Meeting called to order by Dave Behar at 6:40pm and roll call taken. In attendance: Dave Behar (Co-Chair), Linda Alexander (Co-Chair), Olive Reed (stakeholder), Grant Reed (HCNC voting member), Frank Anderson (Central voting member), Phil Nicolay (NWSPNC voting member), Rohan Sourjah (HCNC alternate), Peter Warren (Coastal alternate), James Dimon (stakeholder), Tina Graham (stakeholder), Mike Brown (Coastal voting member), Khixaan Obioma-Sakhu (stakeholder), Pat Nave (stakeholder), Carlos Garcia (stakeholder), James Allen (stakeholder), Carrie Scoville (Central alternate), Dean Pentcheff (stakeholder) and Kristina Smith (note taker).

Rotating chairs for future meetings is being considered.

Public Comment:
- Peter Warren commented that a better location is needed for the meetings as they become more popular. We need to create in liaison with our neighborhood councils and make sure that the public sees the agendas.
- James Allen: Questioned the posting procedures and requested that an agenda be posted publicly.
- Pat Nave: Commented that the NCPAC is similar to the HANC and is therefore does not need to be Brown Act compliant.
- James Allen responded that the group was created by legislative action of neighborhood councils (NC’s) and the NC’s derive their empowerment from the City Council through DONE. Therefore the posting requirements would be inherited.
- Carrie Scoville: At the last meeting the group voted to have only one voting member per neighborhood council and one alternate. However, since the group currently has no bylaws, a quorum has not been established.
- James Dimon: Everyone is here because they care about the community. The group needs to keep their personal agendas aside and use the intelligence of the group to accomplish something and keep away from personal agendas. (Seeing that the Coastal SPNC was represented, Mr. Dimon left the meeting).
- Dave Behar: This is a working group.

Consideration of Motion:
- Motion requesting approval from each Neighborhood Council participating in the NCPAC to evenly share in the cost of Administrative Fees at $125 per month retroactively to June 2014 ($375 per NC) for posting/emailing agendas, taking meeting minutes and maintaining NCPAC files.
- Motion to amend by Mike Brown to change the amount to $450 per neighborhood council per year. Seconded by Grant Reed. Motion to amend passed by 4 votes
Confirm NCPAC Mission Statement:
The mission statement adopted at the last meeting was reviewed. It read as follows: “The mission of the Neighborhood Council Port Affairs Committee (NCPAC) is to review and comment on Port of Los Angeles projects affecting the waterfront community.

The NCPAC will regularly liaise with the POLA Environmental Management Division throughout its stages of proposed projects, from a pre-CEQA publication stage to project finalization and mitigation condition oversight. It is expected that the official spokesperson of this committee shall have regular standing on BOHC agendas, and that the Port of LA will support this committee’s efforts with the free exchange of information necessary to investigate and optimize community impacts.”

Peter Warren felt that the mission statement takes a step back from what was previously established with the PCAC. He would suggest a short amendment to include after the word projects in the first sentence the following “and cumulative port impacts affecting the waterfront community.”

After discussion the amendment to the Mission Statement by Peter Warren was approved with a vote of 3 yes, 1 no.

Motion by Carrie Scoville to amend the first sentence to remove the word “waterfront”. Motion seconded by Grant and passed with a vote of 4 yes, 0 no.

Motion to amend by Carrie Scoville to have the first sentence as the mission statement and remove the second paragraph in its entirety. Motion to amend seconded by Frank Anderson and passed with 4 yes, 0 no. Motion as amended passed with 4 yes, 0 no.

The mission statement as adopted by the NCPAC at this meeting read as follows: “The mission of Neighborhood Council Port Affairs Committee (NCPAC) is to review and comment on Port of Los Angeles projects and cumulative port impacts affecting the community.”

The use of the second paragraph as part of procedural verbiage will be addressed at a future meeting.

Review list of POLA projects: Phil Nicolay went over the list of Port’s Capital Improvement Projects.

- Terminal Redevelopment, lease pending, an EIR will be generated.
- YTI 221-224 redevelopment is about 60% complete. November 16, 2014 it will be on the Board of Harbor Commissioners’ Agenda. A final EIR will come out for review 30 days before a public meeting.
- Evergreen, 226-236 Terminal Improvements, Planning and Environmental is on hold pending the finalization of the business deal by the Port.
- APL – has a lot of little projects but it is waiting for the tenant to decide what they want to go forward with before they spend the money.
• MOTEMS is the legislation for the tanks – lease pending. No EIR’s will probably be generated.
• LA Container Terminal 206-209. On hold.
• Counterpart to the DSNF Railyard.
• Ports O’Call. An agreement between the developer and the Port has not yet been signed.
• Yankovich is being moved but should not require an EIR.

Pat Nave commented on $300 million in infrastructure improvements which the Port promised. The Northwest San Pedro NC has been submitting comments.

Sampson Way Project: Money has been allocated to continue the design.

James Allen would like to see the Neighborhood Council Port Committees bring their motions to the NCPAC so that other NC’s can also support such a motion.

Carlos Garcia: the logistics of how the NC’s would coordinate this would need to be worked out.

Carrie Scoville: Commented that there are many more projects that may need to be looked at besides the Capital Improvement Projects. NC’s individually would need to do Council File actions. We need to prioritizing projects. Other projects include:

• Joint planning documents
• Altasea Project
• Energy Project
• NC’s need to take a position on the EIR for the Boy Scout camp.

Carlos Garcia: Commented on the CIP and the projections. $75 million left over is projected at end of 2013-2014 year. What are they going to do with the money? Where does it go? What investments will be made into beautification efforts?

Other comments included:

• Give each NC’s port committee a chance to prioritize a list and then bring it back to this group. (Kristina to combine all of the information from Phil and Carrie into one list for each NC Port Committee to prioritize).
• Keep the NCPAC co-chairs as they are right now. Suggestion to do third Tuesday as a meeting date.
• Next Agenda: Prioritization of the list. Invite a port official. Next meeting date was suggested to be Tuesday the 16th of September.

Meeting Adjourned at 7:33pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristina Smith