

Planning Work Group Meeting Summary

Prepared on Feb. 12, 2017

Twelve attendees, including eight members of the AAPA Maritime Economic Development Committee's Planning Work Group, participated in the Planning Work Group's initial face-to-face meeting and conference call on Wednesday, Feb. 1, 2017, from 2:00pm – 5:00pm, in Tampa, Fla.

Participants included:

In Person

Aaron Ellis, AAPA

Jean Godwin, AAPA

John Peterlin, Port of Galveston

Jim Dubea, Canaveral Port Authority

Karl Palsgaard, IHS Markit

Shannon McLeod, WSP/Parsons Brinkerhoff

On Phone

Natacha Yacinthe, Port Everglades

Davinder Gill, Port of Long Beach

Matt Plezia, Port of Long Beach

Allison Yoh, Port of Long Beach

Patrick Bohlen, Halifax Port Authority

Carlos Bell, Mississippi State Port Authority at Gulfport

Among the topics of discussion were a review of the Planning Work Group's formation, a discussion on the work group's mission and priorities, and suggestions for incorporating planning topics and speakers in AAPA's Communications and Economic Development Seminar, to be held in Portland, Ore., June 13-14, 2017

AAPA's Jean Godwin began the meeting with a brief rundown of the mission of the former Research and Planning Committee, which was disbanded in 2006 due to lack of sufficient interest and participation among committee members and member ports. The former committee's mission was:

“To monitor, collect and disseminate information pertaining to the marine transportation industry and research and developments in trade, industry and transportation technologies that affect port planning and operations...”

The next order of business was a lengthy discussion on the work group's definition, activities and priorities, which included some back-and-forth on whether or not to add “Research” to the work group's name. It was eventually decided to refrain at this time from changing the name of the work group and incorporate research as one of the work group's priorities instead.

First, the group agreed on the following general work group goals:

- To research, develop and share ‘best practices’ and case studies
- To network with other planners (both AAPA members and nonmembers)
- To increase awareness of the value of seaports
- To inform AAPA’s Legislative Policy Council on legislation issues, policies and funding matters important to port strategic planning

Next, the group agreed to the following initial priorities (in no particular order):

- Develop training programs for port planning and development, grant writing, and port investment strategies.
- Investigate (and provide as a resource to the rest of the committee) alternative financing strategies for port projects.
- Provide educational resources for port planners so they can better articulate and provide evidence as to how and why ports are economic engines for their communities and regions.
- Help guide standardization in port planning methodology and statistics, particularly as it applies to incorporating a port’s master plan into its specific (U.S.) state freight plan to better enable the port to compete for state and federal funding.

Below are several potential research topics that the Planning Work Group to considered to undertake as resource materials for the larger committee. There was discussion of voting for the top two and that will be the group’s focus for 2017.

1. Develop an explicit methodology to prioritize research investment as it pertains to seaport security.
2. Develop a methodology for determining the types of projects that should be developed or constructed at ports when politics, community will and limited budgets come into play.
3. Review and analyze the research needs and parameters of the maritime industry and ports’ economic roles as “major economic engines,” and how existing port infrastructure funding arrangements are affected by policy initiatives and regulatory limitations.
4. Research the contributions of AAPA-member port authorities to community livability enhancements and compare them to ports elsewhere to determine what are the most beneficial attributes AAPA-member ports may want to adopt to improve relationships within their communities.
5. Research the roles of ports that have combined their resources (e.g., Northwest Seaport Alliance) vs. ports that fiercely compete in the same geographic area, and showcase the advantages/disadvantages of both.
6. Research variables of successful ports in the U.S. vs. Canada and determine how success is being measured.
7. Research prospective benefit-cost analyses of publicly-funded port expansion plans.
8. Research the differences between municipal, county and state-owned port authorities vs. privately-owned ports to identify strengths and weaknesses of each.
9. Research various types of port master plans as a tool for investments to identify “best practices.”

10. Research the impacts of various federal policies on port operations and identify what works, what doesn't, and why.

For the last agenda item of the meeting, Planning Work Group meeting participants offered suggestions for topics and speakers to fill out the agenda for AAPA's "Communications and Economic Development Seminar" in Portland, Ore., on June 13-14.

For the *Creating Synergy for Business Development* session, a proposal was advanced to invite a representative of the Georgia Ports Authority to discuss its plans with the South Carolina Ports Authority to cooperatively develop the new Jasper Port Authority on the Savannah River. Another suggestion was to invite a representative from the Northwest Seaports Alliance to discuss the pros and cons of the alliance between the ports of Seattle and Tacoma.

For the *Capital Investments for Cargo Handling Efficiency* session, a suggestion was offered to invite a member of the Port of Lake Charles to share information about its off-shore terminal for project cargo being developed with a private entity. Another recommendation for this session was to explore the relationship between the Port of Prince Rupert, in British Columbia, with CN Railroad, for moving containers across the country, and all the way to Mobile, Ala. Still another thought was to invite a Port of Long Beach representative to talk about that port's Middle Harbor terminal project and how the port is paying for, and recovering, its costs. Additionally, a recommendation was advanced to invite a representative from the Canaveral Port Authority's container terminal to discuss how it is being paid for through port, state, federal and private investments and grants, or invite a representative from Texas A&M's Texas Transportation Institute to discuss its prototype self-driving Freight Shuttle System, which debuted last October.

For the *Blunting Efforts to Alter Port Waterfront Activities* session, a recommendation was made to invite a member of the Port of Grays Harbor to serve as the Discussion Leader, based on the challenges it has undertaken to move bulk commodities through its facilities. Another recommendation was to invite a member of Port of Portland to discuss its West Hayden Island development plans, while another recommendation was to invite a Port of Seattle representative to discuss its successful efforts to keep open an important roadway for the movement of cargo instead of allowing it close for the benefit of a new stadium being planned for downtown.

Finally, a recommendation was made to create a new session, or change an existing one, to have a discussion on case studies of what happens when carriers, like South Korea's Hanjin Shipping, or terminal operators, like Outer Harbor Terminals at the Port of Oakland or the scrap metal terminal at the Canaveral Port Authority, go bankrupt. The purpose for this session is to showcase what the impacts to a port when something unforeseen happens, like a terminal operator or carrier line bankruptcy.

The meeting adjourned about 4:35pm.