The Port Perspective:

Commercial Impacts of Military Deployments from US Ports

Presented by Fred Stribling
South Carolina State Ports Authority

Bottom Line Up Front:

- The "Can-Do" spirit prevails!
- Waterfront property is a limited resource. Marshalling and reprioritizing should be done nearby, but not on the marine terminal.
- Rail load capacity has increased at the forts, but the reception capacity at the ports has not.
- Communication is always important and must be practiced in peacetime and very deliberate in mobilization/deployments.
- The Port Readiness Committee concept works!

A word about my presentation:

I'm here representing the perspective of ports that handle both major commercial traffic and played a significant role in the most recent deployments.

Primarily Norfolk, Charleston, Savannah, and Jacksonville.

Today's discussion will be in broad terms regarding matters that large commercial ports have in common.

Specific lessons learned by each port location are in the process of being compiled by MARAD and MTMC.

Setting the Stage

Historically the military utilized dedicated marine terminals for large scale deployments.

In the early 1990s base closure initiatives removed the military ports of Bayonne and Oakland. This led to increasing the shift of more DOD cargo to commercial port facilities. This strategy has both pros and cons.

Now, looking back on deployments in support of campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, what were the impacts to the commercial shipping business from the port perspective?

An overview of port growth:

Loaded TEUs	CY2002	CY1990
Charleston	1,177,783	516,217
Savannah	1,013,315	351,002
Virginia Ports*	1,025,609	483,969
Jacksonville**	486,630	352,243
Source: JOCs, *Port Horizons*		

* Includes Norfolk, Newport News and Portsmouth.

** Includes estimated Puerto Rico cargo that is not tracked by Port Horizons.

5 Categories of Impacts:

1) Rail/road reception process and capacity.

5 Categories of Impacts:

1) Rail/road reception process and capacity.

2) On-terminal constraints at the port.

5 Categories of Impacts:

1) Rail/road reception process and capacity.
2) On-terminal constraints at the port.
3) Berthing constraints at the port.


M S C

5 Categories of Impacts:

1) Rail/road reception process and capacity.
2) On-terminal constraints at the port.
3) Berthing constraints at the port.
4) Labor availability and expertise.


GREEN COVE
NEW ORLEANS

5 Categories of Impacts:

1) Rail/road reception process and capacity.
2) On-terminal constraints at the port.
3) Berthing constraints at the port.
4) Labor availability and expertise.
5) Information flow for planning.

Summary:

- The "Can-Do" spirit prevails!
- Waterfront property is a limited resource. Marshalling and reprioritizing should be done nearby, but not on the marine terminal.
- Rail load capacity has increased at the forts, but the reception capacity at the ports has not.
- Communication is always important and must be practiced in peacetime and very deliberate in mobilization/deployments.
- The Port Readiness Committee concept works!

Recommended Solutions:

We need to optimize the flow of both cargo and information from **fort to port.** Arrive in time, not ahead of time. How do we do that?

- Reinforce the role of the Port Readiness Committee.
- Investigate possibility of Federal funds to enhance port terminal rail capacity.
- Develop secure near-terminal marshalling areas.
- Keep the CAN-DO attitude!


Thank You!