Big Ship Ready

2012 was the year of ‘big ships’ at the Port of Long Beach. On September 30, 2012, the **MSC Beatrice** (pictured on cover) at 1,200 feet long, 167 feet wide and capable of carrying 13,798 container units docked at Long Beach’s Pier T on Terminal Island. It is one of the first of what is expected to be a string of larger container ships to be deployed by ocean carriers in Pacific Rim routes. Before 2012, the largest container ships serving North America had capacities of about 10,000 container units.

Larger ships are more cost effective for ocean carriers and reduce impacts on the environment by decreasing diesel consumption. However, few ports in the world have navigation channels deep enough to handle these massive ships. With a main channel at 76 feet deep—the deepest in North America, the Port of Long Beach is ‘big ship ready’. The Port of Long Beach is investing $4.5 billion over the next decade to modernize its facilities. Projects include the construction of the Middle Harbor terminal, the world’s greenest and most technologically advanced container terminal, and the replacement of the Gerald Desmond Bridge with a higher span that will allow larger ships to reach the back channels.
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**ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAPA</td>
<td>American Association of Port Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMP</td>
<td>Air Quality Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATB</td>
<td>articulated tug and barge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF</td>
<td>Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSFC</td>
<td>brake specific fuel consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTH</td>
<td>Business Transportation and Housing Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BW</td>
<td>breakwater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAAP</td>
<td>Clean Air Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARB</td>
<td>California Air Resources Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td>California Energy Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>control factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHE</td>
<td>cargo handling equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH₄</td>
<td>methane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>carbon monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂</td>
<td>carbon dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO₂E</td>
<td>carbon dioxide equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>dynamic braking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>deterioration factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMV</td>
<td>Department of Motor Vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>diesel oxidation catalyst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF</td>
<td>diesel particulate filter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPM</td>
<td>diesel particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>deterioration rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTR</td>
<td>Drayage Truck Registry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWT</td>
<td>deadweight tonnage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECA</td>
<td>Emission control area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEAI</td>
<td>Energy and Environmental Analysis, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>emission factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>emissions inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCF</td>
<td>fuel correction factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/bhp-hr</td>
<td>grams per brake horsepower-hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/hr</td>
<td>grams per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g/kW-hr</td>
<td>grams per kilowatt-hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{10}$</td>
<td>particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM$_{2.5}$</td>
<td>particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLA</td>
<td>Port of Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLB</td>
<td>Port of Long Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PZ</td>
<td>precautionary zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reefer</td>
<td>refrigerated vessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFID</td>
<td>radio frequency identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>rail locomotive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>residual oil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rpm</td>
<td>revolutions per minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>Regulatory Support Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTG</td>
<td>rubber tired gantry crane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>sulfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFC</td>
<td>specific fuel consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoCAB</td>
<td>South Coast Air Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO$_x$</td>
<td>oxides of sulfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>Stevedoring Services of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEU</td>
<td>twenty-foot equivalent unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpd</td>
<td>tons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpy</td>
<td>tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>technical working group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULCC</td>
<td>ultra large crude carriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULSD</td>
<td>ultra low sulfur diesel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UP</td>
<td>Union Pacific Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USCG</td>
<td>U.S Coast Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBP</td>
<td>vessel boarding program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLCC</td>
<td>very large crude carrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLCS</td>
<td>very large cargo ship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT</td>
<td>vehicle miles of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSR</td>
<td>vessel speed reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VTS</td>
<td>vessel traffic service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZH</td>
<td>zero hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZMR</td>
<td>zero mile rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>