Port of Los Angeles Centennial Oral History Project
Geraldine Knatz Oral History
Date of Interview: Unknown
Location: Los Angeles, California
Length of Interview: 01:25:34
Interviewer: MS – Unknown
Transcriber: NCC

Male Speaker: First question we ask everybody is to say your name and spell it.

Geraldine Knatz: Geraldine Knatz, G-E-R-A-L-D-I-N-E, and the last name is K-N-A-T-Z.

MS: Geraldine, what is your position here at the port?

GK: I'm the executive director.

MS: Okay. What year were you born, and where were you born?

GK: I was born in 1951 in Paterson, New Jersey.

MS: Now, your background really is quite interesting as far as how you got to where you started in your education in your early years. Talk about your early years and your interest the environment and how, over time, that led you to working here for the ports.

GK: Yes. Well, I think, as a child, I was always interested in science. I had a laboratory in my basement. But when I was in college at Rutgers University of New Jersey, I had to do a research project. So, I went to the local government lab and kind of volunteered and found myself doing research on the New York harbor area. So, that was really my first introduction to harbors. Then when I came out here to go to graduate school at USC, I was just drawn to the harbor, and I decided I was going to look at the harbor as the focus of my dissertation research. So, I actually had been doing sort of biological research in the harbor for several years before I learned about a position that became open at the port, and that was as an environmental scientist. So, I applied, and I got the job. So, I started in 1977 as an environmental scientist, and really, working as an environmentalist for a port in the [19]70s was kind of a unique position. The first – actually, Los Angeles, the port of Los Angeles sort of led the way. In 1973, they created the first port environmentalist, and that was my first boss, W. Calvin Hurst. He was a very interesting man. He had spent time in Africa with Albert Schweitzer. He wore his hair in a page boy. He was really a devoted environmentalist. So, he built up a staff over a period of years. What prompted the fact that the port needed to hire environmentalists, because there were new laws coming into place. We had to do environmental impact reports. But we were still fairly unique. I think also, at that time, it was fairly unique to be a female and working in the port and not being in one of the more clerical positions. So, most of my early career here at the port was studying the biology of the harbor. In those days, you'd go out, and the harbor was pretty dead. We'd go out to sample the water quality, and we'd be excited if we could find any oxygen in the water. We were excited if we found anything living in the harbor mud, especially back in the inner harbor. So, we'd find this one worm, capitella capitata, which is a worm that indicates the area is real polluted. So, I remember, though – as we'd get into the outer harbor, we'd find a little oxygen, and we'd feel pretty good about that. But over a period of time, that changed. Back then, there was a lot of focus on protecting the habitats in the harbor and trying to bring back the water quality, bring back the fish. I can remember trips that we took to Catalina Island to collect some kelp. We brought it back here to the harbor and planted the kelp along the inside of the breakwater. Over several decades, that kelp eventually took hold and kind of has spread around the harbor. A couple of years ago, I was back, like, in the inner harbor area in Long Beach, and I saw some of the kelp there. It's the kind of stuff you see at Catalina Island. You don't see it in

the inner harbors in San Pedro Bay.

MS: Let's go back to when you were first discovering harbors as a part of study in New York. What were you finding in those days when you were first studying? Why were you attracted to harbors when you were studying New York?

GK: I was, first of all, fascinated by the organisms. I was studying the plankton. So, that's what really led me to it. It just was the fact that I was involved in that first project that involved dredging in New York harbor. It just kind of interests me. I never was really interested in going into academia. I was more interested in working on real issues and issues that industries have in the environmental area. So, I think the fact that maybe I had that exposure to New York harbor, when I came here to Los Angeles, I was doing research in the harbor. I knew a little bit about harbors. That probably helped me get my first job, get my foot in the door.

MS: But basically, studying as a biologist or a marine biologist, studying a harbor is studying a graveyard. I mean, what is particularly interesting about that?

GK: Yes. Well, as a graduate student at that time, there was research money available to help students in the Los Angeles area. Because at that time, the fish canneries were still discharging waste into the harbor. So, USC and the – they had a group up there called the Harbor Research Program, received a lot of funding to come in and really look at the fish waste that were being discharged in the harbor and determine, is this a good thing, or is this a bad thing? There was a very controversial report that was done by the group up at USC that basically said it's a good thing.

MS: So, the USC study, why did it come to a conclusion it was a good thing, all this discharge coming from the canneries?

GK: Let me say, the USC study came to a conclusion that discharging of fish cannery waste into the harbor was a good thing. It was extremely controversial among the federal and state natural resource agency, the environmentalists. They basically looked at it as, hey, industry funded this study. The canneries were involved in money that went to the study. So, the conclusion was foregone. There was that sort of aura about the study. I suppose it was nutrient-rich material. It was organic material. It could be broken down. But you have too much of a good thing; it's not a good thing. So, it was extremely controversial. The purpose of the study really was to deal with whether or not that fish cannery waste got hooked to the sewer system and/or is cleaned up before there was any discharges into the harbor. Obviously, that would have cost money for the industry. They didn't want to do that. So, they went and had this study to show us, we call bioenhancement, that the fish wastes were enhancing the harbor. It was bioenhancement. It was extremely controversial. Despite the study, ultimately, the cannery wastes were -- discharge was eliminated from the harbor.

MS: Can you give us a little historical context about the awareness of the environment, maybe 1930, [19]20, [19]30, [19]40? What was the attitude before the so-called environmental movement, about the environment of the harbor, and how did it evolve over history and over time?

GK: Yes. I think pretty much, there wasn't concern in the 1920s and [19]30s. The concern really started when you had all of the industries and the refineries that got cited along the Dominguez Channel and the Dominguez Slough, and they discharged down into the harbor. Then I think it was probably – there was more awareness in the 1960s. I think that was nationwide. Most of the rivers and a lot of the lakes in the United States were pretty much dead. They were heavily polluted. I think with respect to San Pedro Bay, I think there was a lot that was done by the Los Angeles Regional Water Quality Control Board. There was actually a woman who was put on that board in probably the early 1970s, late 1960s. She was a Beverly Hills housewife. They held a meeting down here in San Pedro Bay. Some of these people, and particularly this woman, saw what the condition was, and she led the effort to really stop the discharge of all those industries into Dominguez Slough. That was imposed in the 1970s, and it took a period of years. But you can go back, and you can look at the water quality of the ports. I went out every month for years testing the water quality. You can track it over a period of decades. Near the late-1970s, you saw the oxygen go from almost constantly being zero, all of a sudden, it would get up to a level of, say, five parts per million. If we got up to five, we were like, excited. That was a good day when we go out, and we'd see, oh, five parts per million. You can start getting some biological diversity back in the harbor.

MS: So, your first job when you came here was here at the port.

GK: Right.

MS: Describe how you got that job. Then second, what was the port like when you first came here?

GK: Yes. Basically, there were notices stuck in the mailboxes of all the graduate students at USC that this position was available. So, I contacted the phone number and came down for an interview. It was a provisional appointment, which means you sort of come on a temporary basis, and then you have to take the civil service job. So, I came on. I got the job. I worked for about six months. Then they gave the civil service exam. I remember it was up at Hollywood High School. They were like, I go to take the exam, and there's like 500 people in line. I'm like, wait a minute, these are 500 people that want my job [laughter]. So, I scored, like, number one. Then I got bumped down because of veterans' preferences and things like that and was number three. But I was a female. So, that was an odd thing back then. They were able to reach me on the civil service list and skip over a few White males because I was a female. So, I was able to get the job on a permanent basis. Back in the [19]70s, we were in the Pacific Trade Center on Fifth Street. The Harbor Department had a couple of floors in that building. It was a much smaller organization than it is today in the year 2007. You'd go to the Engineering Department. The chief engineer would have an office. Everybody else was sort of out in a bullpen. They just had desks. Pretty much we just had desks in an area. You didn't really have, sort of, private offices, or it wasn't as – cubicles like, they kind of stuffed people into, later on, over time. We were more sort of out in the open and very small organization. As I said, not a whole lot of women and –

MS: Not a whole lot of environmentalists too.

GK: No, not a whole lot of environmentalists.

MS: You had a double whammy there.

GK: Yes. But I loved the job. I really loved the job. I worked there for about four and a half years, until an opportunity came up to take a promotion. But it was at the port of Long Beach. So, then I went over to the other side of the bay.

MS: So, what was going on in the port in those four years, and what was the attitude toward the environment? What was happening in the port itself?

GK: It was pretty negative. In those days, the engineers really ran the port. Everything was build, build, build. When the environmental laws came into place, and those of us who were working on environmental impact reports, which were a new thing, started using this word, mitigation. Everyone was like, what the heck is that? Mitigation is trying to compensate or eliminate or reduce the negative effects of what you're doing on the environment. That was an alien concept to the engineering-run port. Really, the reaction we got is, "Hey, we don't mitigate. We create jobs. We don't have to mitigate. We're above that." So, we, as environmentalists, tried to institute this concept of mitigation, and that just did not go over that well. Of course, at that time, we were trying to mitigate for impacts on habitats. We were doing landfilling. We were doing dredging. So, we were destroying some of the marine habitat, or we were impacting the marine habitat. So, that's how the kelp transplant project started – happened. So, that was some of our –

MS: Can you describe what the kelp transplant project was?

GK: Yes. The kelp transplant project was a way to mitigate some of our impacts on habitats. If we're impacting habitat in one part of the port in a negative way, could we do something somewhere else to increase the productivity of the harbor? So, working with, say, Fish and Game and the National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, we get together with these agency guys, and we talk about, "Okay. What can we do to enhance productivity in the harbor?" We came up with this idea that, oh, maybe we can transplant kelp back to the harbor. So, this is the big Macrocystis kelp that you see if you go out diving in the coves in Catalina Island. So, we said, "Okay. Let's try it." We went over to Catalina. We collected the kelp. We brought it back. We'd take the little holdfast. We'd tie it to these rocks. We'd place it along the breakwater. Then we'd go out there. I used to dive when I came to the port. We'd go out diving to collect sea urchins. Because the sea urchins would like to eat the holdfast. Then all of our kelp that we transplanted would disappear. So, we'd go out, and we'd collect these bags of sea urchins just to remove them from the harbor. Because there were too many of them, and they were eating up the kelp. Then sometimes, once the engineers found out, "Ooh, those environmentalists may be useful. They have wetsuits," then they'd ask us to do some of these other things. "Could you go down and check at the bottom of this pier? We think there's an obstruction there. Could you go down and look and see what there is?" So, sometimes we'd go out and do these other things. Then I can remember the explosion of the *Sansinena* vessel. The explosion happened right before I came to work at the port. I can actually even

remember when that happened, I wasn't here in San Pedro. I was standing in New York airport or someplace in New York City. I was watching the tickertape go by and was talking about this accident in Los Angeles harbor. I'm thinking, "Wait a minute. I'm going to go to work there. I do research there. What's going on?" Then when I came on board, one of the things that I can recall doing is going and diving on the site where the *Sansinena* exploded, and some of the oil had sunk to the bottom. So, there was this major dive that – where all the people that were divers among all the agencies were assembled, and we were diving transects along the harbor. We were given these little white sticks, dipsticks, to go and measure how deep the pools of oil were on the bottom of the harbor. So, I was kind of fortunate that I, along with my dive buddy, who was another port environmentalist, had a fairly clean transect where we had to dive. But some of the other divers came up with their equipment pretty fouled with oil and things like that.

MS: We [inaudible] see Torrance Parker, Parker diving. He was the guy with the helmet and everything, went down there right afterward, and his [inaudible] down there.

GK: Oh, yes.

MS: So, as you came to San Pedro, in your interest in history, did you start beginning to discover some of the history of this port, either then or now? How were you discovering the history, and what were you discovering?

GK: Well, as a kid, I always was involved in museums. When I was in high school, I used to volunteer at a place where George Washington slept, which there are numerous places like that in New Jersey. But I came out here. When I first started at the port, I was living in Silver Lake. So, I was commuting along the harbor freeway, and I passed this sign for the Banning House. One of those days, I decided to get off and follow it. I went to the Banning Museum and had the tour. I thought, "Oh, my God, this place is fabulous." First of all, you don't expect seeing a house like that in Wilmington and then in the lower floor, the history of the harbor there. So, I started volunteering at the Banning Museum. Even though I went to Long Beach and got married and had kids and my time was kind of occupied, I still kept my connection with the Banning Museum and still am a member and still volunteer and work over in the gift shop during their holiday event. But I just love that place. I find the history of the harbor is just really totally fascinating. So, while I worked here then, I was not that interested in the history, but coming back – when I came back to the port as executive director – when I worked here, I used to work out in the maintenance yard in Wilmington. We had all the old photographs there, the old negatives, the glass negatives. So, when I came back here as an executive director, it was in the back of my mind. I'm worried about the negatives. Are the negatives okay? I have to find the negatives. We have a great little archive over there. But what I found, when I came back here, is we kept a lot of those old negatives in envelopes that were not acid-free paper. So, what I found was – and I actually brought one to a board meeting and showed it to our board members – is a lot of those old negatives are bubbled. I'm like, oh, my gosh. So, one of my goals, coming in as a new executive director, is we need to come up with a restoration and preservation plan for our archives. First of all, we need to identify our archives. We don't even know what we have. Stuff is stuffed all over the place. So, we've begun that effort this year. It's something that I'm committed to carry out. I also have this attitude, like, we don't have to tear down everything [laughter].

MS: When you came back to the port, talk about your rediscovering the history of the port and some of the physical part of the history that's here, Warehouse 1 and places like that, and what you were learning and how you were learning to appreciate the history of the area.

GK: Obviously, I've worked in the harbor area my whole career, but the 24 years before that, I was on Long Beach. I didn't spend a lot of time in Los Angeles. But I actually got involved in the reuse of the Long Beach Naval Station. We were tearing down those buildings to make a container terminal, and I ran up against the historical element in the community. I wasn't that familiar with them. That was a fabulous learning experience for me. I got to know the historical groups. I saw their perspective. Working through that process, they became friends. I really learned to appreciate it more. So, when I came back to Los Angeles, you're new. You're driving around. You're looking at stuff. I see this round thing. I'm like, "Oh, my God, that is the neatest building. What is that? That's really fabulous." It's a sewer pump station. I'm like, "Oh, geez [laughter]." I mean, even the sewer pump stations are historic. So, I drive around Wilmington. One of the things that I really am excited about, especially in Wilmington, is a lot of the historic fabric has not been torn down. So, I drive around with some of my real estate people. I'm finding out, "Oh, we own that property. We own that property." My director of real estate at that time was saying, "We're going to tear that down. We're going to tear that down." I'm like, "No, you're not. No, you're not. Look at that art deco facade on that. That building is cute." So – the way some of the art deco warehouses have been painted. Then I happen to go out on a boat cruise, and the boat oper says to me, "Well, you ought to look at the old Wilmington cruise terminal." I'm like, "Where's that?" I realize it's the second floor of one of our transit sheds. So, I get in that building, and I'm just, like, amazed at the stone floor with the seagulls that are inlaid into the floor and the columns and the mahogany doors and the mahogany woodwork. I'm like, "Oh, my God, what a fabulous public space and the curved glass windows." I'm like, "Oh, this would be great to restore." So, I'm – got all these ideas. I'm walking around with the staff. They're talking about, "When we tear this down and tear this down." I'm like, "Oh, my God, we found a doorknob." Unfortunately, all of the bronze doorknobs were stripped out of this building. Someone got in and stole them. So, I'm like, "Geez, maybe we can find old pictures, find out what the doorknobs look like, recreate them. Or we go up to Liz's hardware; we find them." So, we come across one door that still has its doorknob. I'm like, "Take that doorknob off." Right now, that doorknob is in my office. I'm protecting that doorknob. Because I have the only one doorknob left from the cruise terminal. If we restore it, then we know what they look like. So, yes, a lot of people around here still think I'm nuts. We're getting ready to tear this down. I'm like, "No, you're not. No, you're not."

MS: You went from one outrageous cause, environmentalism, to another [inaudible].

GK: Yes. Right. Exactly. So, it's been kind of fun. Interestingly enough, I've been here a little over a year. I haven't had a chance to burrow around in Warehouse 1, but I do want to get out there. Because we have files going back to the 1850s in Warehouse 1, and I want to see where they're stored and how they're stored. I'm very concerned about making sure these things get preserved. So, honestly, I'm going to take on myself our restoration and preservation plan. Because I'm bound and determined to make sure that it's done. There's one legacy I can leave to make sure that our archives are protected. We found original artwork that is historic, noted

painters. There's all this stuff we have, and some of it should be made available to the public to see. We are in a situation now at the port where we're out of space. We're looking at constructing a new building. How do our archives play into that? Maybe we have an archives. I don't know. So, there's a lot of great things that we can explore in this whole area, but we've got a lot of great history. So, one of the things that we've done recently is just develop a map to show the historical sites. When I was working here in the [19]70s, we'd go over to Warehouse 1. We'd go in there. We had Winston Churchill's funeral car stuffed in Warehouse 1. It was the funeral car, the rail car that carried his casket, and it was in there in Warehouse 1. I'm not sure how it got there, but it was in there for years. When I came back, I remember my first board meeting, and I was talking about history. I said, "Who remembers seeing Winston Churchill's funeral car in Warehouse 1?" Of that whole room, one person raised their hand. I started worrying about, we're losing some of that history. That was the impetus to, as part of our centennial year, we have to start documenting some of the oral histories because some of the old timers and – I don't want to classify myself as an old timer, not yet anyway. But they remember that. I remember going in there and saying, "Ooh, this is kind of a neat thing, the glass and the curtains and everything." I don't even know how it got in there. I don't know where it went, but it was in there for a long time. So, that's another little story.

MS: So, aside from saving the environment and saving history, what is the job of the executive director of the Port of Los Angeles? What are your responsibilities? What do you do, and how you're actually contributing to the future as well as the past of the place?

GK: Well, being executive director of the Port of Los Angeles is like a 24-hour-a-day job, seven days a week. You have to live and breathe the port. I'm responsible for really everything, all aspects of the port. We don't actually operate the terminals. In one respect, you can say we're almost like a big land developer. We're a major landlord. But we have customers that rely on us. One of the great things about the port of Los Angeles is its diversity of businesses. We not only have the industrial cargo handling business, we have the cruise business. We have commercial fishing business. I was thrilled to come back here and find that we're still landing wet fish. I have to say, the commercial fishing area is an area that hasn't been touched in years. There's a lot of facilities there that are pretty derelict, empty, boarded up. That's one of my goals, is to come up with a plan to look at not only promoting the existing fishery business that we have, but enhancing that. Some of our customers want to do boutique canneries, where you can go to Whole Foods market and buy a can of tuna that cost $6 or something. It's something really special, a boutique food item. We can promote those kinds of businesses. So, I'm really excited about doing that. We are really replanning the port. For many years, there's been issues with things not being in the right location. So, we're looking at Terminal Island being the focus of our industrial facilities and that we're trying to get everybody in their right spot. That means some of the businesses on the San Pedro waterfront don't really belong there. They should be another location. Out on Terminal Island, we have this fabulous resource. It's the laboratory that was built by USC, and it's now a collaborative of all the universities in Southern California that do marine research. It's the institute, out there, of coastal marine science. I want to get them on the San Pedro waterfront. I thought, "Ooh, gosh, to go and tell somebody they have to move." I went out there and said, "Geez, what do you think about moving to San Pedro?" It's like they've been waiting for decades to get off of Terminal Island, so people can find where they are. They can have classrooms. They can do outreach. There would be a synergy with the Cabrillo Marine

Museum. So, developing this master plan, and I want a master plan that can live on in perpetuity. Because every time a new administration comes in, like this one, you shouldn't have to start planning from scratch. We ought to have something that's sustainable, and that's our goal. I want to put things in place that are carried through beyond this board. So, that's what we're trying to do.

MS: When you were at Long Beach – although really, it was a joint effort, the 2020 Plan, which is a major landmark, historical landmark in the harbor. Talk about what that 2020 Plan was, and how did that really affect and is this still affecting the harbor? Why is it a historic landmark?

GK: Yes. One of the early things I worked on when I was working at the port of Long Beach in the 1980s was a plan known as the 2020 Plan. I think it's rather significant because it was the first time that the two ports really came together to do basic planning for our facilities. It was the first time that the two ports really decided to do cargo forecasting, to look ahead to the future. I have to say, what really brought us together was the Army Corps of Engineers. Because in 1971, you had Glenn Anderson, a congressman at that time, who was pushing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to do a report on the harbors, and he introduced a resolution, I believe, in 1971. It first got funded in about 1973 or so, in the early [19]70s. So, the Corps got money to do this plan. From the Corps' perspective, they look at it as San Pedro Bay. They don't look at it as LA and Long Beach harbors. So, they brought the two ports together. Because this had kind of started around 1970, [19]71, the Army Corps of Engineers uses a fifty-year time horizon . So, from 1970, fifty years ahead, that was 2020. So, we came together with the Corps and the two ports. We decided, "Okay. We're going to do this study, but we're going to look to the year 2020. We're going to really go out and look at what the cargo forecast should be." So, we did this cargo forecast. We saw the numbers. We thought, "Wow, that's a lot of cargo for the year 2020." Then we said, "Okay. What do we have to do if we're going to assume we can handle that amount of cargo?" We came up with a plan. These were consultants working for both ports. We showed these massive islands in the outer harbors. I'm like, "Wow. We're going to go out, and we're going to show these big islands to the people?" It's like, nobody's going to believe this. This is just way too much cargo. So, of course, we came out with the plan. It was like, oh, yeah, right. That amount of cargo – and I can't remember the exact number – is, like, so big. We can't imagine that coming through San Pedro Bay. Well, guess what? That's a small number now [laughter]. As we've grown, we've sort of ellipsed and passed those forecasts significantly over the years. So, the 2020 Plan was important in that it brought the two ports together and the Army Corps to do this regional planning for this bay. Since then, we've continued to do this kind of master planning, working together. We do our cargo forecasts together. We're doing another one right now. Now we're looking at 2030. We're not looking as far as fifty years ahead because it really gets speculative when you go that far. The numbers that we first generated for fifty years ahead did not – they were way underestimates of where they should have been. But we're looking at 2030 now. That early planning led to things that came after, like the Alameda Corridor.

MS: Explain what that is.

GK: Yes. The Alameda Corridor is a rail corridor that was jointly developed by the port of Los Angeles and Long Beach. We spun off another agency to kind of carry through the project, the

Alameda Carter Transportation Authority. But the two ports were involved in acquiring the railroad rights of way from Southern Pacific and Union Pacific. It was another effort on joint planning. I can remember I was the person from the Long Beach side who was one of the principal negotiators for the acquisition of the right of way. I can remember some of those early negotiations with Southern Pacific to get control of the right of way with my counterpart. It was Art Goodwin at the Port of Los Angeles at that time. Again, going back to history, we were looking at, we're buying this right away, and the title was kind of iffy in a lot of areas. Some of those old documents said, "Gee, if you don't allow the cattle to cross, or you don't always continue this right of way for rail purposes, it reverts back to the Banning family." So, I can remember sitting in a meeting with a very high official from Southern Pacific saying to me, "Well, what do we care about that? Where are we going to find a Banning today?" I said, "Well, I can introduce you to some." It was a little surprise that there were Bannings still around. It was an interesting time to negotiate. Every once in a while, we'd identify a piece of property. When we bought the property, it was kind of like the two port executive directors, they went in a room with the head of SP. They agreed, "Okay, here's the dollar amount." We bought it. Then it got turned over to me and Art Goodwin to identify what we had just bought. So, from our perspective, we bought it all, lock, stock, and barrel, you know, from Los Angeles to the harbors. Well, from the Railroad's perspective, it was you bought this tiny little strip and not anything else. So, we spent a long time negotiating what we got. Every time the Railroad was too quick in saying, "Yes, that's in the deal," we were suspicious. They said, "We want this old piece of SP right of way down here in Wilmington." "Oh, yes, you can have that." We said, "Oops, we better go out and look at it." Then we go out and look at it and find that there were like 300-foot piles of old tires on it or something like that. It was property they really wanted to unload. So, those were interesting times. The two ports bought the property, got the project going, spun off a Joint Powers Authority, Alameda Carter Transportation Authority. When you spin off a new authority, one of the first things is the board. You've got to have a board for it. So, I remember Art Goodwin and I were dispatched to go up and meet with all the various city managers up and along the rail carter to talk about how we were going to create this Joint Powers Authority, and we're going to have a board of LA and Long Beach. We met with all these cities. They said, like, "No, you're not. What about us?" So, I remember we came back, and we met with the – kind of reported back to the executive directors at that time. "Gee, I don't think the cities are too happy about just us having this authority. They want to have representation on the board." We were told, "Okay. We'll give them one seat. All the cities can designate one person to sit on the board. So, go back and meet with all those cities again." Art Goodwin and I did that. We met with them. Then we said, "Okay, we'll give you one seat." It's like, "Not good enough. We want a seat for each city." We came back and reported to the executive directors. Ultimately, we wound up with a board that had all of the cities represented on there to start off to go through the planning process. But all through that, we're still working with the railroads, trying to get an operating agreement through, trying to finalize all our negotiations. The historical things kept popping up. Because one time in our negotiations, we said, "Okay. We're going to buy this little office." Our consultant at that time, who was a railroad buff, had found in one of the railroad magazines that this clock from this office was being – was up for sale. So, we're in this negotiation. We're saying, "And you promised that everything in that office comes with it, all the equipment, everything." This was in downtown Los Angeles. They said, "Oh, yes, everything's in there." Then we whip out the magazine. "Then why is the clock for sale in this railroad magazine?" So, we had lots of good times about it. We were calling up, trying to talk to

this person who's selling this clock, and finding out who they are and why it wasn't in the building we were buying because we were supposed to get it along with it.

MS: It's a great story. What about the effects of Pier 300, Pier 400 in San Pedro, as far as expanding and changing the nature of port activities more toward container and that kind of thing? Could you talk a bit about that in historical context?

GK: Right. When I first came on at the ports, container terminals were sort of a new thing. If you had a 35- or 50-acre container terminal, that was fabulous. But as time went on and the business grew, the companies were looking for 100-acre terminals. We thought, "Oh." So, at both ports, we were trying to rearrange things. These ports were never built to handle container ships. They were built with piers. The ships came up along the side. You offloaded things. The longshoremen took the stuff into the back land. So, there weren't these big sort of parking lots that you needed for the container facilities. So, we were trying to amass large land areas. In order to do that, we had to change the actual configuration of the port. We had to change the way it looked. So, a lot of those piers that had water areas, the slips in between, and the water area, we filled those. We created those – we turned those water areas into land. What we needed really were what were called marginal wharfs, where the ship would come up along the wharf. Then you have this sort of large, open area, sort of parking lot behind it. You could offload the containers and have these wide areas. So, consistent with the 2020 Plan, we were going to create a lot of new, large land areas in the outer harbor. Here's where the two ports kind of diverged a little bit. Los Angeles set about building Pier 300, and that was made with dredge material from the main channel dredging, and then after that, Pier 400, which was the big island in the outer harbor. On the other side, Long Beach had a couple of other opportunities. First of all, people don't realize, but San Pedro Bay really sat on one of the largest oil fields in the United States. In the 1940s, 1950s, the Wilmington oil field was the third largest field in the continental United States. So, oil was big here. Especially on the Long Beach side, there was a lot of land area that was privately held by the Union Pacific Resources Corporation. One of those companies under that big corporation was the company that really managed the oil fields and owned the oil fields, along with Union Pacific Railroad. So, one of the things Long Beach did was they bought the Wilmington oil field from Union Pacific Resources Company. So, all of a sudden they had over 700 acres of new land that they could develop. It was contaminated, but they had that. Then a little bit later, kind of about the same time in the United States, the military was going through the base closure process. So, the Long Beach Naval Station was shutting down. So, that provided another opportunity for Long Beach to develop – to get some major big chunks of land, which is what they needed for container facilities. On the Los Angeles side, it was pretty much those facilities were created through the process of dredging and landfilling, which is how most of the ports was created, how most of Terminal Island was created.

MS: Now you've got this new world of the environmental world. Dredging is not simply an engineering challenge anymore. Yet you're needing it for the big new ships coming in. You're recycling that soil to build the Pier 400s, yet you have nice environmental component to it. Talk about that element of it, the combination of opportunity and challenge that way.

GK: Right. So, during the [19]70s, a lot of focus on development of the port was on dredging and landfilling, scooping up the harbor bottom, and in doing that, you sort of kill everything

that's in it, and then use it to create land areas. So, you take water areas, and you create them into land. So, it had an impact on habitats. So, one of the things that was necessary is, okay, we have to mitigate for that. Now, in a lot of port areas around the country, they had difficulty doing this process. But one thing that was unique about California was we had the California Coastal Act. The Coastal Protection Law is very strong in California, but it was equally as strong in protecting certain areas along the coast for harbor facilities. So, even though people may have wanted the water area to preserve just for marine habitats, the Coastal Act put a high priority on port facilities. Even though in the Long Beach side, people wanted maybe the Navy gym and all of those recreational facilities for the general public, the Coastal Act put a priority on port facilities. So, we were able to get through the process of dredging and landfilling. As long as we could get an Army Corps of Engineers permit, we were able to go forward and do that. So, we had advantages that, say, some other port areas didn't have. That still meant, though, we had to do this thing called mitigation, which is mitigate for the impact on habitats. So, that raised another major issue, that policy issue that San Pedro Bay had to deal with, and that was mitigating outside the port jurisdictional boundaries. So, one of the things that the port used to say is, well, once they got into it, once they agreed that, "Okay, we have to mitigate now," then they said, "But we can't mitigate. We can't spend money outside our jurisdictional boundary." So, actually, those discussions were happening in Los Angeles at that time. They were not very fruitful with the management. I left then and went to Long Beach. It was really my first day on the job at Long Beach. The Fish and Wildlife Service called me and said, "Okay. Now that you're there, let's see if we can get this going on the Long Beach side," spending the money outside the boundaries and doing an offsite mitigation. So, at Long Beach, we developed the first offsite mitigation project. We made a contribution to the restoration of the Back Bay Harbor in Newport Beach, down off Jamboree Road. We contributed a million dollars to a project down there that kind of opened the door on off-site mitigation for sort of both ports. At that time, State Lands Commission was saying, "You do that, we're going to sue you." It's like, "Okay. Go ahead." We went and did the project and followed it with a restoration in Anaheim Bay, the Seal Beach Naval Weapons Station. We went in, did a restoration there of over 100 acres. So, by then, all of a sudden, that kind of started the whole thing about offsite mitigation. Los Angeles then developed the Batiquitos Lagoon project, which was the largest restoration and kind of raised the mark in creating an endowment fund for the perpetual rest – really the perpetual maintenance of the restoration. So, not only then did we just go and do the restoration, we created money. We set up a fund so that the restoration could be maintained in perpetuity. One of the issues State Lands Commission had was, if you're spending port money, trust revenues, for the benefit of the state, to do this restoration, you have to make sure that it is maintained in perpetuity for the benefit of the citizens of the state of California. So, Los Angeles established the first fund for perpetual maintenance in the Batiquitos project.

MS: Another question is, here's this port very near, butting head-to-head with the community of San Pedro. Talk about the dynamics in all aspects, environmental, economic jobs, physical, real estate. What is the dynamic between the port and the city of San Pedro? What's the complexity of that? Give us a little bit of the history of that and bringing us to understanding that relationship.

GK: Yes. The dynamic with the surrounding community is a very interesting one. It has many facets. There are so many people in town that work in the harbor. So, there's a real connection

to the harbor. But equally as important, there are those that live in town that view the harbor as its blight. Early on, it was really the sort of biologists that got involved, and a lot of folks who had a marine biology bent, they lived in San Pedro. That was the community that we worked with. One of the first projects that I remember getting involved with in the [19]70s was the redevelopment of the West Channel Cabrillo Beach area. There was a storm drain discharge there that created a very small wetland out there. So, you know, even back in the [19]70s, was the desire to protect any of the wetland area, protect any of the habitat area. So, a lot of the focus was on the biological habitats. When the port, in the [19]70s, tried to encroach into the community and take down Knoll Hill, which is one of the ancestral hills along the bluff, they really ran into a buzzsaw. I can remember Bill Samaras, who was a teacher and a paleontologist, taking a group of us on a field trip and showing us Knoll Hill and showing this whole thing is just filled with fossils. So, again, it was, okay, here's another issue that we're sort of running into the community. Then in the [19]70s, the Port of Los Angeles did another bold thing. They went out and created a Citizens Advisory Committee to work with them and plan the West Channel Cabrillo Beach area. Pete Mandia, who lives in town, was the person – he was in the Planning Department at that time – who was tasked with heading that effort up. I was kind of the port environmentalist. It was unique in that we went out there, the lower Fort MacArthur area, the military property, had been turned back over to the city. So, we had to plan for all that area. It was unique in that we went out to community and said, "Okay. We've got this big land area. What are we going to do with it?" We didn't go out with, "Here's our plan. Do you like it? How do you want to tweak it?" It was like, "Gosh, here's this land area." We started from a blank slate. Honestly, that's really the best way to start. When you start with a blank slate, you get everybody's input, and you design it from the bottom up. It was a very rewarding experience. They developed a plan that the community really supported. Actually, it was kind of interesting. They did most of the project except the piece over in the area known as Watchorn Basin, the West Channel marina. So, it was interesting to come back in 2006 and find, like, what? You didn't finish that piece yet? The port had been in negotiation for seven years with a potential operator to do that project. So, sometimes the community was like, "Hey, how long do we have to wait for these things?" So, one of the first issues that was laid in my lap is do something with it this. We sort of cut off those negotiations. They were not fruitful. We said, "We're going to take this project on ourselves. We're going to deliver on the project." But as a result of things like the *Sansinena,* there was a risk management plan put in place that required that the hazardous facilities get relocated from the community, away, either to an island out in the harbor – they called it Energy Island – so that you don't have these areas where people could be impacted if there's an explosion at the facility. So, over a period of time, a lot of those facilities either went out of business, their leases came up, the port did not renew the leases, but the energy island never got built. So, the few that remain, and one which has been a sore point with the community over many years, wasteways, which is right along the West Channel area. I came over at the time that there was a lot of community concern about, "This energy island has never been built. This wasteway facility has never been moved. You promised you were going to get rid of it." So, these were plans that had been promised in the early [19]80s that never had been followed through. So, of course, you come in new, and it's like, people are unhappy [laughter] because of these things. So, the previous administration tried to work through that process. I'm happy to say that actually next week at our board meeting, we're going to announce the final document's done, that that company will vacate in 18 months. Now we have an area that we can look at and replan for uses that are more appropriate for along the waterfront. It's an area where

I'd like to move the academic research facilities. When I worked here in the [19]70s, you had some neat research vessels that came into this port. The *Glomar Explorer* would come in and Howard Hughes's ship and all this other stuff. Universities back then would have these big research vessels. USC had the big *Valero IV* research vessel. They'd take these big research trips. Even when I was at USC in the early [19]70s, we'd go out to sea for days at a time. Unfortunately, universities can't afford those research vessels to keep them up. We still have a lot of research vessels in the harbor, and those things are cool to look at. They're kind of neat to walk by and see that activity going on. So, those are the kinds of things that people are attracted to the waterfront and like to see then. So, I'd like to get those in those areas. But we'll have a perfect area for it once we are able to remove some of the more industrial uses from the harbor. So, a lot of promises made, not kept. Wilmington, I think a recognition now, things were put in place before I came here to, hey, we need a buffer in Wilmington. We need to start delivering to Wilmington. So, I'm committed to doing that and carrying out some of those projects.

MS: For the transcriber, please say your name again and spell it.

GK: My name is Geraldine Knatz, G-E-R-A-L-D-I-N-E. Last name is K-N-A-T-Z.

MS: Great. A couple of areas. One is we were talking about this idea of a green port. Please introduce us to the concept of green port and why that's so important for San Pedro.

GK: Well, the concept of green port means that the port incorporates sustainability into its operations, its development plans. I mean, basically, we want to make sure that we're taking care of the environment, preserving it for future generations. In the current situation right here now in San Pedro Bay, we have a little of catch up to do. In other words, we already are having an impact on the community, especially in the area of air quality. So as part of becoming a green port, we've developed the Clean Air Action Plan to really aggressively try and reduce the level of emissions that we have out there. Allow the port to grow, but really have emissions going down while growth is going up.

MS: We talked a little bit about this but, again, the idea, here's a community very close to this port, which is a very important port, which has business to do. How do you balance the people who would like to stroll the promenade and have some fish and chips versus the needs in real estate and equipment and traffic of a port? How do you balance that? Is that an issue.

GK: I think a way to balance the growth that industry needs and the atmosphere that the general public and those that live close in San Pedro is by doing both but doing it through good land use planning. I mean, consciously making the decision to say, "This part of the port is going to be for public use access. It's the closest to the community. This is not where we put heavy industry." We have developed a new land use plan, and the focus for all of the heavy industrial areas will be on Terminal Island, which is further away from the public, and in certain areas of Wilmington that are not very close to the community. Where we are close to the community in Wilmington, we've taken land area, 30 acres, that was ultimately at one point, going to be developed into container terminal. We're turning that back to the public and creating green space that will buffer the community from the more industrialized areas of the port.

MS: Now, is this port unique in relationship with other ports? I know the ports usually are big industrial complexes, and they don't really care much about their environment. This is different here. How does the Port of Los Angeles compare to other major ports around the world as far as its relationship with the local communities and how it does business?

GK: There are other ports around the world that experience some of the same problems that we have here at the Port of Los Angeles in terms of community living close to the port. But there are other ports that have developed wonderful waterfronts where the people come down. They look at the port activity, and they find it very fascinating. So, there's some negatives associated with it, but it's also a major draw. Interestingly, as I travel around the world, I meet with other port executive directors who are doing the same sorts of things that we are doing. So, the big ports, the big urban ports all around the world are really experiencing the same sort of problem.

MS: Now, also, something we never really clarified, if you can, even with numbers or whatever, put the Port of Los Angeles in international and national context. What's its importance? Give us some numerical basis to judge it.

GK: The Port of Los Angeles is considered the number one port in the United States. That means we're judging by the number of containers that move through the port. In the world, if you take Los Angeles and Long Beach and look at it as a port complex, we are number five in the world, so the fifth largest port complex in the world. Interestingly enough, up until about two years ago, we were the third largest port complex in the world, behind Hong Kong and Singapore. But since that time, ports in China are growing very rapidly. Shanghai and Shenzhen have now gotten bigger than San Pedro Bay. So, now, we have been dropped down to the number five position.

MS: What is the importance of the port to America? What is its significance for the American economy?

GK: Oh, the Port of Los Angeles and San Pedro Bay ports, together, we are really the nation's port. Over 40 percent of all the containerized goods that come into the United States come through this port complex. So, really, you can go to every state in the nation, and you've got really something, some connection to the Port of Los Angeles. As a matter of fact, we recently completed a major study where we looked at every congressional district in the continental United States. Well, even, we have a relationship with Hawaii and Alaska as well. We've been able to identify the value of goods moving through our port that actually are destined or some way connected with every congressional district in the entire country.

MS: Going back and looking at history, as best you know it, what were the big turning points in the last hundred years, do you think, in the history of this port?

GK: Well, about fifty years ago, containerization was developed. Those ports that really moved quickly into the containerization business became the ports that are the successful ones today. Many of the other smaller ports in California or along the West Coast are what we call niche ports. They specialize in a particular commodity or different types of goods, like breakbulk cargo. Port of Hueneme, for example, handles automobiles and handles fruit and does the kinds

of operations that the Port of Los Angeles did historically but which, over time, has sort of been pushed out because the containerized operation needs such large land areas.

MS: That's the next question. My impression is you've been creating land through dredging in the past, but that's running short too. Is there a limit to how much physically this port can grow and change?

GK: There is definitely a limit on how much this port can grow. We say today that we average a little over five thousand containers per acre per year in terms of the land area we have devoted to containers. There's probably not much more new land that can be created in Los Angeles. However, we do believe that at some point, we'll be able to move ten thousand containers per acre per year. That's basically doubling capacity. That's utilizing the land you have now more efficiently, twice as efficiently as we do today. There's technology out there that can allow that to happen.

MS: So, basically, these are going to be efficiency elements that are going to allow the port to grow and change. But it's not going to be physical, not going to be facilities anymore.

GK: Exactly. We're really going to expand in the future not by acquiring more property or building more property. It's going to be using the assets we have and using them more efficiently.

MS: The other question, which is the growth of China and the East, I assume from the founding of Los Angeles, they talked about its relationship to Asia trade. Well, now it's really real. What do you think the future is, related to – the Port of Los Angeles – to the changing global economy is going to be?

GK: When I went back and I read the minutes of the early board meetings in 1907, this board talked about – they wanted to get the Army Corps of Engineers out here. They held this big meeting, and they talked about a description of the role the port would play. They emphasized things like China in that description, 100 years ago. It was phenomenal. I can read that paragraph today and say that still holds true. The vision that those first commissioners had; came about, and we see that the importance of the port will not change over time. It will become even more important. I think what will happen around the United States is that other port areas will also become important. I think you have to look at Charleston and Savannah being what Los Angeles and Long Beach is today, especially if the big locks project in the Panama Canal goes forward. I support that project. I support all port projects because at some point, we're going to need more capacity all around the country.

MS: That's interesting about 1906. So, looking at the future, as far as relation to the China trade, is that going to be effective particularly or have impact on Los Angeles particularly? Or as you say, is it going to affect ports like Charleston? Are we going to be the primary beneficiary of this? Or are others going to benefit from it just as much?

GK: I think we'll continue to be the primary beneficiary. But China is so big. They're really at the sort of beginning in terms of their demand for goods coming from this country, in terms of

the exports that we have going into that country, and also the fact that our demand is increasing here. We forecast that that is going to continue to happen that I think all ports are probably going to benefit from this. But Los Angeles – and it was recognized 100 years ago – we have the benefit of this location. You can't say it enough, location, location, location. Then the fabulous weather, it's a great place to do business. You've got other ports around the country where they're impacted by the weather. So, we don't have that situation. But our location is really what gave us the advantage. I'd like to say it's the great (map?)

MS: You talked about the expansion of the Panama Canal, but one of the concepts that was sort of innovative about Los Angeles, the Port of Los Angeles, was this idea of a land bridge. Can you give me a sense of the history of that and what that is and what impact it's had on the success of the port?

GK: I think, back in the 1970s, some of the planners here at Los Angeles recognized what we call the land bridge, which means that cargo that comes in through Los Angeles, containerized cargo, gets put on a train here and then is taken to the East Coast, really east of the Rocky Mountains. When it gets to the East Coast, it could be put on a ship again and then taken over to Europe. It was determined that that was a fast way to move cargo. It was faster and maybe in some ways, cheaper than taking it through the Panama Canal to get it from Asia to Europe. So, the first intermodal container transportation facility, the concept for that started in the early [19]70s because of a planner here, our planning director at that time, who envisioned that land bridge was going to be really important. So, we sort of stuck our necks out and developed that first offsite intermodal container yard. It obviously has proven to be a very fortuitous move. That also helped solidify Los Angeles' position because we have fabulous rail facilities. It is really our competitive advantage to other port areas on the West Coast, say, like the Bay Area or the Pacific Northwest.

MS: Tell me again about this intermodal transportation. What was the concept behind it? What's the history of its development? What did it contribute to the port?

GK: Yes. About fifty years ago, a man in New Jersey, Malcolm McLean, came up with the idea of moving containers. He had a ship that was a modified tanker. It was called the *Ideal X*. He put about fifty containers on it and moved it from Port Newark, south to one of the other ports, I can't remember where, in the South Atlantic. It was the first time containers had ever been moved by ship. Then they were then offloaded and then handled by trucks. So, that really started the whole containerization movement. It was basically, you pack your goods. You keep them in the same unit, and that same unit moves on different modes of transportation. So, it's the same unit as on the ship. It can go on a truck, or it can go on a train. So, that is what really has facilitated the expansion of some of the ports in the United States, that they can handle that intermodal cargo.

MS: What is the history of that idea here? Give us a sense of how it got established here and the commitment the port made to apply those kinds of ideas here.

GK: So, once that containerization was proven it could work, Los Angeles picked up on that and really started modifying their facilities, developing containerized facilities for some of the first

steamship companies that went into that business. That has really driven our development plan since the very early times, so I'd say probably the early 1970s. It's been the drive towards amassing these larger land areas, where you can develop container facilities that has led to the port's growth. We had enough space to do that. San Pedro Bay was kind of big, wide-open spaces. We had water area that could be converted into land, which could be used to create these facilities.

MS: Do you know the history of the intermodal transit center, when it was built?

GK: The ICTF?

MS: The ICTF, yes.

GK: The ICTF –

MS: You have to explain what that is.

GK: Yes. I'm thinking –

MS: Tell me what it is, too.

GK: Yes. I worked on the EIR. It was finished in 1981. I'm trying to think. It may be opened in about [19]83. I'm not sure exactly. Okay. The Intermodal Container Transfer Facility, which was the first off-dock rail yard which was developed jointly by the Port of Los Angeles and the Port of Long beach on property owned by the Port of Los Angeles, was developed in the early 1980s. At that time, it was a very unique project. We developed it outside of our boundaries. It was really to facilitate rail movement. We worked in cooperation with, at that time, the Southern Pacific Railroad, to develop that facility. Not all the railroads at that time wanted to join on the project. Even though they were invited, they chose not to. But it was very successful. So, now, today, here we are in 2007 and Burlington Northern has come to us and said, "Hey, we need an intermodal container transfer facility, too. Because the original one was so successful. We developed on-dock rail facilities as well to try and accommodate moving more of the cargo out of the port facilities on rail. Ultimately, we hope that at least 30, even more, percent of our cargo will move out of this port complex on rail.

MS: We talked about the limits of size of the port. Isn't there another limit? The impression you get with increasing containerization is that the ships are going to get bigger and carrying more containers and having deeper drafts and all that. If these monster ships start being developed, is that going to be a limitation for the Port of Los Angeles?

GK: I don't think anyone can really predict how big the container ships are going to get. At this point, we feel like 10,000 to 12,000 TEUs are probably the largest ships that could be handled in San Pedro Bay. We've had vessels in here that really are larger than 9,000 TEUs or 20-foot equivalent unit. That's the container box that's on the ship. The ship designers tell us that once you get beyond a 12,000 TEU vessel, you're basically talking about a twin-screw ship. In other words, it needs to have two engines. Whether the economies of scale in terms of the movement

of the containers by ship can warrant a ship bigger than that, that can handle the two engines and pay for the cost of that kind of ship, whether that is economically feasible, I can't really answer that question.

MS: I lost my train of thought for a second.

GK: Were you trying to get the channel depths in terms of handling bigger ships?

MS: Well, yes, you've got some limitations there.

GK: Right.

MS: Dredging has been the savior for the port for a long time, historically, I mean, from day one really. Talk about the history of dredging and what role it played in the port from its beginning to the present and the possible future.

GK: The history of the Port of Los Angeles is really the history of the dredging and landfilling process that started very early in this port to try and create the channels that we have today. So, we've just recently completed another major deepening project. Our channels are essentially 50, 55 feet of water, which is what you need to handle the largest container ships that are afloat today. As container ships get bigger, they are not really getting deeper. They are getting longer and wider, which then creates another challenge for ports. Because you have to get the ship in the channel, then you have to turn them, and you have to get them out. So, what we're finding is that draft, the depth of your channel, may not be the limiting factor in the future. It may be the width of the channel and the size of your turning basins. Because we may be able to make our channels deeper, but in order to make your channel wider, you'd have to take out all the businesses that are operating there today. There's no way that a port could do that. So, you're pretty much going to be limited by your channel width and your turning basin. At facilities like Pier 400 and Pier 300, which are in the outer harbor, you don't have those constraints because you're out – you've got sort of open-water area to move the ships. But in the inner parts of the port, it's going to be the channel width and the size of our turning basins that limit our use of those facilities in the future. We're already experiencing that with the cruise ships, which are getting too big to get under the Vincent Thomas Bridge, getting too long to turn in our turning basin in order to be able to exit the port.

MS: That's another question you just reminded me of, the future of Vincent Thomas Bridge. We're talking about widening that. Is that going to come down in order to widen it, or can you do that and keep it in place?

GK: We look at these bridges, and we have done a very long look at the future of the bridge. The engineers will tell you that that bridge may not be adequate for the future. So, I don't think we'll look at taking down Vincent Thomas Bridge. I think you look at how can you add new capacity, and the new capacity could be a bridge next to it or widening the existing bridge. You look at all of those different things. I think it would have a major impact on the land facilities on both sides. Whether we do that, I think that's an open question. I think if you just look at volume, you could say you could justify a new bridge. But whether you want to do it in terms of

the impact on the land facility, what it does to the waterfront plan, that's a totally different question. We haven't looked at that yet. I don't think there's a need to really look that far into the future for some of those things. Because most of the heavy truck traffic is going north. It's not going back and forth between Terminal Island and downtown San Pedro. It's really going north from Terminal Island to downtown Los Angeles, north and east.

MS: This is jumping back to history again.

GK: There's really another comment I'd like to say on that last issue. Another thing, when that study was looked at for the Vincent Thomas Bridge and whether what we need to do – what we need to do with it in the future, that was before we really undertook a much broader look at technology. So, there's other technology for moving containers that might come into play that might affect whether or not you need to even modify the bridges, at least the Vincent Thomas Bridge. So, I think some of the other bridges need to be improved now in order to handle the business that we have now and in the near future. But because the Vincent Thomas Bridge is a long-term strategy, I think we really need to look at how some of those other technologies come into play.

MS: Now, I realize you're not a historian, and this may be an unfair question. But from your point of view, from what you know about the history of the port, who are the people from its earliest days, individuals that you think left major marks on – I know it's a hard question. You can leave somebody out. But, I mean, keep it to a small list. Go back [inaudible] –

GK: Yes. Let me think.

MS: – Stephen White, if you want to. Who are the people that, historically, should have their names forever –

GK: Yes. Phineas Banning would be one. I'm reading through the board's history [laughter] going forward on their minutes. You can see a lot of the key players. I think it would probably be the people that I couldn't even identify who saw the need to move into containerization, the executive directors at that time. I'm sure probably there's so many. I could even say our board president now, David Freeman, in having the broader view of looking at energy and looking at technology. I'd hate to leave people out.

[talking simultaneously]

MS: [inaudible] On a personal note, you're at this job for a little over a year now.

GK: Right.

MS: What do you think you would like to contribute to this long history? Where do you see yourself leaving your mark on this hundred-year history, so when 100 years from now, people look back at your term and say, "That's what she did here"?

GK: I think in terms of legacy I would like to leave for the Port of Los Angeles is the fact that

we've been able to address our impacts on the community, that we've been able to tackle the health risk issue. We've been able to really grow and green the port and make it sustainable. I have a vision that people will be able to come down and experience 16 miles of – gosh.

MS: Start again.

GK: Yes. I have a vision that I'd like to leave the port with, which is that people can come to the waterfront and have 16 miles of waterfront that they can view, and they can travel along and walk along. That is an uninterrupted promenade along the waterfront. So, I'd like to really do that. I'd like to have the appearance of the port to be much improved than what it is today. I want people to come to the waterfront edge and say, "Wow, it looks fabulous." Because we really spruced up. I believe you can have industry, and you can have landscaping. It can look attractive. So, that's one of the things. I also want to leave a legacy of making sure that the first hundred years of our history is preserved and restored and taken care of for the future. Not only the historic buildings that we're responsible for, that we have the right guidelines in place to take care of them. Our archives and all of those things are preserved. Our photographs have been damaged in the more recent history. They haven't been taken care of properly. I want to make sure that they're protected. Lastly, for the employees, I think that not enough attention has been given to our employees themselves, the facilities they occupy. I want to get things in place. Maybe you don't carry it all out. But you set things in place to ensure that when you leave, those things have to be carried out. It's the same way with having a sustainable land use plan. I want to have a land use plan that carries beyond, from executive director to executive director, that you make the right land use decisions. You put things in the right place. So, they're not these festering issues that the community argues over for generations and generations. Let's fix it. Let's get it done. Let's get everybody in the right place, and let's keep them there. Then we go forward.

MS: Last question. Why should we care about the history? We have this rapidly growing port, future-oriented, really. Why should we care about the last hundred years of the Port of Los Angeles?

GK: We have to care about the history of the Port of Los Angeles. Because in going back, in my reviewing the things that those early commissioners and the staff worked on, it's the same issues that we're dealing with today, the growth, how are we going to expand, the economic development. It was remarkable when you saw those types of issues, the battles with the railroads, the struggles – we're just doing those same things. They never end. So, you can learn by history. You can learn by looking at what they're doing. You can appreciate the efforts that they did and that you're carrying out that legacy that was set in motion a hundred years ago.

MS: Beyond that – and this is a little self-serving because I'm hoping we can interest a wider audience about this – why should someone in New York or Chicago or Paris or London care about the history of San Pedro and the Port of Los Angeles? Why should this history be of interest to anyone else outside the circle of the port and outside the circle of Los Angeles?

GK: I think this history of San Pedro Bay and the Port of Los Santa Angeles has to be of interest to every citizen in this nation because this port developed to serve all of them. If it wasn't for us,

they wouldn't have all their stuff that they have, where they live, where they work. When they go home tonight and they take off their clothes, they need to look at every label that's on their clothes. I can guarantee that they're wearing something that came through the Port of Los Angeles.

MS: I guess I'm going to push a little bit more.

GK: Okay.

MS: The history of the Lower East Side in New York, the history of the Port of New York, these are looked upon as international stories. Los Angeles is somewhat a newcomer to the historical perspective of the country and of the world. Yet this is, in many ways, in the future, is going to be even more increasingly valuable as history. So, I'm not just talking about the port. I'm talking about the community. Why should someone outside of Los Angeles, outside of San Pedro – what is that history going to contribute to their understanding of –

GK: I'm not sure I have a good answer to that question. I can understand why they need to relate to why we're so important to them. The history led us to where we are today. But why would they be interested in the history? It's so fascinating, the things that people did, the people that were here, those early pioneers and the role that Los Angeles had in transportation, not just –

MS: A lot of people say Los Angeles is a city without a history. You and I know that's not true.

GK: Oh, yes. Right.

MS: It's only been true because people haven't taken the time to think about it. Now we're the second largest city, the number one port in the country. Well, gee, isn't there some history there [laughter]?

GK: Yes. Right. Well, I mean, the whole transportation industry – and it goes beyond the maritime. It goes into aviation and everything. When you look at what happened in Southern California and the Los Angeles area, transportation history is Los Angeles history, and the railroads and in the maritime and in aviation. There's all important facets of it that happened here in the LA area. But I don't know that I can see much more than that.

MS: Anything else you wanted to mention that we didn't have a chance to talk about?

GK: I'm sure I'll think of a bazillion things tonight.

MS: Well, that's okay. We can always come back to you.

GK: Yes. Right. Let me think a minute.

MS: Go ahead.

GK: We are making history today by the things that we're doing today. The far-reaching look to

technology, the look at how we're going to generate our own power in the port, the look at how we're going to move containers on some clean system that doesn't have any impact on the community, the things we're doing today, people, a hundred years in the future will look back on and say, "Wow. Those people made history back then." So, I think we're making history today.

MS: That's a pretty good ending [laughter].

GK: Okay. Good.

MS: Great. Good.

GK: All right.

[end of transcript]