way the environment is, people do not want pollution on the water, on the land, and in the air. These environmental concerns have to be considered in any kind of a project and the way port complexes are operated.

The areas of concern in the port complex, from my perspective, center around operational safety. They include the local pilot organization. There are very few port authorities, and also state authorities, who really give a damn about the quality of pilots, their service and who they are. And it's time that people ought to start thinking about that, because they are the key people who bring the ships into our areas.

Tugboat escort has its place, but as a safety issue, there are other places where it does not apply. Tugboat escorts in some cases are just a matter of spending a lot of money on nothing. Because if you don't have the right type of escort, you're not going to save anything.

Every port ought to have speed limits. Not only for tankers and ships carrying hazardous materials, but also for container ships. We've had some horrible examples in our port complex of ships speeding in order to get to the longshoremen first. In fact we recently had a close call where a container ship trying to hurry to get inside the port almost collided with a passenger ship. The reason is because they assign the longshore gangs as to who gets to the breakwater first. Think about it, if a ship comes in at 22 knots and tries to slow to less than seven in less than a mile.

I am of the opinion that the only way to have excellent port safety programs is through excellent vessel traffic systems. Without them, there is no control. It is necessary for each regional or state or port authority to get in and take a look at what kind of a system they need.

At one time, we in fact had a lot of operational safety inspections on vessels: not only American-flagged vessels, but foreign-flagged vessels (e.g., how do they pump and discharge their cargo). This does not take place anymore. A friend of mine who deals in some offshore areas recently said to me, "You would be surprised what comes over the horizon." He said some can't even speak English. He said in some there's so many holes in the pipelines that you can't pump the cargo. Now as we go along, we need to get back to having some kind of inspection or some kind of guidelines set for operational safety.

The Consequences of Inaction

The consequences, in my opinion, in not addressing these kinds of issues, especially as you talk about Alameda Corridor, especially as we talk about increased

land use and public policy, will be delay in projects. Because as you build more container terminals and as the oil facilities stay inside the port, you have a definite safety issue from a navigational standpoint.

I also see some ports becoming noncompetitive. Because if you stand up and face the issue, and decide that in fact you're going to require certain specific safety things, then in fact you could raise the rates so high that people won't use the port. You have a very delicate balance.

Liability is a big issue in my industry now. We are now operating in the State of California and in the State of Alaska, and before it's over with it we will probably be with every state that there is in the Union, with unlimited liability when it comes to oil spills. Do I like it? No! I think the federal government, as far as I'm concerned, turned their back on the problem and gave the states open access to liability. But we will continue to operate there. But I have a question for everyone: while liability to me is unlimited, what is the liability to port authorities for not supplying safety inspections, fire protection, vessel traffic systems and all these kinds of things?

I wonder what will happen when we have a major accident in one of the ports in this country, and in fact the port authority is named in the unlimited liability lawsuit.

Sadly enough, the way we're solving some of the problems is by legislation. We are not taking an active role in what I like to call a safe operating cooperation standpoint. Every time someone passes a law, it's another thing that we have to do. I'm not worried about that, because we can meet most of the guidelines. But the problem is that there's no coordination. I just recently read the State of Washington's new bill on oil spill protection. There are 10 competing agencies who will have something to do with oil spills. I'm a ship operator that operates into that area; it is almost impossible for me to be able to operate in that area, and do it safely, and know who to go to when I want assistance.

We have federal regulations. The Coast Guard has done a very good job with the resources that they have. I think they can do better. But the Coast Guard is responsible for ship safety on the navigable waters of the United States, and also for some facility safety. I don't think they have enough resources, and in addition to that, when we charge the Coast Guard with chasing drug runners, when we charge the Coast Guard with being involved in coastal protection, there is no way whatsoever, in my opinion, that in fact they can serve us as an operator, and you as a port authority, in pushing up the safety standards on vessels coming into our ports.

As I said when I opened, I think that local port authorities have turned their backs on safety issues. I think they're more interested in real estate, money and moving containers. And they'd better take a better look at regional safety issues. And what has happened, the state regulatory agencies have moved in. I'm seeing it now in California, I've seen it in Washington, and they will continue to move into these areas. It is to the detriment of the local authority, because you'll get state-wide rules and regulations that may not be adaptable to your particular port or area.

Recommendations

We need to develop a land access policy relative to energy productions, and it must include all stakeholders.

Local port authorities ought to stop their infighting, and get together and decide that they are, once and for all, as entities, going to assume the role of local safety facilitators.

There needs to be developed, for each area, a general energy product safety plan, and a philosophy of how we're going to run the port from a safety standpoint.

Please let me remind you again that 85 percent of all container ships coming into our port complex have a hazardous substance on them.

Each port complex must have a port emergency response system. It is not good enough to rely on someone else's equipment. It is not good enough to not have mutual aid.

As you develop long-range plans, energy products issues must be considered, and they must be considered from an operator's standpoint.

Local port authorities must become involved in the pilot issue, the fire issue and the response issue. But above all, people like myself and other people who are operators also have got to stop complaining about all the regulations we have, clean up our operation, and cooperate with the authorities to make all port areas safe.

RESPONDENTS

HIGHWAY PERSPECTIVE

**David J. Hensing, Deputy Executive Director
American Association of State Highway and
Transportation Officials**

Water transportation has been important over the four centuries since European settlement on this continent and obviously dominated transportation of both agricultural commodities and manufactured goods in the early period.

The U.S. has a system of about 3,000 miles of coastal waterways, and some 22,000 miles of inland waterways. 38 of the contiguous 48 states of North America are served by water transportation by one or both of these systems. We have 1,600 terminals on the shallow draft inland waterway system and 188 deep draft U.S. ports on the Atlantic, Gulf, Pacific, and Great Lakes coasts.

Even with the advent of new forms of transportation (railroads, movement of motorized trucks over highways, air cargo), there still is a vital role to be played by water transportation given its unique characteristics of extremely high capacity and low unit costs.

AASHTO 2020 Consensus Transportation Program

About three years ago, at the time of this meeting in 1987, there was a session involving several members of

AASHTO and some others that led to the creation of what we call the AASHTO 2020 Consensus Transportation Program. The stimulus at that time, even though the 1987 Surface Transportation Act had not been passed, was in looking ahead a few years beyond that year's reality.

Underpinning surface transportation debate was that the interstate highway system was in fact anticipated to be completed. It necessitated a more fundamental and a more strategic examination in the relative roles of the federal, state and local government in surface transportation. This strategic examination was basically the stimulus that created this program and allowed the success of the fundamental concept, to take a look at the long range future, to look out to the year 2020. That's the name of the AASHTO program. It was also to engage in substantial outreach and consensus building as part of that effort. Those two characteristics clearly lend themselves to the other modes as well, and so very quickly the program embraced rail, aviation and water transportation.

Principal responsibilities for water transportation were assigned to the Standing Committee on Water Transportation, (one of the five modal standing committees within the Association). The committee created the *Water Transportation Report: A Summary of Issues Affecting the Nation's Water Transportation System* (published in October of 1989).