

Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum

Date: May 4, 2007

To: Stakeholder Interviewees, Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan

From: Scott McCreary and Jon Mires, CONCUR, Inc.

Re: Findings of Stakeholder Assessment Interviews

This Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum presents our summary findings from 32 interviews we conducted with stakeholders during the assessment phase of our work. This Assessment is a key step in designing a stakeholder involvement process to support the Port of Oakland's development of a Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan (Plan).

Interviewees were individuals and organizations who have been active in discussions on Port of Oakland (Port) air quality planning. They included a cross section of representatives from public agencies, industry and business trade associations, community and environmental organizations, labor interests, and public officials and their senior staff.¹

CONCUR distributed this document in draft form to all interviewees, and specifically invited interviewees to offer revision or pose clarifying questions. The interviews, and this Memorandum, represent a key input to the Stakeholder Involvement Plan design.

Overview of Findings

Our overarching finding is that interviewees are encouraged by the Port's effort to prepare a Plan and involve a group of broad stakeholders in Plan development. Across the board, interviewees are eager to see this effort move forward. There is extremely strong support for creating a "standing stakeholder group" (we use the phrase "Task Force" in this document) as one of several pathways for stakeholder involvement. Most interviewees advocated for a level of involvement that goes beyond review and comment, allowing stakeholders to participate in proposing and ranking options and perhaps co-drafting Plan text.

At the same time they want to see early progress, respondents want the planning process to be careful, taking account of relevant studies, related efforts, evolving regulations, and innovative air quality planning concepts to produce a set of feasible, implementable commitments. Many respondents suggested that this planning effort represents an excellent opportunity for the Port of Oakland to demonstrate a strong partnership with the West Oakland community. Many also stated that clear leadership and support from Port of Oakland executives and Commission members is likely to be critical to a successful planning effort.

Additionally, we heard very broad agreement that both air quality improvement and sustaining the economic health of the Port of Oakland as a major economic engine must go hand in hand.

¹ Many had attended Port-convened air quality meetings on September 7th, 2006 or October 5th, 2006. Additional suggestions for candidate interviewees were solicited during each interview. (Interviewees are listed in Appendix A).

Assessment Memorandum Structure

This memorandum is organized into five primary sections:

- Section I summarizes the key interests expressed by respective interviewee constituencies;
- Section II summarizes stakeholder interests regarding the content of the Plan;
- Section III summarizes stakeholder interests regarding the planning process;
- Section IV summarizes factors contributing to success and challenges to address;
- Finally, Section V provides information on this document's authorship and linkage to the Stakeholder Involvement Plan.

I. Stakeholder Interests: Key Constituency Interests

A. Key Industry Interests:

- Account for Port expansion plans in the air quality improvement plan.
- Distinguish between Oakland emissions due to Port operations and other emitters.
- Specify targets to be met, rather than mandating methods for achieving targets.
- Commit to shared responsibility for action items resulting from the planning process.
- Give all voices equal weight in deliberations.

B. Key Community and Environmental Interests:

- Prioritize measures that lead to improved health for West Oakland residents.
- Ensure engagement of, and access to, Port decision-makers at the executive and Commission level.
- Ensure transparency in hiring consultants and defining their scope.
- Identify and implement up-front actions and commitments by the Port to improve air quality.
- Construct a menu of mitigations to include strategies beyond emission reduction (such as land use and construction operations).
- Integrate air quality monitoring into Plan implementation.
- Incorporate related social and environmental justice goals into the planning process.

C. Key Labor Interests:

- Improve the "two-way street" of respect between the Port and community: Port to value its role as a community partner and provide local jobs, community to value Port's role as an economic engine and place of career opportunity.
- Structure Port employment so that jobs are desirable and accessible to local workers.
- Maintain or improve the Port of Oakland's competitive position in relation to other West Coast ports.

D. Key Interests of Public Agency Representatives:

- Respond to community needs in setting Plan priorities.
- Initiate and sustain trust building between the Port and other stakeholders.
- Address all modes of Port emissions.
- Institutionalize Port Commission engagement with stakeholders.
- Present accessible technical information to stakeholders.
- Pursue emission reductions aggressively.
- Characterize focus on both emissions reduction measures and associated expected outcomes (public health and air quality improvements).

II. Stakeholder Interests: Plan Content

A. Define the Geographic Focus of the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan

We heard some differing views on the appropriate geographic focus for the planning effort:

- A large majority of respondents favored an initial focus on the Port of Oakland itself and West Oakland.
- Some preferred an expanded focus to include areas that are directly involved in Port Maritime operations even though they are not located at the Port. Examples included:
 - Warehousing facilities along the highway 880 corridor north of Hayward;
 - Truck distribution centers that serve the Port of Oakland but are located in other communities;
 - Rail yards located north of Oakland in communities along the Richmond peninsula.
- A very small number of interviewees wished to see a regional plan for the Bay Area, though most did not think that a regional focus was an appropriate starting point for a Port of Oakland-driven Plan.

Several stakeholders also raised concerns that while defining a geographic boundary may be necessary for planning purposes, such boundaries are artificial. These stakeholders had suggestions for managing this dynamic:

- If the geographic focus is to be Port-specific, then emissions inventories informing Plan development should examine emissions only while at the Port, not while approaching the Port.
- Consider defining the scope to include other heavily impacted areas such as Richmond, San Leandro, and the entire City of Oakland.

B. State a Clear Linkage Between the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Effort and Regional Air Quality Planning

Although most respondents believe an initial focus on the Port itself and West Oakland to be appropriate, they also believe that the Port of Oakland's maritime impact on air quality is not confined to an easily defined geographic space. Many interviewees felt that in doing a Port of Oakland-specific plan, there needs to be a clear statement at the outset about the intended relationship between this planning process and regional air quality planning efforts. Many viewed the Port of Oakland's planning effort as a possible first step or as a potential model for either a subsequent regional plan or individual air quality plans by other ports in the region.

C. Articulate a Broad Vision and Clear Goals

Many stakeholders indicated that the broad vision for the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Plan must incorporate two key elements:

- Improve air quality at the Port of Oakland and in West Oakland.
- Maintain or improve the Port of Oakland's competitive economic position in relation to other West Coast ports.

Stakeholders also suggested several broad goals that should guide Plan development: (Note: no one stakeholder made all of these suggestions; this is a compilation of several ideas we heard).

- Air quality improvements should be considered along with their ability to reduce adverse health impacts.

- Choices between specific improvement measures with comparable cost and effectiveness should be made based on their ability to address other community goals (such as local job creation).
- Air quality improvements should not impede the Port of Oakland's ability to increase throughput (volume of cargo).
- The financial burden of air quality improvements on emitters and on the Port of Oakland should not be so high that it threatens the viability of the Port of Oakland as an economic engine for the area.
- Air quality planning at the Port of Oakland should be coordinated so that each project on Port property is linked to an overarching air quality strategy.
- All air quality planning at the Port of Oakland should be closely linked with regulatory planning by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, the California Air Resources Board, and the US Environmental Protection Agency.

D. Incorporate Useful Source Documents and Related Efforts

There was very strong interest in building on work completed in other forums and making sure the Port of Oakland's Maritime Air Quality Plan is consistent with regulatory requirements at the local, state, and federal level. Time and again we heard "The Port of Oakland's Plan should not reinvent the wheel".

Among suggested source documents for potential initiatives and frameworks were the following.

- San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan (Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach)
- 2006 Air Resources Board Emission Reduction Plan for Ports and Goods Movement in California
- 2005 Railroad Memorandum of Understanding with Air Resources Board
- California Goods Movement Action Plan
- City of Oakland Community Task Force on Ports Recommendations
- Reports of the West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project and the Pacific Institute
- Recommendations of the Ditching Dirty Diesel Collaborative
- Recommendations of the West Oakland Toxics Reduction Collaborative
- Reports of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CARE Program

Several respondents suggested that an early step in the process should be creating a comprehensive list of potential source documents for review.

E. Evaluate the Applicability of the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan

The most frequently noted source document was the Clean Air Action Plan (CAAP) for the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. Many respondents are generally aware of this Plan. Few of the stakeholders interviewed had deep substantive knowledge of that plan's contents, but many viewed it as a potential source of ideas; some suggested it could be a direct model for designing the Port of Oakland's Plan.

Several other interviewees stated that the Port of Oakland's situation is quite distinct from Los Angeles and Long Beach (relative to size of the port, port operations, and status of ambient air quality in the San Francisco Bay region), and therefore the plan may not be easily transferable to the Port of Oakland. Almost all stakeholders agreed that the San Pedro Bay Ports Clean Air Action Plan should be considered within the Port of Oakland's context to determine which elements are applicable. Many stakeholders stated that the measures in the Plan are sound, but stated the view that the planning *process* was somewhat exclusive and should not be repeated in Oakland.

F. Establish a Well-Accepted Baseline from Which to Plan Future Air Quality Improvements

Air quality planning is not static, and many stakeholders called for establishing a baseline to inform the initial planning process. Several respondents also highlighted the need for the resulting Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan to be revisited as control measure technology and air quality change over time.

G. Establish Specific Actions Targeted to Each Major Source of Air Contaminants in the Port Environs

Several respondents stressed that it was important that the Plan not single out one source, but address each one in a systematic manner, with an eye towards “fair share” solutions and practical implementation across industries and modes of transport:

- Shipping
- Trucking
- Rail
- Terminal operations
- Harbor craft
- Other Maritime operations

Many of these respondents also favored creating small stakeholder work teams linked to one or more of these categories; these work teams would then develop and review potential strategies.

H. Consider Early Actions and Commitments by the Port of Oakland

Many respondents felt that early actions and commitments by the Port of Oakland would be critical in conveying the Port’s seriousness about air quality improvement. Several stakeholders mentioned that trust needs to be repaired and developed between the Port and its stakeholders.

Most suggestions for immediate action revolved around measures related to reducing the impacts of truck diesel emissions, including addressing idling and wait times, approach routes, and/or providing truck parking and improved truck facilities on Port of Oakland property.

I. Set Targets and Milestones; Include Implementation and Funding Strategies

Stakeholders expressed a strong desire for the Plan to explicitly state details about targets and milestones. Additionally, we heard very clear suggestions that the Plan be explicit about funding and implementation strategies, including prospects for leveraging support from City, State, and Federal funding sources in addition to participating industry partners and regional public agencies.

Some interviewees expressed a concern that the Plan might be strong on broad goals and strategies, but be silent on funding and implementation, making it less useful as tool for actually improving air quality.

J. Establish a Protocol for Monitoring and Tracking Progress Relative to Targets

Several respondents emphasized that it will not be enough to set targets; these interviewees urged that a feedback loop be built in to the planning process so that progress can be tracked, reported out, and needed adjustments can be made.

Some interviewees suggested that ongoing air quality monitoring in West Oakland should be one piece of this feedback loop.

K. Consider the Value of an Ongoing Role for Community Involvement Following Plan Completion

We heard several suggestions that the Plan should include an element on governance and participation that would establish an ongoing role for community involvement in the Port of Oakland's planning and decision-making processes. Specific suggestions include:

- Establish a standing agenda item for local community organizations at Port Commission meetings.
- Form a Community Advisory Committee to regularly consult with the Port of Oakland across all Port issues. (Such an Advisory Committee was viewed as a long-term body with much broader focus than the recommended Task Force associated with the Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan.)

L. Link Plan Content To Regulatory Requirements

We heard several comments that already-enacted regulatory requirements will lead to significant emission reductions for the Port's Maritime operations. There is also strong support for coordinating the planning process with emerging regulations. This has three dimensions:

- Give careful consideration to existing regulations - A number of interviewees requested that careful consideration be given to industry requirements under existing regulations, such as the 2005 Air Resources Board's regulations for Cargo Handling Equipment replacement or retrofit, as these regulations are expected to result in significant improvements to emission levels.
- Link the planning process to emerging regulations - Respondents pointed out that several rules affecting Port Maritime operations and air quality are under consideration by the Air Resources Board and the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and that the Plan's content should take account of these emerging rules.
- Clearly state how the Plan may exceed or address topics in addition to regulatory requirements - As one stakeholder phrased it, "What will this Plan do for the Port's air quality that regulations don't already address?"

III. Stakeholder Interests: Planning Process

A. Stakeholder Participation Opportunities

We heard interest on the part of interviewees for creating multiple ways for stakeholders to engage in the development of the Plan.

- Create a "standing group" as a primary sounding board for Plan development: Interviewees expressed extremely strong support for establishing a "standing stakeholder group" (Task Force) with defined membership that would meet regularly over the duration of the planning process. Among the advantages respondents cited are the continuity of this structure, the potential for engaging in useful information exchange, and the ability to participate at a deep substantive level. This concept of a standing group has virtual unanimous support among interviewees.

This was coupled with a strong desire that there be additional ways for stakeholders to engage in the Plan's development:

- Convene periodic public workshops to update the broader community on planning progress and to provide a forum for community dialogue on the Plan. Some suggested using varied process formats, including breakout groups, to maximize participation.
- Have Task Force meetings open to the public and provide a structure for members of the public to submit comments and suggestions at those meetings.
- Include a public review and comment period when a Draft Plan is completed.
- Provide a mechanism for submitting comments directly to the Port at anytime during the planning process.

B. Structure of a Standing Task Force

- i. Ensure that the Task Force Has Balanced Representation and a Strong Linkage to West Oakland: A recurring theme was broad agreement that the Plan will likely affect a large number of groups and organizations, so broad-based representation on the Task Force will be essential. When asked for appropriate groups to be represented, the most frequently mentioned were peer agencies, the West Oakland community (including the business and non-profit community), labor, organizations concerned with the environment, trucking, shipping, and rail interests, and other industries associated with Port Maritime operations.
- ii. Elected Officials Have Expressed Strong Interest in the Planning Process: A striking number of elected officials at the local, state, and federal level have expressed interest in tracking this planning process. Some have also stated they would like to participate on the Task Force.
- iii. Task Force Plenary Meetings Should Be Open to the Public: Stakeholders also widely believed that Task Force meetings should be open to the public to increase the transparency of the Task Force's deliberations. There was very strong support for agenda-driven meeting discussion focused among Task Force members. However, many stakeholders indicated that this must be balanced with a mechanism for allowing suggestions and comments from observers who are not members of the Task Force. As one interviewee stated, we should work to avoid a dynamic of "second-class citizens" in the room during Task Force meetings.
- iv. Organize Ad Hoc Work Teams to Develop Plan Elements: There is strong support among interviewees for creating Work Teams (subsets of the larger Task Force). These teams would meet in the interim between plenary Task Force meetings to develop concepts, co-draft elements of the plan, deliberate a specific topical area, or gather information for the plenary Task Force to consider. Many interviewees felt that this would be a good way to let stakeholders engage at a deeper level in the topics that most interest them, keep the process moving forward, and allow stakeholders to match their participation to their available time.

C. Stakeholder Roles in Crafting and Refining Plan Elements

Almost all respondents stated that simple review and comment on emerging Plan drafts or chapters was not a sufficient level of involvement for stakeholders. Almost all interviewees believed that stakeholders should have a substantive role in co-developing the Plan with the Port: working to set Plan priorities, suggesting options for consideration, reviewing and engaging with technical information, and possibly co-drafting text for the Plan.

A very small number of interviewees felt that the process should strive to achieve full consensus, where all parties seek to reach agreement on every element of the Plan. Many of those who felt that striving

for broad consensus was a worthwhile goal also acknowledged that this approach has practical limitations. Stated concerns included: potential for an overly long planning process, the tendency to gravitate toward a “lowest common denominator” outcome, and effectively conferring veto authority in the deliberations. Most interviewees felt that while the concept of consensus has merit, it would not lead to an effective air quality plan.

D. Consider a Step to Engage Members of the Task Force in Review and Ranking Options

Many respondents commented specifically that aspects of the plan may be quite technical in nature, and thus might not lend themselves to “co-invention” by all stakeholders. Interviewees stated that a step to engage the Task Force in seriously reviewing and considering options would be very useful in building support for the Plan and would underscore the credibility of the planning process.

We also heard that extending the reviewing and ranking process to the larger community through broader workshops would be a good way to include a larger number of stakeholders in substantive Plan development.

E. Appropriate Duration of Planning Process

We heard a range of views on specifically how long the planning process should take, although most responses clustered in the range of 9 to 12 months. There was broad support for a timeframe that is long enough for the Plan to have meaningful deliberation and technical analysis and short enough that it isn’t “demoralizing” for participants or stakeholders feel there is no end in sight. Many stated that completing a Plan in a year or less is desirable, but would only be possible with very strong support from Port of Oakland executives and the Port Commission.

F. Timing and Frequency of Stakeholder Meetings Keyed to Substantive Products

There is broad support among stakeholders for meetings that are substantive in nature: new information to consider or review, a task to be completed, or options to be deliberated. Interviewees were largely against meeting “for the sake of meeting.”

Responses for the appropriate interval between meetings ranged from 4-8 weeks, with many people suggesting that a 6 week interval might be an adequate time to maintain momentum while having enough time for substantive work between meetings.

A few interviewees were wary of Task Force meetings spaced more than one-month apart, though most felt that having Work Teams do substantive work between Task Force meetings would maintain momentum.

G. Ensure Access to and Interaction with the Port’s Technical Consultants and Access to Technical Information Used to Formulate the Plan

There is broad agreement among stakeholders that access to technical information and the Port of Oakland’s technical consultants is critical to a transparent planning process and sound decision-making. There is strong support among stakeholders on several dimensions:

- Desire for Port of Oakland technical consultants to be present at stakeholder meetings to explain their findings and to answer stakeholder questions.
- Desire to see an effort to translate technical information into an accessible form.

- Desire for a Work Team structure where the Port of Oakland's technical consultants can work side by side with technical stakeholders.
- Desire to make sure that the Port of Oakland's technical staff (in addition to strong staff from the Social Responsibility Division) are interacting directly with stakeholders.
- A commitment to explicit documentation of working assumptions, data sources used, and analyses conducted to support the Plan.

H. Link the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan and Related Planning Processes/Studies

In considering the timeline and milestones of the planning effort, many respondents stated that important studies and regulations are likely to be released in the coming months that will necessarily inform the development of the Port's Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan. The West Oakland Human Health Risk Assessment and the Air Resources Board's emerging regulatory program were frequently cited as key inputs that must be incorporated into the planning process.

One aspect of this is thinking strategically about when those products will be available, and how that shapes the Port of Oakland Maritime Air Quality planning process.

Another aspect is acknowledging the value of past efforts, and committing to taking a thoughtful look at the work products of the West Oakland Toxics Reduction Collaborative and the recommendations of the City of Oakland's Port Task Force, as well as products from other related efforts.

IV. Factors Contributing to Plan Success and Challenges to Address

A. Demonstrating Clear Leadership by Port Executive Staff

There is an extremely strong desire among stakeholders to see coordinated leadership from Port of Oakland executives. A strikingly common stakeholder comment is that the Port staff that regularly engage with stakeholders are "friendly," "pleasant," and "get it" but may not have the policy-making authority of Port executives or the Engineering division of the Port. Many stated that the success of the planning effort will be dependent on strong support and engagement from the highest levels of Port leadership. This has two dimensions:

- Desire to see officials with the authority and technical capacity to make policy decisions engaged with stakeholders.
- Desire to see coordinated support for collaborative work with stakeholders among executives across the Port of Oakland, specifically including the Maritime and Engineering divisions.

B. Engaging Port of Oakland Commission Members in Plan Development and Implementation

There is equally strong support for Commission engagement in the planning process. We heard differing views on what this engagement should look like:

- Some stakeholders indicated that having at least one Commission member commit to attend each plenary Task Force meeting would be a critical step in demonstrating institutional support for the planning effort.
- Other stakeholders suggested that public statements of support for the planning process and for improving air quality would be sufficient to demonstrate Commission commitment.

C. Identifying and Quantifying Sources of Air Emissions

There is broad agreement among interviewees that the Port of Oakland's operations as a whole contribute a significant portion of the total air pollutant emissions in the Oakland area. However, respondents also stated that emissions in the area are not solely the result of Port of Oakland operations, and disaggregating the Port of Oakland's sources from other sources is a challenge to address. Several interviewees specifically stated that meeting this challenge will be key in characterizing the health impact of the Port of Oakland's Maritime Operations on West Oakland.

Many stakeholders believe that the Air Resources Board's West Oakland Diesel PM Health Risk Assessment will be a tool in meeting this challenge. Many also expressed concern that the methodology of the Health Risk Assessment could have potential flaws. A specific concern is that the Health Risk Assessment is expected to utilize average emissions data rather than peak emissions in calculating risk.

D. Engaging a Highly Disaggregated Trucking Industry

A large number of stakeholders stated that diesel emissions from trucks that serve the Port of Oakland is the most significant short term issue and thus urgently needs to be addressed. Many also expressed concern that the disaggregated structure of the trucking industry will make this a particularly challenging issue to effectively resolve:

- Most motor carriers are small, independent operations. There are therefore an extremely high number of motor carriers compared to other Port Maritime operations (such as steamship lines, terminal operators, and railroads.)
 - This makes representative trucking participation on the Task Force a challenge.
 - It is difficult to get an accurate count of the number, age, and types of trucks serving the Port of Oakland.
 - Many small motor carriers and individual truckers have limited resources to devote to implementing technical innovations.
 - Administering programs for reducing truck emissions is challenging because of the disaggregated nature of the industry.

E. Learning from the Prior Perceived “Disconnect” Between Expressed Community Concerns and Port of Oakland Actions

Some interviewed members of the community felt that while the Port had made many good faith gestures in the recent past, there has sometimes been a “disconnect” between community concerns and commitments made. This has several implications for stakeholders:

- A strong desire to engage the Port of Oakland in serious discussions, through give and take, about what kinds of actions might be feasible.
- A desire to include community priorities in the Port of Oakland's long-term decision-making structure.
- A desire for the Port of Oakland to self-identify as a community partner.

F. Achieving Clarity on the Regulatory Landscape

There is strong interest on the part of stakeholders to understand the regulatory framework affecting the Port of Oakland's air quality planning. Specific questions posed by stakeholders include:

- What regulatory authority does the Port of Oakland have in relation to its tenants? How will that impact development and implementation of the Plan?
- How will the California Air Resources Board's recent actions affect Port of Oakland air quality planning? Which of these actions are legal requirements and which are non-enforceable goals?
- Does the Bay Area Air Quality Management District impose regulations? If so, how do these relate to the Air Resources Board's regulations?
- What are the roles of the US Environmental Protection Agency and other federal agencies in Port of Oakland air quality planning?

V. Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum: Authorship and Linkage to Stakeholder Involvement Plan

A. Authorship and Review Steps for the Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum

This Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum was prepared by Jon Mires and Scott McCreary of CONCUR. We conducted all of the interviews on which this document is based and served as sole authors of the text.

We distributed this document to interviewees in draft form and invited interviewees to ask clarifying questions or suggest revisions to clarify the content of this memorandum, particularly if they felt that we misconstrued or omitted a key idea. The comments received have been incorporated into this document.

B. Link to CONCUR's Stakeholder Involvement Plan

The findings in this Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum directly inform the development of our Stakeholder Involvement Plan. The Stakeholder Involvement Plan combines elements of our Assessment Findings with our professional experience to propose a structure for stakeholder involvement.

The Stakeholder Involvement Plan is currently in draft form and will be finalized by May 15, 2007 based on this Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum as well as stakeholders' suggested revisions to the Draft Stakeholder Involvement Plan itself. The final version will be posted on the CONCUR website at <http://www.concurinc.com/portofoakland/>.

Appendix A - Interviewees

NAME	ORGANIZATION / AFFILIATION
Bill Aboudi, Owner	AB Trucking
Diane Bailey, Health Program	National Resources Defense Council
Brian Beveridge, Coordinating Team Member	West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
Doug Bloch, Port of Oakland Campaign Coordinator	Change to Win / East Bay Alliance for Sustainable Economy
Bob Brauer, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs	City of Oakland, Mayor's Office
Jack Broadbent, Executive Officer	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Dr. Washington Burns, Executive Director	Prescott-Joseph Center
Pam Evans, Program Coordinator	Alameda County Environmental Health Department
Jamie Fine, Assistant Professor	USF Department of Environmental Science
Eric Goodman, Manager, Operations Mike Stanfill, Manager, Environmental Program Development	BNSF Railway
Margaret Gordon, Coordinating Team Member	West Oakland Environmental Indicators Project
Jay Halsch, Manager	Marine Terminals Corp.
Carol Harris, Legal Department	Union Pacific Railway
Ginny Hessenauer, Director, Environmental Affairs, Americas	APL
John McLaurin, President Mike Jacob, Vice President John Berge, Vice President	Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Ellen Johnck, Executive Director	Bay Planning Coalition
Andy Katz, Community Coordinator	Alameda County Supervisor Keith Carson's Office
Ray Kidd, Board Member	West Oakland Neighbors
Ian Kim, Policy Director	Ella Baker Center for Human Rights

Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum
Appendix A - Interviewees

Kirk Marckwald, Principal Sarah Weldon, Research Associate	California Environmental Associates
Cynthia Marvin, Assistant Division Chief Carolyn Suer, Staff Air Pollution Specialist	California Air Resources Board
Therese McMillan, Deputy Executive Director, Policy Carolyn Clevenger, Goods Movement Planner/Analyst Ashley Nguyen, Planning Staff	Metropolitan Transportation Commission
Nate Miley, Supervisor	Alameda County Supervisor
Nancy Nadel, Councilmember Marisa Arrona, Policy Analyst	Oakland City Council – Nancy Nadel’s Office
Swati Prakash, Program Director	Pacific Institute
Jean Roggenkamp, Deputy Air Pollution Control Officer	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
Teri Shore, Clean Vessels Campaign Director	Bluewater Network / Friends of the Earth
Lisa Swanson, Manager, Environmental Affairs	Matson
Clarence Thomas, Member and Former Board Member	ILWU Local 10
Rachel Weinstein, Director, District Office David Weinreich, Field Representative	State Senator Don Perata's Office
Sandra Witt, Director, Community Assessment, Planning, Education and Evaluation	Alameda County Public Health Department
Amy Zimpfer, Associate Director, Air Division Richard Grow, Air Toxics, Radiation, and Indoor Air	USEPA Region 9

Appendix B – Interview Instrument

Note: This instrument was used as a guide in our discussions with interviewees. We covered all topics with each interviewee. We did not ask every question verbatim of every interviewee.

Introduction:

- As part of the Port of Oakland's (Port) development of a Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan (Plan), CONCUR has been asked to design and facilitate a Stakeholder Involvement Process.
- CONCUR is a neutral, nonpartisan environmental mediation firm based in West Berkeley. We specialize in environmental policy analysis and multistakeholder collaborative processes on environmental planning issues. Our role in the project is to provide neutral facilitation and stakeholder process design services.
- This assessment phase will significantly inform the design of the Stakeholder Involvement Plan. This assessment will be based on confidential stakeholder interviews we will conduct with you and about 20 other stakeholders. Our intention is to interview a representative group of stakeholders; we will not interview every individual who has a stake in the outcome of the project. The assessment team includes Scott McCreary and Jon Mires of CONCUR.
- We anticipate that this interview will take approximately 60 minutes.
- We will summarize the findings of the interviews in a Stakeholder Assessment Memorandum. We will share this memorandum with the Port, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and the stakeholders we interview.
- All of the interviews are confidential; comments will not be attributed to specific individuals.
- Do you have any questions for us before we begin?

Your Background:

1. In brief, please tell us a little about your professional background and your current position and responsibilities.

Your view of the Air Quality Plan and Your Interests:

2. In your view, what is the Port trying to achieve by developing an Air Quality Plan? What do you see as the appropriate role of stakeholders in developing this plan?
 - [Optional] Who do you see as its primary partners in developing this plan? Is your organization such a primary partner?
3. What are your organization's interests in the establishment of an Air Quality Plan for the Port?

Learning from Past Efforts:

4. What has been your involvement to date in discussions related to the development of the Port's Air Quality Plan?
 - [Optional] We understand that two meetings devoted to the Maritime Air Quality Plan were convened in the fall of 2006. Did you take part in either of these meetings? If so, what worked well and what could have been done better?
5. Were you involved in past efforts to develop an Air Quality Plan in the Bay Area or another region? In your view, what worked in these efforts, and what could have been done better?
 - [Optional] Are you aware of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach Air Quality Management Plan? If so, in what ways is this an appropriate model for Oakland, and in what ways does it not reflect unique conditions near the Port of Oakland?
6. Have you been involved in previous collaborative planning efforts with either the Port of Oakland or with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District? In your view, what worked well in these efforts, and what could have been done better?

Useful Approaches:

7. What are the keys to success for the stakeholder involvement process and the project more generally?
 - [Optional] What would help you contribute most productively to the process?
 - [Optional] Do you know of past similar stakeholder collaborative efforts that might serve as useful models for this project? What specific elements of these past efforts made them successful?
 - [Optional] What opportunities do you see to integrate the diverse stakeholder interests involved in the development of the Port's Air Quality Plan?

Issues to be Addressed:

8. The Maritime Air Quality Improvement Plan is being completed concurrent with other significant planning efforts and studies. Which ones do you see as most linked and relevant for this project?
 - [Optional] What do you see as the linkage between this project and the Air Resources Board's Health Risk Assessment?
 - [Optional] What do you see as the linkage between this project and the Oakland Army Base redevelopment projects?
 - [Optional] What do you see as the linkage between this project and the Infrastructure Bond money available to ports through the Air Resources Board?
9. What outcomes do you expect to see from the Air Quality Plan?
 - [Optional] What elements and level of detail should the Plan contain?
 - [Optional] What suggestions do you have about implementation, monitoring, and enforcement?
10. In your view, what are the key challenges or barriers facing the project?
 - [Optional] Questions/concerns about people and agencies involved:
 - Do you have any questions or concerns about the role of Port staff, project consultants, or other public agencies (BAAQMD, ARB) in the mix?
 - What steps could clarify their respective roles?
 - What steps could help strengthen their credibility?

Process Design and Preparation Needs:

11. The aim of this process is to produce a representative stakeholder body. What organizations should we be sure to contact?
 - [Optional] Are there organizations that have views closely aligned with yours?
 - [Optional] Are there organizations that have views that are divergent from yours?
 - [Optional] What will be the primary areas of agreement and disagreement between various stakeholders?
12. The structure, timing, and duration of stakeholder meetings are being informed in part through these interviews. However, it is likely that the next stakeholder meeting will take place in April, and subsequent meetings may extend through the end of the year. Are you interested in participating in these meetings? If so, do you anticipate being able to participate for the duration of the project?
 - [Optional] What suggestions do you have for maintaining the continuity of the group over the duration of the project?
13. One of CONCUR's tasks is to draft a Stakeholder Involvement Plan. As we put that together, what factors should we consider in determining the:
 - Appropriate spacing of meetings?
 - Length of meetings and the time of day to hold them?
 - Structure of the group (i.e. work teams or committees)?

14. What do you see as potential roles of stakeholders in contributing to and reviewing the plan?
What do you anticipate the decision-making process will look like?
 - [Optional] Does seeking broad based support or concurrence for the Plan seem like a useful step?
15. What specific information would be helpful to support this process? Please recommend specific documents or studies that you are aware of.
16. When facilitating collaborative groups, we typically put forward draft ground rules that cover areas such as “Participation,” “Representation,” “Information Sharing,” and “Media Conduct.” Are there ground rules you would recommend including to help members work together effectively?

Other Comments, Questions, or Advice

17. These interviews focus on discussions with a wide range of Port stakeholders, including [overview of groups/individuals being interviewed]. Should we be talking to other individuals who represent perspectives not already covered by the list of candidate interviewees?
18. Do you have any other questions, comments or advice for us? You are welcome to send us any additional thoughts by email (mires@concurinc.net or scott@concurinc.net).