

<p style="text-align: center;">TRANSCRIPT OF PROJECT PRESENTATION AND FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS RE: LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PETROLEUM CLUB 3636 LINDEN AVENUE LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA DECEMBER 5, 2005 6:14 P.M.</p> <p>MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143 05-268</p> <p style="text-align: right;">1</p>	<p>1 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2005; 2 6:14 P.M. 3 4 MS. EBERHARD: Good evening. My name is Chris 5 Eberhard, and I'm with a firm called CommuniQuest, and I'm 6 a consultant for the public outreach portion for Bonterra, 7 the project managers. I welcome you this evening, and we 8 all want to thank you very much for taking time out of 9 your Monday evening for coming down and listen to the 10 presentation and make comments. 11 This is the third of three public meetings, and 12 the draft EIR is available for review on the City's web 13 site. You're going to hear about an hour presentation 14 tonight on the highlights on the findings, but if you want 15 the full document, there are several places that you can 16 get it. 17 The first is the City's web site, 18 www.longbeach.gov, the airport's web site, www.lbg.org, 19 and it's available at each of the City's libraries, the 20 main library in Lakewood and the main library in Signal 21 Hill. It's also available for review at Long Beach 22 Planning and Building Department on the fourth floor. 23 In addition to making comments this evening, 24 you can also make comments via e-mail, but you do need to 25 be aware that the City's system cannot handle attachments.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">3</p>
<p>1 PRESENTERS: 2 Christine Eberhard, Facilitator, CommuniQuest 3 Kathleen Brady, Bonterra Consulting 4 Jessica Feldman, Jones &amp; Stokes 5 Cindy Krebs, Bonterra Consulting 6 Janet Harvey, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. 7 Vince Mestre, Mestre Greve Associates 8 John Pehrson, CDM 9 10 PUBLIC COMMENTS (in order of appearance): 11 George Longaberger Gerrie Schipske Kevin McAchren 12 Janet Richardson Jim Saurenmann Bruce Alton 13 Mike Donelon Gary Frahm Phyllis Ortman 14 George Gibbons Randy Nisbet Suzanne Berman 15 Sandra Gibbons Tom Warnke Carmen Caldes 16 Ann Cantrell Steve Wraight Gerald Mineghino 17 Lillian Kawasaki Joe Sopo Birgit Delatorre 18 Terry Slavin Ann Denison Mike Kownal 19 Laura Sellmerr Greg Herweg Scott Robinson 20 Gail Ramsey Paul Gutierrez Ester Cervantes 21 Don May Elena Wraight Steve Rivcro 22 23 24 25</p> <p style="text-align: right;">2</p>	<p>1 So you can write your comments as an e-mail, but you can't 2 -- because of the viruses, et cetera, the City system 3 won't take attachments. 4 You can submit written comments through the 5 mail also to Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer, City 6 of Long Beach Planning and Building Department, at 7 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, 90802. And this, I 8 believe, is in some of the information that's being handed 9 out. 10 As you probably know, there's a 45-day comment 11 period, public review period, for the draft EIR, and that, 12 just so you know, does close on December 22nd. I've been 13 asked to remind you that tonight it's not really a 14 discussion about the approval of the EIR. This is a 15 meeting to take your comments on the draft document. 16 So this is your opportunity to comment on the 17 document itself, and we want to capture your input 18 regarding the findings. 19 The CEQA process requires that the City 20 responds to all comments in writing as part of the final 21 draft EIR that will be submitted to the Planning 22 Commission after the conclusion of the public comment 23 period, and therefore, we won't be taking -- we will not 24 be orally responding to many comments that are made 25 tonight.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">4</p>

1 As I mentioned, there are handouts at the  
 2 registration table, and if you didn't sign in, please do  
 3 so. But there is a power point presentation that's going  
 4 to be shown. Then you should have that, as well as a  
 5 project description and a summary of the draft findings.  
 6 I know we've got a couple elected officials  
 7 here this evening. Rae Gabelich from the 8th District is  
 8 somewhere here.  
 9 COUNCILWOMAN GABELICH: Right here.  
 10 MS. EBERHARD: Brian Mengino of the office of  
 11 Councilwoman Tonia Reyes Uranga from the 7th District is  
 12 with us, and Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell from the  
 13 4th District.  
 14 The timing for tonight's meeting will be three  
 15 hours, and as I mentioned, we're going to have a  
 16 presentation just so everyone has a basic understanding of  
 17 what the findings are. It will be the highlights really  
 18 of the findings, and that's going to take close to an  
 19 hour. Then I'll come back up, and we'll start the public  
 20 comments, and I'll explain more about that process when we  
 21 get there.  
 22 There's coffee and water in the back.  
 23 Restrooms are out toward the front. Some of you are  
 24 probably pretty familiar with this place.  
 25 I would like to remind you that this is being

5

1 recorded. Some of you have been at our last two meetings,  
 2 but we do have a court reporter, Mary, here this evening,  
 3 and so that she can get all of this down as part of the  
 4 record, it is important that it's fairly quiet.  
 5 So if you heard the presentation before and you  
 6 want to have a side conversation, we really would  
 7 appreciate it if you'd go out in the hall so that not only  
 8 everybody can listen, but especially so that Mary can get  
 9 all of the information.  
 10 Also, you probably had the opportunity, but  
 11 I'll remind you that there's comment cards for you in the  
 12 back of the room, and we will be taking comments tonight.  
 13 You can also do written comments or, as I mentioned  
 14 earlier, you can use the e-mail system. All of those  
 15 forms are equal. So it isn't like if you come up and make  
 16 verbal comments that that weighs heavier. They're all  
 17 equal, and they'll all be submitted to the record.  
 18 So with that, I would like to introduce  
 19 Kathleen Brady from Bonterra Consultants, who is the  
 20 project manager, and she's going to give highlights from  
 21 the finding of the draft EIR.  
 22 Kathleen.  
 23 MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.  
 24 As Chris indicated, my name is Kathleen Brady,  
 25 and I'm with Bonterra Consulting, and we prepared the

6

1 environmental impact report for the Long Beach airport  
 2 terminal improvement area.  
 3 The report was prepared consistent with the  
 4 requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act,  
 5 or CEQA, and with me tonight are a number of the experts  
 6 who prepared the technical studies on which the findings  
 7 in the EIR were based.  
 8 Jessica Feldman, the architectural historian  
 9 with Jones & Stokes, prepared the cultural analysis, which  
 10 focused on the architectural components of the project.  
 11 Cindy Krebs, also with Bonterra Consulting, prepared the  
 12 land use and hazards analysis and is also going to be  
 13 discussing the visual assessment.  
 14 Vince Mestre with Mestre, Greve & Associates  
 15 conducted the noise analysis. Janet Harvey, with Meyer  
 16 Mohaddes, prepared the traffic analysis. And John  
 17 Pehrson, with CDM, was responsible for the air quality and  
 18 human health risk assessment.  
 19 As Chris indicated, the slides that are  
 20 presented tonight are all part of the handouts, and much  
 21 of this information is in the summary document.  
 22 The EIR was prepared with the basic premise  
 23 that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not  
 24 be modified, that the key objective of the project is to  
 25 provide airport facilities to accommodate the minimum

7

1 permitted number of flights at the airport, which is 41  
 2 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, and the  
 3 associated number of passengers served on those flights in  
 4 full compliance with all applicable fire, building, safety  
 5 codes and other applicable standards.  
 6 Associated with that objective is the  
 7 commitment to compliance with the Airport Noise  
 8 Compatibility Ordinance and maintaining the current  
 9 character of the airport terminal building as a Long Beach  
 10 cultural heritage landmark.  
 11 The proposed improvements would be implemented  
 12 in the area surrounding the existing airport terminal, the  
 13 airport parking area, the aircraft ramp and Parcel O,  
 14 which is the area located by Clark and Willow Streets.  
 15 To give you some orientation, here is Lakewood  
 16 Boulevard, here is the terminal building, here is the  
 17 existing parking structure. This is where the proposed  
 18 parking structure would be constructed, and then the ramp  
 19 improvements would be in this area.  
 20 And the area with the thatched markings I'll be  
 21 referring to later. This is an area that is currently  
 22 leased by Million Air that would be taken back from that  
 23 leasehold, and the general aviation aircraft would be  
 24 moved down to Parcel O, which does not show on this  
 25 exhibit.

8

1 As previously indicated, a basic premise of the  
 2 project was maintaining the tenets of the Airport Noise  
 3 Compatibility Ordinance. The Ordinance allows a minimum  
 4 of 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights.  
 5 The proposed -- the facilities proposed as part  
 6 of the project have been sized to accommodate the  
 7 passenger levels associated with the minimum number of  
 8 flights.  
 9 The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance  
 10 allows the number of flights to increase over the minimum  
 11 41 commercial flights provided the noise budget outlined  
 12 in the ordinance is not exceeded.  
 13 In order for the number of flights to be  
 14 increased and still comply with the Airport Noise  
 15 Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines would have to  
 16 optimize their flight operations through methods such as  
 17 using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of  
 18 late-night operations.  
 19 Under optimal conditions, which have never been  
 20 achieved at the airport, the estimated number of increased  
 21 flights would range between seven and eleven flights.  
 22 Though the proposed project would neither directly nor  
 23 indirectly allow the increase in the number of flights, at  
 24 the direction of the City Council, the EIR evaluated the  
 25 impacts associated with the maximum number of flights that

9

1 could be expected.  
 2 In the EIR analysis, this was identified as the  
 3 optimized flight scenario because in order to achieve this  
 4 level, the airlines would be required to optimize their  
 5 operations. It assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25  
 6 daily commuter flights.  
 7 The project proposes improvements in 13 primary  
 8 areas. The sizing of the improvements was established by  
 9 the City Council in February 2005, and I'll review what is  
 10 being proposed in each of these areas in just a moment.  
 11 While it's premature to develop a final design  
 12 for the airport improvements prior to City Council  
 13 selection of an alternative, a schematic layout showing a  
 14 potential footprint of the airport improvements has been  
 15 developed to provide the environmental team basic  
 16 parameters for evaluation in the EIR.  
 17 During the final design, the precise size and  
 18 configuration of the proposed improvements may vary to  
 19 ensure compliance with applicable fire and building codes,  
 20 safety and security requirements, operational necessities  
 21 and with refinement of planning data.  
 22 However, the overall size of the airport  
 23 terminal area improvements would not exceed the square  
 24 footage allocation and would be consistent with the  
 25 parameters ultimately adopted by the City Council.

10

1 In developing the concept plan, as well as the  
 2 ultimate design of the facility, there were basic guiding  
 3 principles that were used to ensure that the building  
 4 would be consistent with the historic nature of the  
 5 airport terminal building.  
 6 These include the 1990 MOU adopted by the  
 7 Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council  
 8 pertaining to modifications to the terminal building, and  
 9 this MOU included the Secretary of Interior's standards  
 10 for rehabilitation of historic buildings.  
 11 Secondly, there's the development and use  
 12 standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Plan  
 13 Development Ordinance, which is the zoning regulations for  
 14 the airport, and third was a memorandum prepared in 2005  
 15 for consideration of any new construction at the airport.  
 16 In addition, the City has committed to  
 17 designing and constructing the new facilities to meet high  
 18 standards for energy efficiency and environmental design.  
 19 The intention is to construct a facility consistent with  
 20 LEED standards, which stands for Leadership in Energy and  
 21 Environmental Design.  
 22 I've been told that there's a slight  
 23 distraction, kind of a murmur in the room, so if people  
 24 could keep their comments or step outside, that would be  
 25 appreciated.

11

1 As I indicated, there's 13 areas where  
 2 improvements are being proposed, and the first area are  
 3 the holdrooms, which is shown in this area here in the  
 4 concept plan. Actually, I'll take a step back.  
 5 For your bearings, this is Donald Douglas  
 6 Drive. This is the existing terminal building. The areas  
 7 shown in the gray would all be enclosed buildings. The  
 8 areas shown in the light green or yellowish color would be  
 9 areas that are covered but not enclosed, and then the  
 10 darker green are areas identified as garden areas.  
 11 For the -- currently, the airport holdrooms are  
 12 comprised of both the 1984 permanent holdroom and the  
 13 temporary modular structures. As part of the proposed  
 14 project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary holdrooms  
 15 currently being provided through the use of modular  
 16 buildings would be replaced with 21,171 square feet of new  
 17 permanent floor space. That is a net increase of 8,021  
 18 square feet.  
 19 The concession areas, which are shown here,  
 20 would be expanded to serve the new holdroom areas.  
 21 Currently there are 5,460 square feet of concessions at  
 22 the airport, and the proposed project would add an  
 23 additional 9,541 square feet for this purpose.  
 24 The passenger screening area, shown right here  
 25 -- so people would come through the terminal and that way.

12

1 The screening of the passengers would be designed to meet  
 2 the requirements of the Transportation Security  
 3 Administration, known as TSA, and currently there is 3,900  
 4 square feet of passenger security screening area. With  
 5 the proposed project, there would be an additional 7,000  
 6 square feet devoted to this use.

7 The fourth area of improvement is the baggage  
 8 security screening, which would occur in this location.  
 9 The airport currently does not provide a structure for  
 10 conducting baggage screening, and since 2003 this has been  
 11 done under a canopy, and TSA has indicated that this  
 12 open-air situation is not sufficient because of the  
 13 sensitivity of the equipment being used.

14 The proposed project would provide a 7,000  
 15 square foot structure for security screening of baggage,  
 16 and once that's complete, once it's gone through the  
 17 screening, it would go to a baggage makeup area, which is  
 18 shown in this location, which would be covered but would  
 19 be open air, and this is where the screened bags are sent  
 20 prior to being loaded onto the aircraft.

21 Baggage claim would be over in this area and  
 22 would be similar to what exists now in that it would be  
 23 open air. Currently, the airport has 226 linear feet of  
 24 passenger side baggage claim, and with the proposed  
 25 project, there would be a total of 510 linear square feet

13

1 for baggage side -- or passenger side baggage claim.  
 2 The sixth area proposed is a baggage room, a  
 3 baggage service office and a multipurpose room shown over  
 4 in that area, and the airport does not have a baggage  
 5 service office or sufficient meeting space, and the  
 6 proposed project would allocate 900 square feet for  
 7 baggage service office and 300 square feet for a  
 8 multipurpose room.

9 This area would provide a holding place for  
 10 unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected or for  
 11 reporting lost baggage. The multipurpose room would  
 12 provide on-site meeting space for shift briefings,  
 13 training and other meetings at the airport for airport  
 14 staff and tenants whose job duties don't allow them to  
 15 leave the terminal.

16 The seventh area is restrooms shown right in  
 17 this area. And this exhibit, by the way, is part of the  
 18 summary document handout.

19 Currently, the amount of -- the project would  
 20 provide an additional 2,000 square feet of restrooms in  
 21 non-secured areas for a total of 3,330 square feet of  
 22 restrooms. Office space would also be provided to serve  
 23 the needs of TSA, the airlines and the airport  
 24 administration.

25 TSA currently occupies a modular building, and

14

1 this would be replaced with 5,191 square feet, and that's  
 2 shown in this location right here.

3 Airline offices are currently housed in  
 4 approximately 2,000 square feet within the airport  
 5 terminal in that area, and with the proposed project,  
 6 there would be an additional 3,754 square feet allocated  
 7 for this use.

8 Airport office and conference areas would  
 9 increase from 6,970 square feet to 11,970 square feet.

10 I was told today that it's clear that I'm not  
 11 part of the gaming generation because I can never do the  
 12 little mouse.

13 Think I left off with the aircraft. Okay.

14 The ticketing facilities at the airport would  
 15 also be provided to accommodate the demand at the airport.  
 16 The ticketing facilities are broken into four primary  
 17 areas, the ticketing counter area, the ticketing queuing  
 18 area, the airline ticket office and circulation area, and  
 19 this would be provided in this location.

20 That's all, Cindy. I'm not going to blow it  
 21 again. So I say.

22 And the combined space for the ticketing  
 23 operations for all four categories would increase from  
 24 6,423 square feet from the current 8,410 square feet to a  
 25 total of 14,833 square feet.

15

1 Airline gates. And these are shown with the  
 2 little lines there. The airport currently has eight  
 3 aircraft gates for boarding, loading and unloading of  
 4 aircraft, and the project proposes to increase that to 11  
 5 gates. And at the Long Beach airport, the term "gate" is  
 6 used to identify the doors in the holdrooms that are used  
 7 for passenger holding.

8 Jetways, which provide direct access from the  
 9 terminal to the aircraft, are not possible given that  
 10 jetways require a second story to allow access and the  
 11 proposed projects includes only a one-story holdroom,  
 12 which could not be retrofitted because of its design to  
 13 accommodate a second story.

14 The aircraft parking positions. Currently, the  
 15 airport has ten spaces, and the project would increase it  
 16 to as many as 14 parking spaces. The increase would  
 17 result in the take-back of property currently leased to  
 18 Million Air -- and that's where I showed you earlier on  
 19 the thatched marking -- and use the general aviation  
 20 tie-down parking that's used for general aviation tie-down  
 21 parking and delay parking, and the general aviation  
 22 aircraft would be -- displaced from the Million Air site  
 23 would be relocated to a parcel located south of runway  
 24 12-30. And there's also the potential that aircraft  
 25 hangars could be developed on Parcel O and also that this

16

1 is consistent with the Long Beach Airport Development  
 2 Areas map, which was approved in March of 2003.  
 3 For vehicular parking, at the airport it's  
 4 currently on -- both on-site and off-site through --  
 5 on-site there's the surface lots in the parking structure,  
 6 and then off-site there's lot D, which is leased from  
 7 Boeing.  
 8 There are currently 2,835 permanent parking  
 9 spaces at the airport and approximately 2,100 leased  
 10 spaces. The leased spaces are leased on a month-to-month  
 11 basis, and the project proposes the construction of a new  
 12 airport -- or a new parking structure that combined with  
 13 the existing parking structure and surface parking would  
 14 provide a total of 6,286 parking spaces. This would  
 15 eliminate the need for the off-site leased parking spaces.  
 16 The project would provide 1,351 spaces above  
 17 the existing number of spaces currently available at the  
 18 airport, and the structure would require the relocation of  
 19 the east side of Donald Douglas Loop Drive. It would  
 20 extend out directly to Lakewood Boulevard and have a right  
 21 turn out.  
 22 There would also be modification to the  
 23 existing parking structure, which would include a new  
 24 facade to match the new parking structure and to  
 25 compliment the terminal building. And the facades of the

17

1 terminal building and the parking structures would provide  
 2 a uniformed appearance and enhance the aesthetics at the  
 3 airport.  
 4 The last area of improvements is the  
 5 circulation improvements. As I indicated, Donald Douglas  
 6 Drive would extend out to Lakewood. There would also be  
 7 other lighting and pavement markings to enhance the safe  
 8 movement of both cars, as well as pedestrians.  
 9 Now we can go on.  
 10 As far as how the project would look, as  
 11 indicated, the City has adopted the guiding principles for  
 12 any modifications to the historic airport terminal in that  
 13 the City values the terminal building and wants to ensure  
 14 the historic integrity.  
 15 To accomplish this, the design -- to ensure the  
 16 improvements would not look like an add-on to the terminal  
 17 building or a wall of structures upon approaching the  
 18 terminal, and modifications to the interior of the  
 19 building would be in keeping with the original design of  
 20 the terminal.  
 21 This is a view of the terminal area from  
 22 airside, and here's the existing terminal building. This  
 23 is that holdroom area, and then the use is off to the  
 24 side.  
 25 As far as alternatives that were considered in

18

1 the EIR, Alternative A was based on the improvements  
 2 proposed in the 2003 NOP with minor modifications.  
 3 Alternative A assumed that the airport terminal would be a  
 4 maximum of 97,545 square feet. The nature of the  
 5 improvements would generally be the same as the proposed  
 6 project, but there would be minor reductions in the square  
 7 footage in all except the following categories:  
 8 The baggage security screening would be the  
 9 same as the proposed project, no additional space is  
 10 assumed for ticketing facilities, and the amount of the  
 11 airport office space is increased compared to the proposed  
 12 project.  
 13 One other difference is that the 2003 NOP  
 14 assumes 16 aircraft parking spaces, but that the City  
 15 Council determined in February 2005 that no more than 14  
 16 parking spaces would be evaluated in the EIR.  
 17 Alternative B represents a further reduction in  
 18 the size of the airport terminal compared to the proposed  
 19 project, and the nature of the improvements would also be  
 20 the same as the proposed project in Alternative A, but it  
 21 would only provide 79,725 square feet.  
 22 Overall, the square footages would be reduced  
 23 except for the following. Baggage security would be the  
 24 same as the proposed project. There is no additional  
 25 space assumed for ticketing facilities, and no airport

19

1 office space is assumed as part of this alternative.  
 2 And Alternative C, the no project alternative,  
 3 is required by CEQA and assumes that no new facility would  
 4 be provided at the airport. The vehicular parking spaces  
 5 that are currently leased off-site are assumed not to be  
 6 available because of the short-term nature of the leases,  
 7 and based on recent discussions, Boeing has indicated the  
 8 leases would not be available on a long-term basis.  
 9 And since there would be no new vehicle parking  
 10 spaces, this alternative would have a net loss of 2100  
 11 parking spaces compared to the current conditions.  
 12 The phasing of the project would be based on  
 13 availability of funding and service priorities, and its  
 14 design improvements would follow the approval of the  
 15 project by the City Council, and pending funding, it's  
 16 assumed that the construction would be done in phases to  
 17 minimize impacts to the airport, and the phasing would be  
 18 done the same for all of the alternatives.  
 19 As you can see from the slide up on the screen,  
 20 that it would start with improvements to Parcel O and then  
 21 the parking structure and then ultimately the terminal  
 22 improvements.  
 23 The EIR did identify significant impacts  
 24 associated with the project in the areas of aesthetics,  
 25 air quality, cultural resources and hazards, and with the

20

1 mitigation program, which is provided in the handout, all  
 2 but the construction air quality impacts would be reduced  
 3 to a level of less than significant, and these impacts  
 4 will be discussed in more detail shortly.  
 5 As I indicated before, the EIR also did look at  
 6 the optimized flights, and with the optimized flights'  
 7 impact, significant impacts were identified for air  
 8 quality, land use and transportation and circulation, but  
 9 only the air quality impacts would remain significant  
 10 unavoidable after mitigation.  
 11 Benefits were also identified associated with  
 12 the project, that the project would enhance the TSA and  
 13 airport security services by providing better facilities.  
 14 It would improve existing and future traffic conditions by  
 15 providing enhanced parking on-site. It would reduce  
 16 aircraft emissions by providing infrastructure necessary  
 17 to support electric ground support equipment, and there  
 18 was no noise impact identified with the proposed project.  
 19 The EIR does recommend the development of a  
 20 land use compatibility program associated with the  
 21 optimized flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour  
 22 and the schools within the 60 CNEL contour.  
 23 CEQA also does require the identification of  
 24 environmentally superior alternatives, and that takes into  
 25 consideration the impacts associated with each

21

1 allocation of even the proposed project.  
 2 Since the proposed project is able to meet all  
 3 the project objectives and does not result in  
 4 substantially greater impacts than the other build  
 5 alternatives, it was identified as the environmentally  
 6 superior alternative.  
 7 A question that has also come up is if the  
 8 certification of the EIR by the Planning Commission would  
 9 constitute approval of the project, and it would not.  
 10 Certification is only a determination that the EIR  
 11 addresses the impacts associated with the proposed  
 12 project. It does not approve the project itself. The  
 13 City Council would have to take separate action to approve  
 14 the project.  
 15 Additionally, as part of the project design, a  
 16 certificate of appropriateness from the Cultural Heritage  
 17 Commission would be required for the project.  
 18 And with that, I'm going to turn it over to  
 19 Jessica, who will discuss the cultural resources.  
 20 MS. FELDMAN: Thank you.  
 21 First, I'd like to present a little bit of  
 22 background information on the airport terminal building  
 23 historical significance before I discuss the potential  
 24 impacts from the proposed improvements.  
 25 As many of you may already know, the airport

23

1 alternative, which in this case were all very similar  
 2 because the footprint of the construction would not be  
 3 that substantially different, and the nature of the  
 4 improvements are all basically the same.  
 5 The no-project alternative would avoid  
 6 construction-related impacts. However, it would have more  
 7 substantial long term traffic impacts and associated air  
 8 quality impacts because there would be insufficient  
 9 parking, resulting in extra trips associated with meeters  
 10 and greeters. And also, the no-project alternative would  
 11 not include the mitigation measures associated with the  
 12 human health risk assessment.  
 13 And given that there was no substantial  
 14 difference in the impacts, the evaluation also considers  
 15 the ability of the alternatives to meet the project  
 16 objectives.  
 17 Each of the alternatives, including the  
 18 proposed project, would provide additional capacity that  
 19 would help serve the number of passengers associated with  
 20 minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport  
 21 Noise Compatibility Ordinance.  
 22 However, based on the HNTB study conducted  
 23 during the scoping process, the recommended sizes of the  
 24 facilities to best meet the needs of the passengers,  
 25 visitors and tenants actually exceeded the square footage

22

1 terminal building, built in 1941, was designated in 1990  
 2 as a City of Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark. A few  
 3 of the reasons for the designation were the first  
 4 municipal airport in the Southern California region; it  
 5 exemplifies the historical and economic heritage of the  
 6 community; it's considered a masterpiece of an early  
 7 modern style, Streamline Moderne; the use of ceramic  
 8 mosaic tile throughout the building was innovative, and  
 9 the use of representational images reflected the artistic  
 10 trends of the era; it is the quintessential theme building  
 11 of the airport, its signature element; and it is the most  
 12 prominent visual feature of the airport, which represents  
 13 an established and visual feature of the neighborhood.  
 14 In order to determine if the proposed  
 15 improvements would constitute a substantial adverse change  
 16 in the significance of this historical resource, it was  
 17 necessary to identify the character defining features of  
 18 the 1941 terminal building.  
 19 Character defining features are those  
 20 architecturally significant interior and exterior elements  
 21 that best convey the original use of the building. Some  
 22 of the character defining features we identified from  
 23 historical research, historical photographs and site  
 24 visits include but are not limited to the architectural  
 25 style and related elements, such as the round windows and

24

1 the vents, the geometric panels on the rear elevations,  
 2 the curved walls on the interior and exterior, and smooth  
 3 exterior and interior surfaces.

4 In addition, the building's footprint, which is  
 5 shaped as a segment of an arch, is considered a character  
 6 defining feature, as well as the stepped-back second and  
 7 third stories, the original windows, which were carefully  
 8 designed in relationship to the building, and those  
 9 ceramic mosaic tiles.

10 After reviewing the design concept plans, we  
 11 determined the building will retain its overall historic  
 12 character. The proposed new construction will be  
 13 differentiated from the old and will be compatible in  
 14 size, massing, scale and style, and most importantly, it  
 15 will continue to be used as an airport terminal.

16 However, some of the components of the proposed  
 17 improvements would materially destroy or alter some  
 18 character defining features, which under CEQA is  
 19 considered a significant impact.

20 These project components, which do not meet the  
 21 Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation of  
 22 historic buildings, include damage to historic material  
 23 where the new building would connect to the 1941 building,  
 24 damage to historic material where new doors and windows  
 25 would be introduced, changes to spatial relationships and

25

1 improvements would need to preserve the unique  
 2 architectural features which Jessica just talked about, as  
 3 well as be consistent and in harmony with the existing  
 4 terminal building.

5 During construction, the proposed project would  
 6 have temporary construction-related impacts. The views at  
 7 the project site would be temporarily altered due to the  
 8 staging and use of construction equipment and materials,  
 9 graded surfaces, truck traffic and soil stockpiles. There  
 10 could also be light and glare impacts associated with  
 11 security lighting and light emanating from the proposed  
 12 improvements themselves.

13 The mitigation program that's provided in the  
 14 EIR would reduce these impacts to a level considered less  
 15 than significant incorporating features such as low  
 16 intensity lights, by providing orientation away from  
 17 streets or shielding lights so that glare does not occur  
 18 on streets and residences around the airport and by using  
 19 glass that is less than 20 percent reflective in the  
 20 building structure itself.

21 As Jessica mentioned, the proposed project  
 22 would be compatible with the existing terminal building in  
 23 size, massing, scale and style. With respect to size and  
 24 massing, when you take a look at all the temporary  
 25 buildings that are on site right now, the Million Air

27

1 removal or obscuring of original details in order to  
 2 accommodate the new building.

3 However, we feel the proposed mitigation  
 4 measures would reduce these impacts to levels less than  
 5 significant.

6 And now Cindy will discuss the aesthetics,  
 7 hazards and hazardous wastes and public services section.

8 MS. KREBS: Thank you.

9 Aesthetics. Aesthetics is the evaluation of  
 10 how things look in an EIR. According to the City Zoning  
 11 Ordinance in the May 1990 MOU, Memorandum of  
 12 Understanding, there are certain guidelines that have been  
 13 established for improvements to the terminal building.

14 With respect to building siting, those  
 15 guidelines say that there should be space between the  
 16 buildings to avoid a wall-like appearance, as Kathleen  
 17 mentioned earlier.

18 With respect to building heights, any new  
 19 construction would need to comply with FAA height  
 20 restrictions and would need to integrate with the existing  
 21 buildings.

22 The parking structures would be designed to  
 23 provide rooftop landscaping planters, and those would also  
 24 be designed to observe the FAA height restrictions.

25 The overall design of the airport and any

26

1 space and the current use on it and just kind of the  
 2 footprint of everything that's there around the terminal  
 3 right now, the proposed project doesn't have a spread  
 4 that's much greater than that.

5 The scale of the new buildings would be lower  
 6 in elevation than the existing terminal building, so views  
 7 from the back from the restaurant area and the deck out  
 8 behind that would still be available.

9 The style of the new construction would  
 10 incorporate some stylistic elements from that  
 11 architectural style, Streamline Moderne, that was  
 12 discussed earlier. Those include curved roofs, the west  
 13 wall of the holding room would be mostly windows, the arc  
 14 shape would be copied in the roof shape of several of the  
 15 small detached buildings, and the new roofs would be  
 16 higher or stepped as it goes away from the terminal, so  
 17 the front would be at a higher elevation than the back as  
 18 the existing terminal building is.

19 As per CEQA, the California Environmental  
 20 Quality Act, the EIR focused on impacts that could result  
 21 from implementation of the proposed project. So we looked  
 22 primarily at the terminal area, the parking lots and lot O  
 23 and not the airport as a whole, the airfield and  
 24 everything when we did our analysis for hazardous waste  
 25 analysis.

28

1           However, we should and need to mention that  
2 data was gathered from a wide variety of sources and for  
3 areas that extend well beyond those project construction  
4 area limits.  
5           Sources that we gathered information from  
6 included 2005 EDR reports, which documents past spills and  
7 cleanup efforts at the airport, as well as fuel storage  
8 and dispensing activities, the location of underground and  
9 above-ground storage tanks. It also includes federal  
10 databases and state databases regarding any discharges,  
11 all investigations and all remediation activities at the  
12 airport.  
13           We also consulted the 1998 asbestos survey that  
14 was conducted for the airport and talked with airport  
15 staff, fixed-base operator, FBO, representatives,  
16 representatives from the Long Beach Fire Department, the  
17 Los Angeles County Sheriff's Bureau, and with each of  
18 those we discussed their current hazardous materials use  
19 and containment practices at the airport.  
20           With respect to current hazardous waste  
21 practices, the airport and City share an ongoing  
22 commitment to the proper handling of hazardous materials  
23 at the airport and have documented specific procedures for  
24 those in a couple of key documents, the first being the  
25 Long Beach Airport Certification Manual and the second one

1 being the Long Beach Airport Rules and Regulations.  
2           Those are shared with, and all of the people  
3 who lease space at the airport, they all follow those, as  
4 well as the airport staff itself.  
5           Other documents or processes that are in place  
6 include the airport's Storm Water or Pollution Prevention  
7 Plan, the SWPPP, the City's industrial NPDES permit, and  
8 that stands for National Pollution Discharge Elimination  
9 System, and a full compliment of best management  
10 practices.  
11           These programs, as documented in those  
12 documents, are FAA approved, and they document procedures  
13 for the handling of hazardous materials at the airport.  
14 Those procedures address fuel handling, inspections,  
15 fueler training, corrective action and hazardous material  
16 cleanup procedures. They also comply with all local and  
17 state construction and building requirements and  
18 regulations, including the Uniform Building Code.  
19           Because of its age and because we have a recent  
20 asbestos study, we know that the terminal building  
21 contains asbestos. We also suspect that it could contain  
22 lead-based paint.  
23           Parcel O may contain acrially deposited lead  
24 and trace amounts of DDT, and we make those assumptions  
25 because of their proximity to the freeway, 405 freeway, as

1 well as the fact that in the past, the grass areas at the  
2 airport were treated with DDT substance.  
3           We do know though from a recent project that  
4 very, very small, barely trace amounts of that substance  
5 have been found there.  
6           During construction, however, those hazardous  
7 materials could be released into the atmosphere.  
8 Therefore, the mitigation program that's included in the  
9 EIR when combined with the existing rules and regulations  
10 would be used to reduce potential impacts to a level  
11 considered less than significant.  
12           All contractors would be required to obtain all  
13 required permits. They would have to properly handle,  
14 remove and remediate any waste found. Appropriate testing  
15 would be conducted before any activities get underway,  
16 such as testing for lead-based paint. And they would also  
17 be following regional and state rules, such as those set  
18 forth by the South Coast Air Quality Management District,  
19 the State Water Resources Control Board and the State  
20 construction and building requirements, including the  
21 Uniform Building Code.  
22           Public services. The EIR discusses fire and  
23 police protection at the airport, as well as TSA  
24 activities and airport security services. It also makes  
25 note of the fact that the Transportation Security

1 Administration has requested improvements at the airport  
2 to enhance safety.  
3           The proposed project would provide more secure  
4 baggage and passenger screening areas, which would respond  
5 well to TSA's request. It would also reduce potential  
6 safety hazards that result from overcrowding at the  
7 airport.  
8           If you ever visit the airport now during a peak  
9 period, you're aware that there can be quite a lot of foot  
10 traffic and congestion, and as the flights increase within  
11 the Noise Compatibility Ordinance limits, that crowding  
12 could be more of an issue.  
13           So the proposed project, by providing more  
14 floor space for circulation, would help to reduce those  
15 potential impacts.  
16           However, I should also note that under the  
17 optimized flight scenario, if those additional 11 flights  
18 were added, then significant impacts could occur.  
19 Obviously, when you have more passengers and more baggage,  
20 you have more crowded conditions. Without the proposed  
21 project, there would be no change in baggage security  
22 screening, and that could be an issue.  
23           Finally, staffing levels for the airport  
24 security, as well as police and fire protection, would be  
25 adjusted with City Council approval as necessary to meet

1 changing demands at the airport.  
 2 And now I'll ask Vince Mestre to talk with you  
 3 about noise.  
 4 MR. MESTRE: Thank you.  
 5 This is a very brief summary of the noise  
 6 analysis that is contained in the EIR. EIR Section 3.6 is  
 7 the noise analysis, and it contains much more information  
 8 than I can squeeze into this presentation. The very  
 9 detailed technical studies are contained in Appendix F of  
 10 the EIR.  
 11 The noise analysis can be summarized in two  
 12 figures. The first is Exhibit 3.6-9 from the EIR. It  
 13 shows the existing noise contour for calendar year 2004.  
 14 There are 15 homes within the 65 CNEL contour. That is  
 15 the noise land use standard used by the State of  
 16 California and City of Long Beach. There are no schools  
 17 within the 60 CNEL contour.  
 18 The outer contour in this figure is the 60.  
 19 The yellow is the 65. That's the noise standard for  
 20 residential. And the 70 is this purplish contour that  
 21 remains pretty much on airport property.  
 22 This is a close-up of the area showing the  
 23 homes that are within the 65 CNEL contour north of the  
 24 airport, this group of homes right here, and a few homes  
 25 south of the airport either within or just touching the 65

33

1 noise contours for that case is shown here as taken from  
 2 Exhibit 3.6-14 in the EIR.  
 3 Again, the outer contour is the 60, the yellow  
 4 the 65 CNEL contour, and the purple is the 70 CNEL  
 5 contour. These figures are also in your handouts,  
 6 although the contours are not the same color.  
 7 Most importantly, achieving the budget  
 8 potential of 11 additional commercial flights and 25  
 9 commuter flights is not dependent on this project. Can  
 10 these additional flights occur without this project? The  
 11 answer is yes.  
 12 For the case of the future potential contours  
 13 with 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter  
 14 flights, there are 11 homes in the 65 CNEL contour. In  
 15 addition, there are two schools located within the 60 CNEL  
 16 contour. This is the Minnie Gant Elementary School and a  
 17 special ed building at the school safety and emergency  
 18 preparedness offices. I'll show you where those are.  
 19 Here.  
 20 First, in terms of residential area, with the  
 21 optimized flight conditions, which is quieter aircraft and  
 22 fewer night operations, the contours to the north actually  
 23 shrink, and there are no homes in the 65 CNEL contour  
 24 north of the airport. But the 65 CNEL contour south of  
 25 the airport gets extended, and more homes are located here

35

1 CNEL contour.  
 2 We looked to future conditions with this  
 3 project and identified that this project will not affect  
 4 future conditions. The Long Beach Airport Noise Ordinance  
 5 establishes a noise budget for the airlines and cargo  
 6 operators. The budget permits at least 41 air carrier  
 7 departures a day -- that includes cargo departures -- and  
 8 25 commuter aircraft departures per day.  
 9 In 2004, the 41 air carrier departures were  
 10 allocated, and on weekdays that level is reached. The 25  
 11 commuter flights are not being used.  
 12 The noise budget permits more flights if the  
 13 airlines operate below budget noise limits. How many more  
 14 flights that could be realized if the airlines and air  
 15 cargo operators used the quietest aircraft available to  
 16 them and they reduced the number of nighttime violations  
 17 is an issue that is addressed in detail in the EIR.  
 18 That analysis showed that under ideal but  
 19 realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial  
 20 flights could be accommodated. Of course, these  
 21 additional flights would have to be of the quietest  
 22 aircraft types and not during the night hours.  
 23 The potential future case that was analyzed in  
 24 the EIR is the case where the 11 additional commercial  
 25 flights are realized and 25 commuter flights occur. The

34

1 than in the 2004 case.  
 2 In terms of the schools, this is the Minnie  
 3 Gant Elementary School. This is the 60 CNEL contour, and  
 4 you see that goes through -- kind of through the heart of  
 5 the school. The school boundary is outlined in red.  
 6 This is the 60 CNEL contour just a little bit  
 7 north of that. This is the 65 contour. This is the 60.  
 8 This is Los Coyotes Diagonal. This is the school safety  
 9 and emergency preparedness office in this area, and the 60  
 10 contour just clips these buildings, the north boundary,  
 11 and that's where there's a special education building.  
 12 These exhibits are shown in the EIR as  
 13 Exhibits 3.6-16 and 3.6-17.  
 14 Even though the potential future noise contours  
 15 can be achieved with or without this project, a mitigation  
 16 measure has been identified. That's mitigation measure  
 17 3.6-2. Within 24 months of the certification of the EIR,  
 18 the airport shall develop a sound insulation program for  
 19 homes within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60  
 20 CNEL contour.  
 21 Sound insulation treatment will generally  
 22 include sound-rated windows and doors and other  
 23 modifications to ensure that the interior noise  
 24 environment meets state and local noise limits.  
 25 Construction noise analyses are also included

36

1 in the EIR. Any night construction at Parcel O would  
 2 require noise monitoring, and if the City noise limits are  
 3 exceeded, construction will have to stop until a  
 4 construction mitigation plan is implemented.  
 5 Janet Harvey will now discuss traffic impacts.  
 6 MS. HARVEY: Thank you.  
 7 For the traffic study, the terminal improvement  
 8 project itself, that is a bigger building, would not cause  
 9 an increase in traffic. Additional flights would result  
 10 from the optimized flight scenario due to the additional  
 11 passengers and workers. So therefore, the traffic study  
 12 was an analysis of the optimized flight scenario.  
 13 The intersections that we studied are shown in  
 14 red dots on this map. We went from Carson Street to the  
 15 north, Willow to the south, Cherry on the west side, and  
 16 Clark on the east side. And it also included an analysis  
 17 of the proposed new exit from Donald Douglas Drive to  
 18 Lakewood Boulevard, which would allow you to take a  
 19 right-hand turn and go southbound on Lakewood.  
 20 Assumptions that were made for the traffic  
 21 study, as I said, included the optimized flight scenario,  
 22 which is the 52 commercial and 25 commuter flights, the  
 23 new exit onto southbound Lakewood Boulevard. We  
 24 considered that to be in place in the with-project  
 25 conditions.

37

1 And the parking demands was based on 2.75  
 2 spaces per 1,000 -- excuse me -- 1,000 annual departing  
 3 passengers. This was based on an earlier study that was  
 4 conducted for the airport.  
 5 The number of vehicle trips for the optimized  
 6 flights was based on existing passenger data, and we also  
 7 compared it to John Wayne and Ontario airports, and the  
 8 trip rates were very similar.  
 9 The traffic study also looked at two different  
 10 time periods. We looked at existing with the project in  
 11 place with optimized flights. This means that we would  
 12 wake up tomorrow, and the expanded terminal buildings and  
 13 all the optimized flights would be in place. And then we  
 14 also looked at 2020 conditions with the optimized flights  
 15 where we compared the with project and the no project.  
 16 2020 conditions also assumed that Douglas  
 17 traffic is already on the local roadways, as well as the  
 18 Douglas Park Roadway mitigations.  
 19 The traffic study found that in the existing  
 20 with the project with the optimized flights, we assumed  
 21 that the off-site parking is still available on the Boeing  
 22 lot, lot D, since it's occurring tomorrow, and we found  
 23 that there would be two impacted intersections at Lakewood  
 24 and Spring and Lakewood and Willow.  
 25 Mitigation measures were recommended as the

38

1 passenger numbers increased to mitigate these two  
 2 intersections.  
 3 Now, since waking up tomorrow and having it all  
 4 there wasn't real realistic, we looked at 2020. That  
 5 should give us a better picture of future conditions.  
 6 So in 2020 with the optimized flights, we  
 7 assumed no off-site parking was available. Now, for the  
 8 parking structure, it was originally sized for the flight  
 9 compatibility ordinance number of flights, the 41 plus 25.  
 10 So therefore, in the optimized flight conditions, there  
 11 would be a parking deficiency, but the proposed project  
 12 supplies more parking with the new parking structure.  
 13 And when you think about it, when you have no  
 14 project, there's less parking, and therefore, there's more  
 15 drop-off trips because somebody would have to take you to  
 16 the airport, drop you off, leave, then come back to get  
 17 you later and go on back home.  
 18 And in the with-project conditions, we have  
 19 more parking and, therefore, less drop-off trips.  
 20 So the traffic study results show that in 2020,  
 21 the proposed project with its additional parking actually  
 22 generates fewer trips than the no project because more  
 23 people would be able to drive and park at the airport,  
 24 you'll have fewer people dropped off, remembering that  
 25 drop-off trips generate twice as many trips in and out

39

1 both ways as just driving there to park and then leave.  
 2 So therefore, the optimized flight scenario  
 3 results in added trips, but the project itself does not  
 4 result in significant traffic impacts.  
 5 And now John will be discussing air quality and  
 6 the health risk assessment.  
 7 MR. PEHRSON: We're almost finished.  
 8 The details of the air quality impact analysis  
 9 and human health risk assessment can be found in  
 10 Appendix C of the draft EIR, and the results are  
 11 summarized in Section 3.2 of the draft EIR.  
 12 The air quality analysis and health -- the air  
 13 quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment  
 14 began with the development of a protocol that described  
 15 the models and methods that were used in the analysis.  
 16 It defined the CEQA significance thresholds for  
 17 both air quality and health risk, and it defined the human  
 18 health risk exposure parameters used in the health risk  
 19 calculations.  
 20 A draft document, a draft protocol, was  
 21 developed following regulatory guidelines. The document  
 22 was submitted to the California Air Resources Board and  
 23 the South Coast Air Quality Management District for review  
 24 and comment.  
 25 Both agencies provided comments. Their

40

1 comments were incorporated into a revised protocol, which  
 2 was resubmitted to the agencies for review. The South  
 3 Coast AQMD provided final comments, and the final protocol  
 4 was developed incorporating those comments. That protocol  
 5 was attached -- an attachment to Appendix C, the document.  
 6 The criteria air pollutants that are analyzed  
 7 in the air quality impact analysis include carbon  
 8 monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone precursors, nitrogen  
 9 oxides and volatile organic compounds. And particulate  
 10 matter is analyzed as both PM10 and PM2.5. Sulfur dioxide  
 11 is included, as is lead, which is not shown on this slide,  
 12 but was analyzed as both a criteria pollutant and as a  
 13 toxic air contaminant. Lead is actually shown on this  
 14 slide under the metals here.  
 15 In addition to the metals, we looked at diesel  
 16 particulate matter and a number of toxic VOC organic and  
 17 semi-VOC organic compounds. pH's were included, and that  
 18 included a list of seven of the more toxic pH's around  
 19 found in exhaust emissions.  
 20 In addition to the air contaminants, we looked  
 21 at health risk exposure parameters. These were developed  
 22 in the protocol. We looked at an adult resident, which  
 23 was assumed to have a 70-year exposure 350 days a year.  
 24 These adults were assumed to be located in both residence  
 25 and at school locations.

41

1 emissions from the proposed project, it was found that  
 2 there would be short-term exceedances of the South Coast  
 3 AQMD thresholds of significance for NOx and VOC.  
 4 A number of mitigation measures have been  
 5 developed and are included in the draft EIR. However, it  
 6 is not expected that these mitigation measures will reduce  
 7 the impacts below significance. So therefore, significant  
 8 impacts still remain after mitigation for construction.  
 9 Although not part of the proposed project, we  
 10 also looked at the impacts of the optimized flight  
 11 scenario. This scenario wound up with both  
 12 emission-related significant impacts, as well as  
 13 concentration-related impacts from PM10.  
 14 The increased flight activity under the  
 15 optimized flight scenario would result in exceedance of  
 16 the South Coast AQMD's thresholds of significance for  
 17 PM10, primarily due to the diesel-powered ground support  
 18 equipment and re-entrained road dust.  
 19 Again, recommended mitigation measures are  
 20 provided. They include electrical connections and  
 21 preconditioned air at the gates to reduce the auxiliary  
 22 power unit use, as well as the electrification of various  
 23 ground support equipment.  
 24 However, it was determined that these  
 25 mitigation measures would not reduce the impact below the

43

1 We also looked at workers who were assumed to  
 2 be exposed for 40 years, 245 days per year, and these were  
 3 located at commercial and industrial sites both on and off  
 4 the airport.  
 5 These two receptor types are required for an  
 6 AQMD/CEQA analysis. In addition, we looked at other  
 7 receptors for CEQA disclosure. These other receptors  
 8 included a child resident, a school child and teachers and  
 9 other workers that would be located at schools.  
 10 Potential cancer risks, as well as non-cancer  
 11 risks, were calculated. After reviewing the calculations,  
 12 it was found that none of the project or optimized flight  
 13 scenario risks were found to exceed the significance  
 14 thresholds described in the protocols.  
 15 However, the air quality impact analysis of the  
 16 criteria pollutants identified several -- three,  
 17 specifically, impacts that were significant.  
 18 The Clean Air Act addresses air quality by two  
 19 approaches. Ambient air quality standards for pollutant  
 20 concentrations in the communities are set, and then  
 21 emission limits are specified for sources that emit the  
 22 pollutants. CEQA defines significance thresholds for both  
 23 the ambient concentration, as well as the emissions from  
 24 the sources.  
 25 When we analyzed the construction-related

42

1 levels of significance.  
 2 The third impact was the emissions of CO and  
 3 NOx, again under the optimized flight scenario. It was  
 4 found that these emissions would exceed thresholds  
 5 developed by the AQMD. The emissions from these  
 6 pollutants are primarily from aircraft, the auxiliary  
 7 power units on board the aircraft and the ground support  
 8 equipment.  
 9 Again, recommended mitigation measures, such as  
 10 ground power and preconditioned air, as well as the  
 11 electrification of GSE, was found to reduce the CO impacts  
 12 below a level of significance. However, it was found that  
 13 NOx would still remain significant after mitigation.  
 14 I'll turn it back over to Kathleen.  
 15 MS. BRADY: Thank you, John.  
 16 As Chris indicated at the beginning of the  
 17 presentation today, that the public review period extends  
 18 until December 22nd, and comments can be submitted in  
 19 writing to Angela Reynolds, address on the screen, also in  
 20 your handouts, or they can be e-mailed.  
 21 And if you have attachments, please also mail  
 22 those in because the virus protection lots of time screens  
 23 them out. We can't be guaranteed that they'd be received.  
 24 So any comments received today we'll be  
 25 responding, as well as anyone's in writing we'll be

44

1 responding to in writing as required by CEQA, and that  
 2 entire package will be considered as part of the packet by  
 3 the Planning Commission at the time of the certification  
 4 of the EIR.  
 5 So now Chris will take your questions.  
 6 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you, Kathleen.  
 7 Just couple details, and we will begin the  
 8 comment period, which I think is what you really wanted to  
 9 come out and do, which is place your comments and hear  
 10 what your friends and neighbors have to say.  
 11 I would like to remind you -- and I apologize  
 12 for having to have the room so quiet. It turns out that I  
 13 think it's not a real great room for our court reporter to  
 14 do her work. She can hear every voice, even in the back  
 15 it turns out.  
 16 But the most value tonight from your comments  
 17 will be about the draft document. You can talk about  
 18 whatever you want, but what we're really here to hear from  
 19 you is regarding the draft EIR document.  
 20 As I mentioned before the meeting and since a  
 21 number of you came in after we started, there are comment  
 22 cards at the registration table, and you should have  
 23 gotten those on your way in, but the e-mail are of equal  
 24 value for making your comments in public comments.  
 25 Also, the court reporter, Mary, will be

45

1 available after the meeting, so feel free to go up. If  
 2 you'd prefer to make your comments privately to her, you  
 3 can do that at the end of this session.  
 4 And I'd also like to remind people that this is  
 5 the end. The formal presentation has been given. You can  
 6 stay 'til the end if you want to hear everyone's comments  
 7 or feel free to leave after you've given your comments.  
 8 If you want to get home to family or have other plans,  
 9 feel free to leave because this will be the end.  
 10 I also would like to remind you that due to the  
 11 CEQA process, it requires that the City respond to all  
 12 comments in writing as part of the final draft EIR that  
 13 will be submitted to the Planning Commission after the  
 14 conclusion of this public comment period, and therefore,  
 15 we won't be orally responding to comments made today.  
 16 So you can pose your question or your comments,  
 17 and they'll be addressed in the final draft.  
 18 With that, I think we have time probably to be  
 19 able to go about five minutes each speaker. In past  
 20 meetings that's been more than enough time, but if someone  
 21 really does go on, then I may try and have you end within  
 22 the five minutes, but I think we'll be fine tonight even  
 23 if each of you want to speak.  
 24 I would like to remind you, too, that because  
 25 this is being recorded as part of the public record, we

46

1 need your name, address. And if you can spell your name,  
 2 that also helps the court reporter.  
 3 So I invite one speaker at a time. And again,  
 4 if you have side conversations, that's fine. But if you  
 5 could take them out in the hall, we would really  
 6 appreciate it.  
 7 Let's start. First speaker.  
 8 MR. LONGABERGER: My name is George Longaberger,  
 9 spelled L-o-n-g-a-b-e-r-g-e-r.  
 10 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 11 MR. LONGABERGER: I want to preface this, as you all  
 12 know, how in the world did we ever get an airport in the  
 13 middle of the city and then proceed to build on that with  
 14 all of the repercussions that you're going to have by the  
 15 homeowners living in that area.  
 16 I also want to say big is not better. Case in  
 17 point -- thank you. Case in point, the port. Down  
 18 through the years you read it in the paper, you seen it  
 19 for yourself, build, build, build, more slips, more berths  
 20 and things like that. And what do you got down there?  
 21 You got a monster. You're killing the environment.  
 22 You're gonna have the same thing out at the  
 23 airport. Really and truly. Now, when you get a bigger --  
 24 they're advocating a bigger terminal. That means they are  
 25 looking forward to more people, more flights, and that's

47

1 not gonna cut it.  
 2 People are going to be subject to diseases,  
 3 such as asthma, and there has been a medical survey of --  
 4 stating that more of our younger generations, our  
 5 children, are coming down with asthma.  
 6 This is a health hazard, and people who are so  
 7 commercialized and pushing this thing, they could care  
 8 less. Just the airport was there before we moved here,  
 9 but listen, folks. There's more people in this city, and  
 10 what is this airport? Is this a city for an airport, or  
 11 is it a city for people?  
 12 If it's for people, we've got to take that into  
 13 consideration when any plans are made upon the terminals.  
 14 Thank you.  
 15 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 16 Next speaker, please.  
 17 MS. RICHARDSON: Janet Richardson, 3702 Rose Avenue.  
 18 While I appreciate the issue about not giving  
 19 oral responses, it would actually help if I could get some  
 20 answers to a few questions that I have because  
 21 understanding where you're coming from and some of these  
 22 proposals will allow me to provide intelligent comment to  
 23 the City that I might not otherwise be able to provide  
 24 based on the limited information that we've been given.  
 25 And I have three areas where I have questions.

48



2	<p>1 The first is gates. I'd like to know the basis  2 for the proposal to add three gates. As I understand it,  3 under the proposed reasonable extension of flights which,  4 by the way, I refuse to call optimized, that would be 77  5 flights per day, currently eight gates with 15 hours of  6 operation.  7 I went to law school to avoid math, but let me  8 give this a shot.  9 That's one flight per gate every hour and a  10 half. I guess I don't understand why more would be  11 needed. That seems to be far less than the turnaround  12 expected at other airports, particularly if you've sat in  13 the Southwest terminal at Los Angeles. They'd be happy to  14 have the luxury of an hour and a half to turn around a  15 flight.</p>	<p>1 of the Long Beach Alliance. I have no financial interest  2 in the Long Beach Airport or any airport businesses. I'm  3 here to speak as a resident living in an airport-impacted  4 neighborhood. My record of commitment to preserving the  5 quality of life in this city's neighborhoods is clear and  6 consistent for almost 20 years.  7 It appears that many have distorted what the  8 EIR and the terminal improvements are all about. Some  9 have distributed misinformation stating the terminal  10 improvements sets the stage for expanded flights. Not  11 true. Flights will continue to occur whether the proposed  12 improvements are built or not.  13 There have been many concerns about the  14 pollution from aircraft. The improvements will not  15 increase the number of flights over the neighborhoods.  16 The 102,000 square feet, 14 aircraft parking pad proposed  17 terminal improvements will reduce pollution and enhance  18 the quality of life in my neighborhood by allowing a more  19 efficient operation of existing aircraft.</p>	
3	<p>16 I'm also curious as to why Alternative B did  17 not consider not increasing the number of gates from eight  18 to eleven.  19 The second area where I'd like some additional  20 information is on noise. I'm wondering if the noise  21 analysis considered commercial operations from runway 25.  22 I know they're usually done off runway 30, but that's not  23 always the case. If that was not considered in the noise  24 analysis, why not?  25 I'd also like some information about the</p>	<p>20 It will buy newer nonpolluting ground service  21 equipment. It will improve traffic management and  22 increase available parking, thereby reducing double trips  23 at the airport. And if the Long Beach City Council does  24 not act to improve the airport as recommended in the EIR,  25 this may be viewed as an attempt to restrain efficient use</p>	6
4	<p>1 details of the easement that residents would be expected  2 to provide in exchange for insulation and if that easement  3 would be for noise levels exceeding the ordinance.  4 Finally, I'm interested in information about  5 the TSA. The handout refers to TSA requirements, and I'm  6 wondering where I could find the document -- I presume  7 it's a public document -- where the TSA specifies what its  8 requirements will be for the Long Beach Airport terminal.  9 If it's in one of the appendices to the very large EIR,  10 that would be great. Otherwise, I'd like to know where I  11 might find that.  12 Thank you.  13 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  14 MR. DONELON: Good evening. My name is Mike  15 Donelon, D-o-n-e-l-o-n. I live at 3747 Gundry Avenue.  16 Over the past 18 years, I found and lead the  17 efforts to rezone California Heights, create the  18 California Heights Historic District and the California  19 Heights Neighborhood Association. I've been involved in  20 protests against increased flights at the Long Beach  21 airport. I served as Councilmember for the 7th District.  22 During my term, we implemented the current  23 noise ordinance that limits flights that we all want to  24 protect.  25 In April I cofounded and am presently co-chair</p>	<p>1 of the airport, which can invite a challenge to our noise  2 ordinance.  3 If that challenge occurs, with the ongoing  4 effort to regionalize flight activity in Southern  5 California, the potential to lose control of the ordinance  6 is the real threat to the quality of life in my  7 neighborhood.  8 I've always said the safe path is cooperation,  9 not confrontation, and mitigation, not litigation, but the  10 environmentally superior alternative of our 102,890 square  11 feet and 14 aircraft parking pad, and let's work together  12 to protect our ordinance. Thank you.  13 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  14 Next speaker, please.  15 MR. GIBBONS: My name is George Gibbons. I'm at  16 1041 East Tehachapi Drive.  17 I have a question on the AQMD is collecting  18 data related to this project at 36th and Long Beach  19 Boulevard. That's far outside the flight path, and I'm  20 wondering why it wasn't put someplace like Atlantic or  21 Orange and Carson, in that area. That's where the flight  22 path currently is, and that way we get more accurate  23 information. So I'd like to have information on that.  24 Thank you.  25 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p>	7

<p>8 {</p> <p>9 {</p>	<p>1 Next speaker.</p> <p>2 MS. GIBBONS: My name is Sandra Gibbons,</p> <p>3 G-i-b-b-o-n-s, and I'm at 1041 East Tehachapi with him.</p> <p>4 I agree we need to do, you know, upgrade some</p> <p>5 things for security reasons, but a big concern is that</p> <p>6 they took the air quality and the noise issues from a</p> <p>7 location that is not under the air flight path. Whether</p> <p>8 they're arriving or departing, depending on the winds,</p> <p>9 they go both ways.</p> <p>10 This is going to impact both the schools, it's</p> <p>11 going to impact the homes. If you're sitting in our</p> <p>12 backyard and the flights are going off, you can't even</p> <p>13 have a conversation. You have to stop your conversation</p> <p>14 totally. And it doesn't have to be a big C-17 for that to</p> <p>15 happen.</p> <p>16 Many times, there are flights that are</p> <p>17 departing after 10:00 o'clock -- in fact, I think last</p> <p>18 night there were a couple -- that are going off at 2:00 in</p> <p>19 the morning. Sometimes -- I understand if it's related to</p> <p>20 a mechanical problem or weather, that's acceptable, and</p> <p>21 I'm certainly understanding of that. But this isn't</p> <p>22 always the case. I'm not sure what the flights are that</p> <p>23 are going off at that time.</p> <p>24 I also don't understand how by not having -- by</p> <p>25 having more flights, that it won't create more pollution.</p> <p>53</p>	<p>1 In fact, my second grade class visited the</p> <p>2 airport in 1941 when it first opened, and I can tell you</p> <p>3 that it wasn't in the middle of the city and that the</p> <p>4 airplanes that were there at that time aren't the ones</p> <p>5 that are flying in now.</p> <p>6 I have a number of questions. I love to fly</p> <p>7 out of Long Beach, first of all, because a member of my</p> <p>8 family can drop me off at the airport and I don't have to</p> <p>9 pay for parking. And I think that this will continue, and</p> <p>10 I don't think that this is going to make the traffic less</p> <p>11 to have more parking, or it's not going to do anything for</p> <p>12 the pollution.</p> <p>13 The things that I see that need improvement at</p> <p>14 the airport are the passenger security screening and the</p> <p>15 baggage security screening and the baggage claim device</p> <p>16 area. I see it's going to be 500 square feet, whereas the</p> <p>17 administration part of the airport is in the thousands of</p> <p>18 square feet.</p> <p>19 I am very happy with the amount of concession</p> <p>20 area. I have no desire to eat or drink at the airport</p> <p>21 since I live in Long Beach. The restrooms have been</p> <p>22 adequate. Even -- I flew last year out at Christmastime.</p> <p>23 I had no problem in the restroom.</p> <p>24 But one of the things that's glaringly missing</p> <p>25 as far as I'm concerned is a jetway to get onto the</p> <p>55</p>	<p>13 {</p> <p>14 {</p> <p>15 {</p>
<p>10 {</p> <p>11 {</p> <p>12 {</p>	<p>1 There's going to be more car traffic getting to the</p> <p>2 airport by more passengers.</p> <p>3 The whole issue about parking structures,</p> <p>4 people wanting to use those versus having drop-off and</p> <p>5 pick-ups, I don't understand that philosophy either</p> <p>6 because it's going to cost them more to park for three</p> <p>7 days than it is to have someone drop them off whether</p> <p>8 they're coming from Orange County or who knows, they're</p> <p>9 just coming from Long Beach or the South Bay.</p> <p>10 Another big question I have is who's paying for</p> <p>11 all these improvements? Are the airlines paying for this,</p> <p>12 or are the taxpayers of Long Beach paying for this?</p> <p>13 I also think that they're not allowing enough</p> <p>14 time for the study in general for everyone to look at it,</p> <p>15 to study it. It's obviously about six inches thick. You</p> <p>16 can review the executive summary, but that's not</p> <p>17 necessarily going to give you all the nitty-gritty</p> <p>18 details.</p> <p>19 The presentation tonight was very helpful, but</p> <p>20 I know there are a lot of details that you couldn't cover</p> <p>21 possibly on something like this.</p> <p>22 Thank you.</p> <p>23 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>24 MS. CANTRELL: Ann Cantrell. I live at</p> <p>25 3106 Claremore in Long Beach.</p> <p>54</p>	<p>1 airplane. There are many people who do not need</p> <p>2 wheelchairs but have a hard time walking out to the</p> <p>3 airplane with their luggage, and I'm finding that I'm one</p> <p>4 of those now.</p> <p>5 And I heard your explanation tonight that it</p> <p>6 would need a second story. The original airport has a</p> <p>7 second story. It has a third story. And I would think</p> <p>8 that as long as you are changing this historical building,</p> <p>9 you could change it to put a second story onto the new</p> <p>10 portion so that there would be jetways.</p> <p>11 Thank you.</p> <p>12 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.</p> <p>13 MS. KAWASAKI: Good evening. I'm Lillian Kawasaki.</p> <p>14 That's L-i-l-l-i-a-n, last name K-a-w-a-s-a-k-i, and I</p> <p>15 live at 4281 Country Club Drive.</p> <p>16 What I wanted to comment today was that CEQA is</p> <p>17 very clear that while we can't do piecemeal projects, that</p> <p>18 we can't just grow an airport by increments, but that is,</p> <p>19 in fact, what has happened.</p> <p>20 This airport -- my understanding is the last</p> <p>21 comprehensive environmental document was back during the</p> <p>22 part 150 back in the eighties, and so much has changed at</p> <p>23 the airport and surrounding area.</p> <p>24 And in the meantime, what we've seen are some</p> <p>25 negative declarations and some categorical exemptions that</p> <p>56</p>	<p>16 {</p> <p>17 {</p>

17 cont.

1 really have not properly addressed what all the residents  
2 and businesses and surrounding community know about the  
3 airport, which is that we need to have a document that  
4 assesses the cumulative impacts, tells us what's really  
5 there and what's going to be reasonably in the future.

6 And so what I'd like to first recommend is that  
7 it is totally unreasonable -- I mean, what we're looking  
8 at, decision makers and the public, we're looking at a  
9 40 percent increase in the amount of passengers going from  
10 three million to 4.2 million annual passengers.

11 We're looking at a 30 percent increase, almost  
12 30 percent, in the number of square footage. No, no.  
13 Actually, almost 40 percent in the number of square  
14 footage if we look at the maximum build. The footprint is  
15 increasing at the airport as we take over Parcel O and  
16 move the general aviation.

17 So there's some very big investments and big  
18 decisions that need to be made, and so what I really am  
19 encouraging you is that it is not reasonable for the  
20 assumption that this EIR is only for the on-site terminal  
21 improvements; that, in fact, your optimized scenario,  
22 which you say is we're doing as Council told us to, is, in  
23 fact, the real project. And that ought to be the one that  
24 you evaluate, that's the one that you ought to be  
25 mitigating for.

57

18

1 -- oh, if we look to the SCAG regional transportation  
2 plan, they say we'll accommodate 3.8.

3 So my question is are we now setting up a  
4 project that's inconsistent with SCAG's regional  
5 transportation plan?

6 We also looked at the outcome on air quality,  
7 and again, we have extreme air quality. We're the only  
8 one in the nation. We won it back from Houston. We have  
9 the worst air quality in the nation, and when you look at  
10 the optimized scenario, what we're really going to be  
11 seeing, we violate PM10, NOx and CO.

12 When we look at the human health risk  
13 assessments, really what -- the reason it looks so good is  
14 because you haven't really looked at the cumulative  
15 impacts. In light of the MATES II study from the AQMD and  
16 the Air Resources Board, you just can't come to the  
17 conclusion that the human health risk assessment is  
18 beneficial as a result of this project.

19 You have the port, you have the 710 expansion,  
20 you have all these additional flights, and those need to  
21 be -- because the human health risk assessment is about  
22 what are the kinds of exposures that we have.

23 That same cumulative impact is also the case  
24 for noise, and on sensitive receptors, I think you need to  
25 think about whether it's not 65 CNEL, but 55 CNEL.

59

19

1 And that's also the one that you should be  
2 looking at other cumulative impacts. For example, you  
3 look at only the 52 flights, the 11 additional commercial  
4 and the what, 25 commuter flights.

5 But there's 70 general aviation that you need  
6 to be assessing in all that because as people that live in  
7 the flight pattern, you hear those. And you also have  
8 military planes.

9 So I think there's one thing when you talk  
10 about the document as far as the noise ordinance. I think  
11 what we're really talking about is an adequate CEQA  
12 document, and they are very different.

13 I actually am one of those people -- I've tried  
14 very hard to read the document, all the appendices, and  
15 one of the things I'll close with is really urging you to  
16 go ahead and give additional time.

17 But in my review, I'd like to give you sort of  
18 some what I'll call observations because I will give you  
19 detailed technical comments.

20 One is the map, the million annual passengers.  
21 The NOP which you sent out earlier said you were going to  
22 accommodate 3.8 million. Now without any reason, it's at  
23 4.2 million. What happened that creates 400,000 more  
24 passengers every year?

25 And on that map what we're looking at is that

58

20

1 I think one of the things we will be doing in  
2 the time we have here is to go back and look at what the  
3 world airport at LA has done, and many of the things that  
4 we say we can't do in this EIR, whether they're  
5 operational changes, bringing in the cleanest vehicles or  
6 spreading out the peak so that we don't have this big peak  
7 in the morning and in the evening, but spreading them out,  
8 I'm not so sure that we can't really do those once the FAA  
9 has approved the world airport's mitigation package.

10 And so there may be things that we can look at  
11 that currently we say we can't do because FAA won't let  
12 us, but, in fact, we actually can.

13 Going back to CNEL -- and I think this is not  
14 the case. You say that this is also beneficial on the  
15 noise. And you need to look at all of the noise impacts,  
16 all of the various flights, including those 70 general  
17 aviation and the -- but others, freeways and other sources  
18 of noise pollution.

19 But on that, I wonder what you mean by an  
20 easement. Are you asking that if people who are subjected  
21 to unhealthful noise conditions are required to get  
22 mitigation, that you want them to sign something that says  
23 they won't sue? I think you need to tell us what does  
24 that easement mean and what strings come with that because  
25 under CEQA document, you don't have -- you have to come up

60

20

25 cont.

1 with reasonable mitigations, not as a string that they  
2 won't sue you if they take the mitigation that you owe  
3 them.

4 On vehicular traffic, it says it's significant  
5 without mitigation, and one of the things you didn't point  
6 out that the EIR says is that when we get to the 4.2 map,  
7 there won't be adequate parking on site, so the airport  
8 will go find on-site parking.

9 Now, where are they going to find -- in fact,  
10 it's the airport manager will find on-site parking.

11 Now, where are we finding on-site parking when  
12 we're already building a parking structure, moving the  
13 general aviation? I just don't see that you're going to  
14 have additional parking. And so, if there is that  
15 additional on-site parking, you may want to go back and  
16 really reconfigure the projects you have today.

17 The alternatives are very limited, and, you  
18 know, the only alternatives that you've given us are three  
19 scenarios of different square footage, and one of the two  
20 only varied by what, 6,000 square feet.

21 And based on the level of detail that you've  
22 provided us, I'm not even sure that you know the  
23 difference between 6,000 feet one way or the other. This  
24 is on the square footage.

25 So again, I would hope that with the approval

61

1 projects that are being approved in the City of Long  
2 Beach.

3 And the EIR, which I find kind of incredible,  
4 says that we can't provide you a list of the cumulative --  
5 again, cumulative impact section of the projects because  
6 all the projects that we know about will be developed in  
7 the next five years.

8 Well, those are ones that are reasonably known,  
9 and CEQA says you need to put that list, tell us, and you  
10 need to add that to all the other traffic impacts and  
11 other impacts that the people are going to feel.

12 And they very finally -- as I said, we'll  
13 submit written comments. The CEQA says that you should  
14 provide a minimum of 45 days when you send something to  
15 State clearing house.

16 There is no doubt that this document went to  
17 the State clearing house. So you're giving us the minimum  
18 public review time with the maximum amount of holidays.  
19 Very complex project, very hard to get a hold of the  
20 document. I mean, not everybody has time to go to the  
21 library. They can't download these things.

22 So I really urge you that this is a huge  
23 decision, a huge investment for this region for many  
24 decades to come. Please give everybody the adequate time  
25 to read the document, to understand what's going on and to

63

29 cont.

30

26

27

28

29

1 of the FAA for some of the things that are happening at  
2 LAX, that we would be able to come back and look at more  
3 creative alternatives that would allow us not to increase  
4 the footprint but still provide the modernization and  
5 convenience that we want, such as smoothing out the peak,  
6 bringing in better, you know, height restrictions on the  
7 way they fly and so forth.

8 NEPA. Nowhere in the EIR did I see that we --  
9 that there would be NEPA compliance, and if there's any  
10 grants that you're going to get from FAA or any kind of  
11 permits or federal entitlements, what kind of NEPA  
12 document will be done?

13 And if we have a project that does -- is  
14 inconsistent with the regional transportation plan,  
15 inconsistent with the AQMD or the state implementation  
16 plan -- and I apologize. These are air plans and general  
17 plans and municipal plans -- I think that traditionally  
18 the FAA has a very difficult time approving those kinds of  
19 expenditures when they don't meet the kinds of regional  
20 planning.

21 Also, the cumulative impact I think is just --  
22 it's nine or eight pages. That is it, the entire  
23 document. And yet we know there's huge expansion at the  
24 port, huge expansions in the 710, lots more traffic on the  
25 405. And besides Douglas Park, there are many additional

62

1 provide the input that we need for our decision makers.  
2 Thank you.

3 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

4 MR. SLAVIN: Hi. My name is Terry Slavin, and I'm  
5 running for -- fellow Americans. My name is Terry Slavin.  
6 I'm running for City Council, District 5.

7 MS. EBERHARD: Can you spell your name?

8 MR. SLAVIN: S-l-a-v-i-n last name, first name  
9 Terry, T-e-r-r-y.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. EBERHARD: And your address.

12 MR. SLAVIN: 3960 Gilman, 90815.

13 Okay? Looks like a lot of real, real smart  
14 things going on in this room. I'm a deputy inspector, and  
15 that means I go out and watch guys build buildings. These  
16 guys are doing a good job of building buildings, but N.O.  
17 is going to kill you, so that's a fact.

18 And the noise. How you gonna get airbus 308's  
19 out of here? Suppose you gotta crash land one? LAX  
20 closed up yesterday.

21 I think about freeway expansion, double decking  
22 them, you know. Just like you double deck those 14 planes  
23 out there, build a parking lot because you're going to  
24 have to have one. That's what's happening. That's what's  
25 coming. China. Business going to be out of sight.

64

31

31 cont.

1 So I propose we build a landing field on water.  
 2 That's just what I propose. Take a rubber raft, turn it  
 3 upside down, make it a buoyant piece of concrete, tie them  
 4 all together, long enough, big enough to crash land a 308  
 5 airbus on there.  
 6 How else can you do it for the 20 years you're  
 7 looking at? Where you gonna get the money?  
 8 I am researching working these all out, and  
 9 I'll find a way, I assure you. Thank you very much.  
 10 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 11 MS. SELLMERR: My name is Laura Sellmerr,  
 12 S-e-l-l-m-e-r, 5474 Daggett, Long Beach.  
 13 I have a few points again. I'd like to request  
 14 more time. I think it's -- by a reasonable person's  
 15 standard, to have the minimum amount of time to -- for the  
 16 public to review the document is not acceptable.  
 17 We need to push this off into January when the  
 18 public is free to go through these six inches of  
 19 documents. They are very technical, and I think it's  
 20 unreasonable for the City to expect the public to be able  
 21 to thoroughly review them and respond to them.  
 22 In the presentation tonight, I'm troubled by  
 23 the visuals that are presented here. The Exhibit 1, prior  
 24 to that page, there's discussion about Parcel O being part  
 25 of the project.

65

1 would be Exhibit 2, I'm counting the jets, and we're  
 2 showing 11. But in the text of this proposed project,  
 3 there's 14.  
 4 So I'm looking at 1100 jets here thinking  
 5 that's a lot of jets, and you don't even show 14. So  
 6 again, there may be a fuller, another illustration of it,  
 7 but I think that's misleading for the average resident,  
 8 public, to look at and not see the full scope of the  
 9 proposed project.  
 10 So again, we do need more time. And again,  
 11 this is -- these comments I'm making may be out of  
 12 ignorance. If we had a lot more time to look at these and  
 13 we could set our lives aside, we would have more time to  
 14 look at them.  
 15 The noise footprint that we saw in the  
 16 presentation tonight, I've come to learn about the noise  
 17 ordinance, that when the noise is being monitored,  
 18 measured, it's only when the wheels are up.  
 19 So when a jet aircraft is sitting on the runway  
 20 and it's revving up its jets and it's ready to take off  
 21 and it's really loud but the wheels are on the ground,  
 22 that isn't being counted in the noise budget. That's --  
 23 and yet I can hear that. If I'm shopping over at Lowe's,  
 24 I can hear those jet engines when they're revving up  
 25 getting ready to take off, and I think the residents

67

34 cont.

32

33

34

35

36

1 But then I noticed on the slide when it was  
 2 being presented -- and again in here -- there's no  
 3 Parcel O being shown. There's no sense of reference on  
 4 what that acreage looks like, what that means.  
 5 And again, if there's a concept that you may be  
 6 parking general aviation, that would be the private jets,  
 7 we'd like to know how many more private jets does that  
 8 mean to the residents surrounding the Long Beach?  
 9 Because the size of that parking as opposed to  
 10 where we currently put our commercial aviation parking is  
 11 very key to what Long Beach residents can expect with  
 12 increased flights, and I think that's misleading not to  
 13 show that on the visual, and I really don't understand  
 14 why --  
 15 MS. BRADY: Within the EIR, there are exhibits that  
 16 show Parcel O. And then also on the board outside the  
 17 door, there is a large aerial that has Parcel O  
 18 identified.  
 19 MS. SELLMERR: I rest my case. We need more time to  
 20 go through the thorough EIR as opposed to this abbreviated  
 21 look. We need more time to really be able to look at  
 22 those things. Most of us are very busy during the  
 23 holidays.  
 24 This may also be in the full EIR, but again,  
 25 the number of parking positions shown on this graphic that

66

1 really deserve to know what the noise impact is when the  
 2 jets are on the ground.  
 3 I think this is kind of a subset of the noise  
 4 ordinance, but we do have the monitors available, and we  
 5 could actually measure what the noise is. And for this  
 6 project, I think we need to look at what the noise output  
 7 from the airport, the effect it's having on the residents.  
 8 And with that, again, I'll close it. I also  
 9 believe that one of the guiding principles of the airport  
 10 needs to be LEED, that's U.S. Green Building Council.  
 11 One of the things I learned last week at one of  
 12 the Green Building Council meetings is if you don't use  
 13 materials, you don't have to maintain them.  
 14 So if you're not using that extra 10,000 square  
 15 foot of concrete or you're not using those extra 10,000  
 16 trees for that building, you are -- by building a more  
 17 conservative building, maybe a more modest size, you are  
 18 actually doing -- you are being a better steward of the  
 19 environment by building just what you need to build and  
 20 not just what you want to build because, again, our -- I  
 21 think there's a mind set in our country now that we have  
 22 to become environmental stewards with this greenhouse  
 23 effect going on if we don't start taking it seriously.  
 24 We've got to do that.  
 25 So again, I'm pushing, I'm asking for a

68

1 building that's just what we need and nothing more.  
 2 Thank you.  
 3 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 4 MS. RAMSEY: My name is Gail Ramsey, and I live at  
 5 4610 Virginia Avenue in Long Beach.  
 6 And I'm not a politician. I'm not an expert on  
 7 airport development. This is one of the first meetings of  
 8 this kind that I've attended, and I think that you've all  
 9 done an excellent job at the airport improvement project  
 10 that you showed to us tonight, but my concern is that you  
 11 may be neglecting the main concerns of the people of Long  
 12 Beach. I've lived here for three years, and I must say  
 13 that in three years, I have not had one good night's  
 14 sleep.  
 15 So my concern is that before you propose the  
 16 improvements, what's being done about the existing  
 17 continuous noise?  
 18 I'm really not so concerned about the daytime  
 19 noise. When you live near an airport, that kind of goes  
 20 with the territory. But you had mentioned in Chapter 1643  
 21 that there would only be an increase in flight activity  
 22 if, quote -- and I quote -- if the noise levels remained  
 23 within the approved noise budget.  
 24 What is that budget?  
 25 I also don't know what the Airport Noise

69

1 Thank you very much.  
 2 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 3 MR. MAY: Thank you very much.  
 4 My name is Don May. Make it easy for you.  
 5 M-a-y. California Earth Corps, 4927 Minturn in Lakewood,  
 6 90712.  
 7 Earth Corps has been very concerned with  
 8 particulate emissions, diesel exhaust, over the last --  
 9 better than a decade. Ever since SOHIA first came out  
 10 listing that as a separate toxin.  
 11 And you're all familiar with the MATES II  
 12 study, particularly with the diesel death zone, but  
 13 perhaps you're not as aware of another one on page five  
 14 dash ten of MATES II which looks at the air quality in  
 15 this area without trucks and ships and port emissions.  
 16 We would be in compliance with national air  
 17 standards instead of dead last except for these little  
 18 dots, big one around LAX, one in Burbank, one in Ontario,  
 19 and of course a large dot in Long Beach.  
 20 We really need to do something about the health  
 21 risk that comes from airplane emissions. This is a  
 22 raising level of concern internationally of global  
 23 warming, but more with people in the vicinity of airports  
 24 as they have taken a look and found that there's a large  
 25 health risk associated.

71

1 Compatibility Ordinance means. I mean, what does that  
 2 mean? All I know is that the existing airport noise is  
 3 not compatible with the health of Long Beach residents.  
 4 I know that in battle, in combat, in war, one  
 5 of the things they use most is sleep deprivation, and I  
 6 will tell you I have experienced that every single night  
 7 since I moved to Long Beach three years ago. It's not  
 8 fun. It's not okay.  
 9 And I was really happy to see Vince -- where is  
 10 he? -- put up the picture of the colors so -- because for  
 11 the last three years, I thought, well, I must be right in  
 12 the middle, right in the epicenter of where the planes go  
 13 over because I'm awakened between two to six times every  
 14 single night.  
 15 Now, I know the planes aren't supposed to fly  
 16 between 11:00 at night and I think it's 7:00 in the  
 17 morning, but I will tell you they do. And I don't know  
 18 how that happens. I'm not imagining things. But they do,  
 19 and I'm awakened, and it's -- I mean, it's beyond sad.  
 20 It's beyond angry. It's just not a healthy way to live.  
 21 That's my concern.  
 22 So if you have a noise compatibility ordinance  
 23 that already doesn't work, my concern is how will this be  
 24 addressed, how will it be changed if you're going to  
 25 expand.

70

1 Consequently, we were -- we looked at the EIR  
 2 as a great opportunity to look at how -- what this health  
 3 risk is because if you don't understand exactly what  
 4 contaminants are coming from planes and whose homes  
 5 they're falling on, you don't have a good handle on how to  
 6 control and reduce them and bring them back into a level  
 7 with national compliance.  
 8 We have been heavily involved with the port and  
 9 getting to know that emissions, report emissions.  
 10 Therefore, we've been very interested in seeing a  
 11 pollution bucket, as well as a noise bucket for the Long  
 12 Beach airport, and we're looking forward to this document  
 13 as helping us toward that.  
 14 Consequently, it was a great disappointment to  
 15 find that there were a lot of errors that greatly  
 16 underestimated not only the exposure, but which  
 17 contaminants we're being exposed to and what the length of  
 18 time is.  
 19 That comes from a number of problems. If you  
 20 look at the methodology that's there, one has been a key  
 21 one that's already been referred to, is using the data  
 22 that comes from the AQMD station at Carson and Long Beach  
 23 Boulevard.  
 24 It not only is too far away and only one, but  
 25 it's a sampling station rather than monitoring. That

72

37

38

38 cont.

1 tells you how much has been accumulated over a period of  
 2 time. And you don't find out until months later and, in  
 3 fact, years later 'til the MATES II report comes out.  
 4 If the public is going to be able to avoid  
 5 these episodic exposures to airport pollution, we need to  
 6 have realtime data. That's why California Earth Corps,  
 7 along with HUSH2, embarked on a program to do air quality  
 8 monitoring, that is to say realtime data, to look at on a  
 9 minute-to-minute basis what we were being exposed to and  
 10 what levels.  
 11 It's a pilot study. There's controversy on  
 12 whether or not the methodology we used can really separate  
 13 out what comes from ships and trucks and trains and what  
 14 comes from airplanes, but we do know that the smaller the  
 15 particles that come out, the greater the health impact.  
 16 We do know that what comes out of jet engines,  
 17 being aromatics, like benzene, substituted benzene, has a  
 18 greater adverse impact than many of the other  
 19 particulates.  
 20 We do know that when you do sampling with a  
 21 grid, that's a filter, and if you're doing PM10's, things  
 22 that are greater than one micron, everything that's less  
 23 than one micron goes through and isn't counted. Likewise  
 24 two and a half.  
 25 We're interested in the submicron, the ultra

73

1 lopped off and not counted when you do sampling, and yet  
 2 that's what caused the greatest health impact.  
 3 Remember, if you're a smoker or have been a  
 4 smoker out there or you're very young, very old or  
 5 impaired in other way, you're already exposed to heavy  
 6 levels that -- worst in the nation on west side Long Beach  
 7 from the ports.  
 8 And the trucks on the 710, that extra -- not a  
 9 straw on the camel's back. That's a two-by-four from  
 10 what's coming from the airport. So you're really going to  
 11 have a much greater adverse impact. You really need to  
 12 look at those.  
 13 I'll make one final thing. Unfortunately, our  
 14 applied measurement sciences, best in the country as far  
 15 as I know for looking at this sort of thing, Eric has had  
 16 a personal problem with his daughter that caused him to  
 17 lose about three weeks of work.  
 18 We could really use some more time to come out  
 19 with a good study. Likewise, our modeller, Camille Sears,  
 20 can't until our study is out really look at what our data  
 21 shows. She can't do a good job.  
 22 So I would plead for some more time. I think  
 23 it's to all of our advantage, no matter how you look at  
 24 this, to have really good data to look at. Our study is  
 25 not intended to be definitive, but it should show what the

75

39

1 fines that have the greatest impact, and you don't get  
 2 that from the kind of sampling which is done. You not  
 3 only don't get realtime data, you don't get a look at rich  
 4 particulates and get it so that you can do an accurate  
 5 health risk assessment.  
 6 That's why we took the time and are still doing  
 7 monitoring to determine just exactly what our exposures  
 8 are. We do know that they also undercount because once  
 9 you take a look at the data, what AQMD reports is in  
 10 tiers, greater than so many micrograms per cubic meter.  
 11 That is not a good way to do it.  
 12 What you really need to do is by spectroscopy  
 13 to be able to look. Particularly, we found that one of  
 14 the best instruments --  
 15 MS. EBERHARD: 30 more seconds.  
 16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He can have my five minutes.  
 17 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Me, too.  
 18 MR. MAY: What we hope happens as a result of this  
 19 is that we can embark on a real study that tells just what  
 20 levels of exposure that we're getting. And consequently,  
 21 if you don't know which species and you don't know what  
 22 magnitudes, you can't tell what a health risk is.  
 23 More than that, when you start looking at data  
 24 on a minute-to-minute basis in realtime, you see it's very  
 25 fluky out there. You get big spikes. Those are what is

74

1 best way to go about doing this is. We think it will show  
 2 that, we'd like a little more time to do it definitively,  
 3 and we look forward to working with the airport, the City  
 4 to work out a good monitoring program, not a sampling  
 5 program, out there for all of our health.  
 6 Thank you very much.  
 7 MS. SCHIPSKE: Good evening. I'm Gerrie Shipske,  
 8 and I reside at 2919 Studebaker Road in Long Beach, and  
 9 I'm a registered nurse practitioner with extensive  
 10 experience in public health, as well as being an attorney,  
 11 and for those two reasons I'm here tonight to -- well, you  
 12 can't say it any better than Don May at Earth Corps, but  
 13 certainly I think as the City grapples with trying to  
 14 obviously increase tourism and travel because since we  
 15 have a city where 42 percent are at or below the poverty  
 16 level, we need to certainly have that tax basis in the  
 17 City to support the necessary services that all of us  
 18 enjoy.  
 19 But I think at the same time, we need to be  
 20 very mindful that the residents who live here and who  
 21 provide that tax base need to be protected, and I'm in  
 22 particular concerned -- the draft EIR talks about  
 23 providing soundproofing and insulation for those homes  
 24 that are in the 65 CNEL contour and the schools that are  
 25 in the 60 CNEL contour, but makes no provisions for -- I

76

39 cont.

40

40 cont.

1 think it's approximately 1800 homes that are actually in  
 2 the 60 CNEL.  
 3 I find it ironic that at the same time, there's  
 4 no proposal to soundproof and to insulate these particular  
 5 homes which are located in the heart of the largest tax  
 6 base for this city and provide the property taxes that pay  
 7 for the services.  
 8 MS. EBERHARD: Please hold your applause.  
 9 MS. SCHIPSKE: The Douglas Park Project -- and I ask

10 all of you to take a look at their web site.  
 11 The Douglas Park Project actually is requiring  
 12 the soon-to-be condo buyers and townhome buyers who live  
 13 within what they're projecting to be between 60 and 65  
 14 CNEL, they're going to have to sign an aviation easement  
 15 that waives their rights to sue the airport for having a  
 16 home that's within this impact.

17 And then I ask you then why aren't we  
 18 protecting the property rights of the existing homeowners  
 19 who are living -- who by your projections are going to  
 20 live in a similar area in Long Beach.

21 So I would call upon the City Council to when  
 22 they review the draft EIR to make provisions for  
 23 soundproofing and insulation without requiring these  
 24 homeowners to sign an aviation easement because, in  
 25 essence, by interfering with their rights to enjoy their

77

1 advantages of the city airport is that your friends, your  
 2 neighbors, your spouse can drop you off at the airport. I  
 3 don't see that changing.

4 So the additional parking I do not think is  
 5 going to be utilized, and if it's not going to be  
 6 utilized, then it basically means the whole EIR on traffic  
 7 was very inadequately done because if there's more  
 8 passengers, there's going to be more traffic -- and I  
 9 don't care what anyone says -- unless, of course, this is  
 10 not an airport for Long Beach city. This is an airport  
 11 for Orange County, Los Angeles County generally, and  
 12 especially all the other cities, but they don't have to  
 13 pay the costs.

14 The other thing I was very intrigued, why did  
 15 they take a study of the freeway traffic which is on the  
 16 other side of Long Beach? I would have thought they would  
 17 have wanted to take an intersection of the 405 and  
 18 Lakewood Boulevard. That's where the traffic's going to  
 19 be. Or Lakewood and the 405 or Atlantic and 405.

20 And there will be traffic because you can just  
 21 look at Inglewood and see what happened as the traffic  
 22 grew. You used to drive in on Century Street. Now you  
 23 don't. You take Sepulveda or you take -- you go up north  
 24 and you get off and you come back in. People are going to  
 25 be -- there's gonna be additional traffic because there's

79

41

1 homes that they're taking by the City of Long Beach from  
 2 these 1878 homes, but they certainly should not have to  
 3 waive any rights to simply get soundproofing and  
 4 insulation to bring their homes down to the 45 CNEL, which  
 5 is considered to be the livable noise level that I think  
 6 all of us deserve in the Long Beach area.

7 Thank you.  
 8 MR. SAURENMANN: My name is Jim Saurenmann. I'll  
 9 spell it anyway. S-a-u-r-e-n-m-a-n-n. 2408 Stanley  
 10 Avenue.

11 When I looked at the draft EIR, I'm so glad  
 12 it's a draft. I would hate to think that this was even  
 13 semi-formalized.

14 I was very interested in that the exit from the  
 15 airport is going to be going south, and yet you did not  
 16 analyze any of the impact that's gonna have on people  
 17 making a U turn at Lakewood and Spring, Lakewood and  
 18 Willow, or turning around and going on Spring back up to  
 19 Cherry, back up to Carson, and then through other areas.

20 That was very interesting. I guess it was,  
 21 well, we don't worry about that because that won't impact  
 22 traffic. People don't -- basically what that says is that  
 23 people north of Spring don't use the airport. I find that  
 24 hard to believe.

25 This is supposed to be a city airport. The

78

1 gonna be additional flights. After all, the draft EIR is  
 2 based and predicated on the fact that there will be  
 3 additional flights, pure and simple. That was its  
 4 rationale.

5 The other thing is they talk about peak  
 6 traffic, and they don't take that peak traffic with --  
 7 when the airlines are landing and flying, yet there's  
 8 going to be more flights, there's going to be more  
 9 traffic. And sometimes on the weekends, the traffic is  
 10 worse than during the week.

11 All in all, I was a little bit surprised  
 12 because I've given presentations for Fortune 200  
 13 companies, and the lack of detail and the lack of support  
 14 behind what was said and done, in my mind, is appalling.  
 15 I'd give this presentation sitting behind a desk and not  
 16 out up front, I don't think I'd be with the company  
 17 anymore if this was -- thank you.

18 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. Next?

19 MR. FRAHM: Hi, my name is Good Looking Gary Frahm,  
 20 and I live at 6481 Bixby Hill Road in Long Beach. I am  
 21 currently the president of the Bixby Hill Community  
 22 Association with over 259 homes, 120 townhomes and 56  
 23 apartments with about 1200 residents.

24 I'd like to thank the employees of the City of  
 25 Long Beach for creating this EIR. It's a nice starting

80

42

43

44

45

<p>1 point. And I also like the fact that you put it in a pdf  2 file that is searchable. What I didn't like is when I  3 typed in the words "Bixby Hill," I saw nothing in 326  4 pages.  5 So I took it, I read through it, focused on the  6 noise section of it, of this long report, and I got to  7 thinking, well, this can't be.  8 So I'm in the concert business, so I went down  9 and got one of my handheld sound units and took it home  10 and started monitoring the DB's of the aircraft that were  11 coming overhead.  12 In the last three days, they have ranged from a  13 high of 79.2 to a low of 65.9 with an average of 73.7.  14 The sound came from helicopters, the carriers, prop  15 aircraft, just about -- generally about everything.  16 Our nearest -- is it AMOS system site, the  17 sound systems that monitor everything, is site number  18 three on the corner of Anaheim and Palo Verde. This site  19 is surrounded by trees and only monitors sound, not the  20 humidity, not the wind speed, not any of the other seven  21 or eight factors that influence sound, which concerns me.  22 Bixby Hill is surrounded on two sides by water  23 and a large school ground. The sound is reflected and  24 amplified by those items. My opinion anyway.  25 So here's my question. Why doesn't Bixby Hill</p> <p style="text-align: right;">81</p>	<p>1 going on at this airport because I don't really believe  2 that your numbers are accurate. Not only that, as  3 gentleman Don May said up here, I'm also concerned about  4 the amount of pollutants that are going to occur because  5 of this increased loads of these airplanes coming in.  6 You know, at one point this year, Blue America  7 or whatever it is, ran at 97 percent capacity. That's a  8 pretty full jet for a whole month on every one of their  9 planes, and that's a lot of weight with luggage and  10 everything.  11 I see these sounds going up, and I don't see  12 them coming down. And considering that the City of Long  13 Beach and the air carriers are using our airport haven't  14 been in compliance with the noise ordinance for the last  15 two years, have been over their budget, I don't see how  16 you can get to the 52 jets or 51 jets that you are now  17 saying that we possibly could get in the years to come.  18 There's not enough time to really go into all  19 aspects of this EIR. Again, I would say the same things  20 as the rest of these ladies and gentlemen said. We need  21 more time. We have to do this right because we're not  22 going to change it once its done.  23 Thank you.  24 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. Next speaker.  25 MR. NISBET: Hi. My name is Randy Nisbet, and I</p> <p style="text-align: right;">83</p>
<p>1 -- why isn't Bixby Hill included in the EIR? For that  2 matter, why isn't it included in the sound monitoring  3 system? Oh, I know the one is outside the gates at Bixby  4 Hill, but it's surrounded by trees and on a noisy  5 intersection. How about putting it over by one of the  6 canals that amplify the sound?  7 Also reviewing your data, I found that in 19 --  8 2004, the capacity of the airlines was 72 percent. So far  9 in the first ten months of this year, it's been 80  10 percent.  11 The sound consultant says that the more load,  12 the higher the noise level and fuel consumption. So the  13 question comes to mind is how much more noise can we  14 expect due to this increase?  15 Also, lately you have changed your reports on  16 compliances by adding a new line item called "Duplicate  17 Complaints." Can you explain the breakdown in how you  18 arrive at your numbers on this item or even how you got to  19 break out that category?  20 The system for monitoring the airport is crude  21 at best. Like I said, we don't have all the other things  22 that affects sounds in the mix.  23 So what I'd like to do is before you make these  24 big decisions for us people, that you invest in a  25 state-of-the-art sound system that can monitor what is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">82</p>	<p>1 reside at 5109 Colorado Street in Long Beach.  2 N-i-s-b-e-t.  3 In the ongoing air monitoring study that Don  4 May had mentioned just a little while ago, Long Beach  5 HUSH2 and Earth Corps has been measuring black carbon  6 concentrations around the City of Long Beach and near the  7 airport runways.  8 Some air monitoring data has been taken from  9 residential homes that are more than two and a half miles  10 away from any freeway but are in the flight path of the  11 Long Beach airport.  12 Readings taken from the ethylnometers in our  13 study show sporadic but daily black carbon concentrations  14 that are extremely high, and I mean really high. When our  15 preliminary data is compared to a Seattle air study made  16 by the Puget Sound Air Clean Air Agency, the black carbon  17 concentrations are as high as those found at freeway on  18 ramps at peak rush hours or at close to peak rush hour in  19 the middle of the I-5 in Seattle, Washington.  20 The residents of Long Beach at prior scoping  21 sessions have overwhelmingly demanded that air quality  22 monitoring around the Long Beach airport and its  23 residential neighborhoods. Air monitoring of this sort  24 has not been performed for the draft EIR.  25 The AQMD and CARB told the airport staff and</p> <p style="text-align: right;">84</p>

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

1 consultants last year that such a monitoring project would  
2 take a whole year to take proper samplings of the air in  
3 the City of Long Beach.

4 Instead, it was decided to perform a quicker  
5 retrospective study with outdated computer modeling. A  
6 City air monitoring process could have already been 75  
7 percent completed.

8 The decision to not perform air monitoring has  
9 sacrificed the quality of the EIR for the sake of  
10 expediency to rush into building a larger airport.

11 How can we see a proper state-of-the-art air  
12 quality study performed with data from multiple locations,  
13 not just the lone AQMD site on Long Beach Boulevard?

14 This needs to be done for an airport expansion  
15 of this size and the costs currently proposed. For the  
16 health and well-being of Long Beach residents, air quality  
17 monitoring must occur.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

20 MR. WARNKE: Good evening. My name is Tom Warnke,  
21 that's W-a-r-n-k-e he, I live at 3645 Myrtle Avenue,  
22 apparently outside any footprint.

23 However, having lived there during the  
24 rerouting of some of the commercial flights from the main  
25 runway to 25R, I know I do live in the footprint.

85

54

1 I have an interesting anecdote to tell you. I  
2 have solar panels on my roof. Apparently, they're not as  
3 effective as they could be because particulate matter  
4 drops down, covers the panels, and prevents them from  
5 operating at maximum efficiency for the sun.

6 Let me just state that for purposes of this  
7 study, I think it's important that we expand our noise  
8 monitoring stations to reflect the fact that the runway I  
9 live on -- and I do live on it, it seems like -- is more  
10 accurately represented, that there is care taken because I  
11 know if it were accurately represented, we would have many  
12 more homes within your 60 CNEL, if not within your 65  
13 CNEL, that would have some bearing on this study, and I  
14 think that would just be my request that we do that.

15 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

16 MR. WRAIGHT: My name is Steve Wraight,  
17 W-r-a-i-g-h-t. I reside at 4468 Myrtle Avenue, Long  
18 Beach.

19 Have lived under the airport for 20 years.  
20 Five years ago was diagnosed as having adult asthma, which  
21 never been a smoker, don't live with one, and I know my  
22 children are occasionally coming down with more colds and  
23 things like that than normal. Just an aside.

24 Couple small items, but regarding the terminal  
25 building -- and I hope this project doesn't get this far,

86

55

1 but let me ask some questions.

2 If it is culturally significant, then I wonder  
3 why we're putting a -- I didn't pick up the stories, but  
4 let's say a multi-story parking structure right in front  
5 of it so it can't be appreciated. How about Jeff Lewis  
6 stepping up and putting it underground, the parking  
7 structure?

8 And also again, I hope the process doesn't get  
9 this far, but should retrofitting of the residence in this  
10 area -- which is a wonderful neighborhood. It is the  
11 neighborhood that current planners and architects and City  
12 officials are trying to develop in terms of walkable  
13 neighborhoods, close to schools and churches and stores.

14 Should retrofitting happen in these wonderful  
15 rich enclave of houses, I trust that we won't have a  
16 budget that simply puts in vinyl retrofit windows but does  
17 dual and triple pane glazing in our nice wood casement  
18 windows that we have now.

19 I'd also like to know -- and I have not read  
20 the EIR. I apologize. Let me add this before I get off  
21 of the microphone. We do need more time. I need more  
22 time. It is a busy time of year. I think it was a  
23 political abomination to pick this period of time to have  
24 us study it.

25 This is Southern California. We live outside

87

56

57

58

59

60

60 cont.

1 Long Beach airport. We're putting a bull's-eye on it for  
 2 FEMA, who has already said that they expect us to increase  
 3 our flights because other airports in the region can't  
 4 increase their capacity, and for -- SCAG has already  
 5 stated that what they want is Long Beach airport before  
 6 this expansion to increase the number of flights.  
 7 So we already have that threat from two  
 8 important organizations, so running ahead and building a  
 9 terminal larger because it makes us feel good, we feel  
 10 good when we get off this plane and look how beautiful it  
 11 is.  
 12 But I tell you -- and some proponents of  
 13 expansion have said that they're embarrassed when  
 14 passengers get off of the flights. I'm more embarrassed  
 15 when people get off the 405 freeway on Long Beach  
 16 Boulevard and drive south. That's not only embarrassing,  
 17 that's dangerous.  
 18 We need to focus on all parts of this city, not  
 19 just on an airport that most -- that more people in  
 20 California rather fly out of Long Beach airport than any  
 21 other airport in California.  
 22 Let's don't paint that bull's-eye on our  
 23 airport for the future generation. I love living in Long  
 24 Beach, and I wouldn't want my kids to move out of Long  
 25 Beach because it's not the place to live anymore because

89

1 the time.  
 2 And I can tell you it's so noisy that in the  
 3 summertime, we cannot hear conversations or our television  
 4 if our windows are open. So in the summer, we have to  
 5 close our windows and doors.  
 6 This evening, you kept stating that the  
 7 optimized flight scenario conditions, and then you insist  
 8 that such a huge project wouldn't affect the number of  
 9 flights. People are very skeptical of that statement.  
 10 I can remember years ago there was a vote about  
 11 whether we should even build that diagonal, and the  
 12 argument was -- and you folks who have lived here a long  
 13 time remember that. The argument was that, yes, we need  
 14 that diagonal so that Douglas can build those big planes  
 15 and have a landing strip for them to take off to test, and  
 16 that will be it. We will never have commercial flights.  
 17 And we voted for it because they promised there  
 18 would never be commercial flights. Now we're told that if  
 19 we have this huge project, we will not have additional, we  
 20 will not have additional flights.  
 21 I think I'm not alone and in saying if they  
 22 build it, they will come.  
 23 MR. HERWEG: Hi, name is Greg Herweg, 2024 Marber,  
 24 H-e-r-w-e-g.  
 25 I've spent a little bit of time looking at the

91

61

1 of all the pollution.  
 2 Now, the citizens of Long Beach were promised a  
 3 prospective health risk assessment. I was at that City  
 4 Council meeting when they said, "Yes, staff, give us a  
 5 prospective health risk assessment."  
 6 In this EIR, there's old modeling that makes  
 7 this report a retrospective study. My question is what  
 8 locations were used for air samplings and when were they  
 9 taken? How many samplings were taken?  
 10 If the air samplings were taken from 36th and  
 11 Long Beach Boulevard, that location is upwind and it is  
 12 two miles out of the flight path. Therefore, those  
 13 samplings are invalid.  
 14 So we need to do this right, so that way when  
 15 it's over and done and whatever we do at the airport we do  
 16 at it, we're not saying, "God."  
 17 Well, if we could get rid of those eight and  
 18 16-unit apartment buildings and if we could get rid of  
 19 that humungous terminal, this city would be a wonderful  
 20 place to live. Let's don't do that.  
 21 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 22 MS. DENISON: I'm Ann Denison, Denison with one N,  
 23 please, D-e-n-i-s-o-n. I live at 6931 East 11th Street,  
 24 Long Beach, and we live near Studebaker and Anaheim under  
 25 one of the landing -- under the landing pattern most of

90

1 environmental impact report. It's very voluminous. it  
 2 goes without saying there's so many people that are  
 3 begging for more time. We're just making a plea for more  
 4 time to be able to look at this and really be able to look  
 5 at whether or not it was done right, and what that means  
 6 in my eyes is did you do the air quality testing right,  
 7 was any of the noise violations really looked at. I mean,  
 8 this is an ongoing problem.  
 9 I'm a recent resident that moved into the  
 10 neighborhood. The noise budget is violated every single  
 11 month. There's multiple complaints every single month.  
 12 Last month was 49. Month before was 48. Then I submitted  
 13 into the people that calculate them. It goes on every  
 14 single month, and nothing's being done about it.  
 15 We need more time to be able to look at this,  
 16 but we've got one shot at doing it right. So if it takes  
 17 more time, it takes more time. And if it takes really  
 18 doing a study on the air quality and the air quality, the  
 19 quality of life within Long Beach, we've got one shot at  
 20 it, and then that's it, so...  
 21 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 22 MR. GUTIERREZ. Hi, my name is Paul Gutierrez,  
 23 G-u-t-i-e-r-r-e-z, and I live at 4330 Myrtle Avenue, and  
 24 I'm shocked to find out that that address does not fit  
 25 within any of your little boundaries here for the noise

92

62

63

64

65

66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71

1 mitigation.  
 2 I find it hilarious that you could shush us for  
 3 talking in the room because the court reporter couldn't  
 4 hear what was going on, and then you tell me my house is  
 5 not within the area that needs noise mitigation. Come and  
 6 sit in my backyard, come and sit in my living room someday  
 7 and tell me that my house does not fit in there.  
 8 Thank you.  
 9 MS. WRAIGHT: My name is Elena Wraight,  
 10 W-r-a-i-g-h-t. I live at 4468 Myrtle Avenue. I am a card  
 11 carrying member of the PTA.  
 12 I also request more time to review the EIR  
 13 because I feel I have very -- not very smart questions,  
 14 but I do have questions.  
 15 I'd like to know where the cost of the project,  
 16 if it is approved, will come from. Where will the money  
 17 for mitigations to impacted neighborhoods come from? What  
 18 is the cost to the City to terminate the lease agreement  
 19 with Million Air? Why were monitors in impacted areas not  
 20 utilized? Why does the EIR assume carriers are flying  
 21 quieter aircraft and did not utilize data, noise  
 22 emissions, et cetera, from existing aircraft? And why did  
 23 the EIR assume users want to pay for parking and not  
 24 utilize the drop-off?  
 25 Thank you.

93

1 earlier.  
 2 There's some good environmental mitigations,  
 3 including the replacement of some diesel ground support  
 4 equipment at the terminal with the electrification of the  
 5 parking pads.  
 6 I would like to compliment the historical portion of  
 7 the presentation because as I can see, the 1941 terminal  
 8 building is highlighted as you approach the airport, and I  
 9 think it's pretty interesting.  
 10 This is probably the oldest terminal building  
 11 in use on a regular basis for airline service in this  
 12 country. That may be an interesting sideline to try to  
 13 find out whether, in fact, that is the case.  
 14 One other thing that I would like to speak to  
 15 is there has been displacement in recent years of some  
 16 general aviation uses at the airport for commercial and  
 17 some non-aviation use.  
 18 This is consistent with what's going on with  
 19 the EIR here. As we see, we're losing some general  
 20 aviation space north of the present terminal to parking  
 21 positions for the airlines.  
 22 I think the mitigation is correct and needed in  
 23 the Parcel O complex, and I would certainly hope that all  
 24 general aviation parking area that's displaced be replaced  
 25 in the Parcel O area or other areas at least one to one.

95

73  
74

72

1 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 2 MR. McACHREN: Good evening. My name is Kevin  
 3 McAchren, it's spelled M-c capital A-c-h-r-e-n, and my  
 4 address is 801 Pine Avenue in Long Beach, 90813.  
 5 Thank you again for the opportunity to speak to  
 6 your group tonight. I rise in support of the EIR  
 7 findings. I think that it is a viable project for the  
 8 City of Long Beach. It's definitely necessary.  
 9 Even at the 103,000 square foot size, this  
 10 terminal will be about half the size of what comparable  
 11 terminals for airports that are handling about as many  
 12 passengers as and Long Beach is projected to handle under  
 13 the terms of the noise ordinance.  
 14 So you can see that it is probably not right  
 15 sized for being too small, but I accept those findings at  
 16 being about 103,000 square feet.  
 17 I think it's very important that the 14 parking  
 18 pad positions are also a vital part of the study. I have  
 19 seen instances where aircraft waited on taxiways for 30  
 20 minutes or more waiting for a position to park, and I  
 21 think this is bad environmentally having the aircraft  
 22 having to run engines waiting for -- to deplane passengers  
 23 before they can get a gate or a parking position.  
 24 A position is where the aircraft parks, the  
 25 gate is the doorway, as it was said in the presentation

94

1 So I think that sums up the comments tonight,  
 2 and thank you again for the opportunity to speak.  
 3 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 4 MR. ALTON: Good evening. My name is Bruce Alton,  
 5 A-l-t-o-n, 1106 Ladera Drive. And I also should state  
 6 that I am a member of the Airport Advisory Commission, but  
 7 this evening I'm speaking as an individual.  
 8 I have a few items relating to the EIR and  
 9 issues with its adequacy. I think it's been 20 years  
 10 since the last EIR for a major airport improvement was  
 11 addressed, and it may be another 20 years -- who knows?  
 12 -- before we look at an EIR again.  
 13 My point is that the scope of this EIR is quite  
 14 narrow. It deals with the terminal improvement project  
 15 only and, of course, the parking structure. And as we all  
 16 know, there have been any number of other improvements  
 17 taking place at the airport.  
 18 In fact, over this past summer, there was a  
 19 major runway improvement. There are ongoing improvements  
 20 to taxiways and so on and, obviously, the Douglas Park  
 21 improvements. Although they are separate from the  
 22 airport, they share an adjacent boundary, and obviously,  
 23 there are some overlaps.  
 24 My point is this EIR does not address in a  
 25 comprehensive manner the environmental impacts that have

96

75

75  
cont.

1 taken place over the past 20 years at the airport. I'm  
 2 also aware that we do not have an airport master plan by  
 3 design that would help to aggregate all of the  
 4 improvements that have taken place and may be proposed to  
 5 take place in the future into a single document that can  
 6 be reviewed comprehensively in an EIR.  
 7 So my point is why do we not reflect an airport  
 8 master plan as a foundational document to this EIR?  
 9 The second point I have to make is primarily  
 10 with respect to the process of the EIR in the area of the  
 11 human health risk assessment, both the noise area and the  
 12 toxic air contaminants.  
 13 It appears that a large number of existing  
 14 source materials were utilized to address the baseline  
 15 toxic air contaminant standards that are currently used as  
 16 our point of departure.  
 17 There are -- there were documents that address  
 18 how one views the particulate matter that is being -- that  
 19 comes out of a turbine aircraft.  
 20 Apparently, if my understanding is correct in  
 21 the reading of the document, PM10 and PM2.5 are really not  
 22 relative with respect to understanding particulate  
 23 emissions from an aircraft in that a turbine engine  
 24 appears to put out particulate matter that is much smaller  
 25 than those two criteria.

97

1 essentially the new baseline for the terminal improvement,  
 2 what is it that we are going to do to from an ongoing  
 3 basis monitor and track and document and report to the  
 4 public that, in fact, what we thought was the reality as  
 5 identified in this EIR is, in fact, true as time goes on?  
 6 Possibly will be better, that we are, in fact,  
 7 defining a worst case scenario in the EIR and that  
 8 subsequent readings would say that we're better than that,  
 9 and that's good news.  
 10 However, the opposite could be true, as well,  
 11 that we are overly optimistic in the identification of the  
 12 impacts of this EIR, and we will only know that if we have  
 13 subsequent measurements taken, evaluated and documented in  
 14 terms of what truly is falling on us in terms of  
 15 airport-impacted neighborhoods.  
 16 Thank you.  
 17 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 18 MS. ORTMAN: Phyllis Ortman, O-r-t-m-a-n, 5302 East  
 19 Green Meadow Road in Long Beach in the Lakewood Village  
 20 neighborhood.  
 21 Listening to everybody tonight, I can only say  
 22 where were you last year when we were trying to keep  
 23 Boeing from building houses under the -- right next to the  
 24 airport? Because they're going to be very close, and we  
 25 could have used your group.

99

77

76

1 If that is, in fact, true, I'm concerned that  
 2 we do not understand what that smaller value is and what  
 3 the impact is to us.  
 4 There are any number of other documents that  
 5 address elements of the development of the human health  
 6 risk assessment. My point is that each of these  
 7 documents, when they do make a finding, there is typically  
 8 a range of significance where -- or a tolerance associated  
 9 with a certain finding and the value associated with that  
 10 finding.  
 11 Inasmuch as we are using a very large number of  
 12 documents and amassing them into a single finding for this  
 13 EIR, what have we done to address the cumulative impact of  
 14 those variables in essentially the aggregate risk that is  
 15 driven by all of the subordinate variables and these  
 16 supporting documents?  
 17 And I have not been able to understand in the  
 18 reading so far that we are adequately addressing the  
 19 incremental variables up through this document up to the  
 20 point where we come up with our final response, and it  
 21 would be helpful to me if somebody could point that out.  
 22 I think one last thing that I have to say, and  
 23 this really probably wouldn't be included in the EIR, yet  
 24 it's very important to me, and that is once we do  
 25 authorize this EIR and define the recommendations as

98

1 My only message is this: I'm sorry that the  
 2 noise issue is so much combined with the necessity for a  
 3 new airport or a new terminal.  
 4 The terminal that we have is insufficient. If  
 5 we have the same number of flights, it's insufficient. If  
 6 we have fewer flights, it's insufficient. We need a  
 7 different airport, and that is my message.  
 8 If you were to ask the population in the City  
 9 of Long Beach to put it to a vote, I bet you they would  
 10 say we need a new airport or a new terminal. So that's my  
 11 message.  
 12 Thank you.  
 13 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  
 14 MS. BERMAN: Hi, I'm Suzanne Berman, B-e-r-m-a-n.  
 15 I'm the Manager of Environmental Service for Jet Blue  
 16 Airways, 118 dash 29 Queens Boulevard, Forest Hills, New  
 17 York, 11375.  
 18 The first question or comment that I have is on  
 19 the EIR. I think you guys have done a fabulous job. The  
 20 scoping document was 555 pages. I've heard person after  
 21 person stand up here and say why wasn't my house part of  
 22 this? My question was why weren't you part of the scoping  
 23 meeting?  
 24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We were. All of us.  
 25 MS. BERMAN: Recognize that the EIR for the most

100

78

79

80

1 part from an airline perspective is worst case scenario.  
 2 Most of the EIR was done with stage three aircraft. Jet  
 3 Blue at the current time is operating stage four aircraft.  
 4 The difference between stage three and stage four aircraft  
 5 is stage four is much quieter.  
 6 For those folks that are technical, I'm happy  
 7 to share any type of technical information you want on the  
 8 differences between stage three and stage four.

9 MS. EBERHARD: Go ahead and make your comments, and  
 10 I'm sure you'll be available afterwards.

11 MS. BERMAN: At the current time, I keep hearing MB  
 12 380's bringing brought up. Currently, there are no plans  
 13 within Jet Blue to add a wide body aircraft. We are  
 14 building a new terminal at JFK, the Port Authority of New  
 15 York and New Jersey, and it is all for narrow-bodied  
 16 aircraft.

17 We have two aircraft in our current fleet. We  
 18 have an A320 and we have a 190. Both are narrow body.  
 19 Neither one carries more than 160 passengers.

20 As of right now, the other thing I keep hearing  
 21 is expansion. Expansion of the airport is set by City  
 22 ordinance. There are 41 flights commercial allowed, 25  
 23 commuter. Of those, we were given 25. We gave back  
 24 three, so that we're flying 22 slots. The three were  
 25 given back so another carrier would not affect the

101

1 emissions and what is 405.

2 My final comment is the thing I keep hearing  
 3 over and over is how we're going to pay for this.  
 4 Currently, the airport is self-funded, and quite honestly,  
 5 the airlines have not been given input into what the new  
 6 airport being proposed is going to look like.

7 There was a presentation that was given, my  
 8 understanding, and it was set aside for the City Council  
 9 and what they wanted to compose as a new airport.

10 Thank you.

11 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

12 Other speakers?

13 MS. CALDES: First thing I'd like to -- my name is  
 14 Carmen Caldes, C-a-l-d-e-s. I live in District 8 right  
 15 under the flight path, the departure flight path of the  
 16 airlines.

17 And the first thing I'd like to say is thank  
 18 you very much for giving me the opportunity to speak here  
 19 tonight. I've been to many meetings. I have sat through  
 20 many, many long hours and have never come to express my  
 21 opinions verbally, but I'd like to do so.

22 I find that many people before me, as did  
 23 Miss Kawasaki, did an excellent job to convey my opinions,  
 24 as well.

25 I'm the mom of a five-year-old child, but

103

81

1 ordinance.

2 The infrastructure in Long Beach airport is  
 3 inadequate. It's inadequate for the operation currently.  
 4 We're in double wide trailers. There are numerous safety  
 5 issues for both the Transportation Security  
 6 Administration, as well as for our operation.

7 We are signature carrier to the California  
 8 ground service equipment memorandum of understanding. The  
 9 compliance with that agreement is based on the  
 10 infrastructure that's at the airport.

11 We've invested a significant amount of money in  
 12 pieces of equipment that we cannot use because there is no  
 13 electrical infrastructure within the Long Beach airport to  
 14 be able to utilize them.

15 In addition, for those folks that we keep  
 16 talking about particulates, for us, fuel conservation is  
 17 reduced emissions. They go hand in hand. In order to be  
 18 able to utilize a ground power unit that is electrified,  
 19 you need infrastructure. We have to be using diesel  
 20 equipment because there is no infrastructure at the  
 21 airport.

22 There is a 2002 EPA study on particulate  
 23 diesel, just as an FYI. Less than 10 percent of that is  
 24 attributable to aircraft. Most of that is on-road diesel.  
 25 So very hard part deciphering between what is aircraft

102

1 luckily, I have had the pleasure of flying out of Long  
 2 Beach airport about a half dozen times at least about  
 3 during the last year. I've flown through LAX. I've flown  
 4 through San Francisco, Oakland, Chicago O'Hare, Midway, to  
 5 name a few.

6 Now, all of my flights have not left from Long  
 7 Beach. I try to get a flight out of Long Beach whenever I  
 8 can because of the fact that all of the -- it runs more  
 9 efficiently than any of the airports I just listed. I'm  
 10 in and out of there. My son is with me all the time. He  
 11 travels with me at my side. And I'm able to get in and  
 12 out of there quickly.

13 It could be improved a little bit, but it runs  
 14 very efficiently, and I don't see a need for super-sizing  
 15 this because -- just because it's a little inconvenient  
 16 for maybe the people who work there. I don't know if --  
 17 they're doing a fine job.

18 You're doing a fine job with what you have, and  
 19 I'm doing a fine job with what I have as far as, you know,  
 20 my car gets me to where I need to go. I don't need to buy  
 21 a Cadillac to get me to where I go. It's fine as it is.  
 22 That's my point.

23 But addressing the EIR, I had a copy of the  
 24 synopsis of it, and I was looking through it and I was  
 25 reading through it because my main concern is if we

104

82

83

84

<p>85 {</p> <p>86 {</p>	<p>1 expand, what is going to happen, how is this going to  2 affect me, how is this going to affect my son?  3 And I read in here that it addresses -- the  4 health issues are my main concern, so I'm paging through  5 it. I'm looking for, well, what's going to happen once  6 this airport is expanded, how is it going to affect me?  7 And I see that the EIR addresses air quality  8 health risk assessment while the project is being built.  9 Well, to me that's insignificant. I need to know once the  10 project is built what's going to happen.  11 If I upgrade my house, how much is it going to  12 cost me to heat it? What is the final impact, not what is  13 it going to cost me during construction. What's going to  14 happen once we have this giant airport?  15 Are there going to be effects traffic-wise?  16 How many people are going to come to the airport now?  17 What's the effect of it coupled with the Long Beach  18 terminal expansion, east 710 expansion, et cetera, et  19 cetera?  20 As I said, many people before me tonight have  21 raised many issues very eloquently, much more eloquently  22 than I can, but there's many members of the community that  23 feel as I do, and we would like to have these issues  24 addressed. Please let us know what the health issues,  25 what the health risks will be once the airport is</p> <p style="text-align: right;">105</p>	<p>1 with a gentleman, the airport manager, Chris Kunze, and we  2 kept updated all the time and knew what the airport was  3 doing, what they planned, where they planned to go, and we  4 were always alerted of when things were going to take a  5 turn for better or worse.  6 I believe -- and this is personal, and I'm also  7 president of the Bixby Highlands Neighborhood Improvement  8 Association. But on a personal basis, I believe that it  9 is time for the airport terminal to be modernized.  10 I do believe that it is time to set aside that  11 area, hold the heritage that is Long Beach airport and to  12 make it possibly a greater place for people to see. I do  13 not believe it should be done sacrificing residents'  14 quality of life in surrounding neighborhoods.  15 So in reading the EIR, I'd like to go to -- I  16 guess it's Section 1.3.2, physical setting. It just  17 totally dismisses the fact that there's residential use to  18 the north and the west of the airport. I would like to  19 know why. We stand to be most impacted, especially late  20 at night, because we're the last ones to get the noise.  21 Paragraph -- let's see. Section 1.4, project  22 description. The size of the present facility and the  23 amount of people that go through it, that travel through  24 it, is pretty well set and dictated, and obviously, if you  25 enlarged the maximum from 102,000, you're going to shove a</p> <p style="text-align: right;">107</p>	<p>{ 87 cont.</p> <p>{ 88</p>
<p>87 {</p>	<p>1 expanded.  2 Thank you very much.  3 MS. EBERHARD: Can you just give your address?  4 MS. CALDES: 90 West 47th Street, 90805.  5 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.  6 MR. MINEGHINO: My name is Gerald Mineghino,  7 M-i-n-e-g-h-i-n-o. My address is 4301 Boyer Avenue,  8 90807.  9 If you're not familiar with -- and only a  10 couple people would be -- that happens to be ground zero  11 for three zero departures. We're just right smack dab in  12 the middle of a little neighborhood called Bixby  13 Highlands.  14 Bixby Highlands consists of 875 homes, 65  15 apartment buildings. It's bordered by San Antonio,  16 Cherry, Carson and Orange.  17 Now, let me tell you where I came from. 1981,  18 I purchased a home there. 1981, I also entered a lawsuit.  19 The lawsuit was against the City of Long Beach. Was to  20 try and wrest control away from the City and back to the  21 citizens over noise control and growth of the airport.  22 We established a -- I guess a truce. The noise  23 ordinance was formed, and life kind of went on for a  24 while.  25 One of the things we did was we met regularly</p> <p style="text-align: right;">106</p>	<p>1 lot more than I expected in there. I think that you're  2 going to really attempt to overwhelm the citizens in the  3 neighborhoods once more.  4 My area's a concern, I guess my area's a  5 concern. The additional space -- obviously, the first  6 concern as a resident in the impacted area -- which I  7 guess I'm not in an impacted area because I'm not in the  8 EIR. The additional space means you have additional  9 motivation to increase activity.  10 One of the things that I see is that Long Beach  11 serves as a stepping stone for Orange County. Orange  12 County declined and fought to preserve its green space and  13 its peaceful surroundings, and they gave up a great place  14 to put a regional airport, but I imagine that Jet Blue  15 right now is serving a lot of Orange County folks.  16 The impact to the full use of all those slots  17 has never, ever been seen. God help us when the 25  18 commuter slots get filled because that's when we're really  19 going to see the picture.  20 Right now we're seeing the commercial, we're  21 seeing the commercial and general aviation. When the 25  22 commuters hit, whoa, hold on.  23 Intelligent use of departures and arrival  24 times. I think that's been the biggest problem, and we've  25 said it for years, and we've said it to people that are in</p> <p style="text-align: right;">108</p>	<p>{ 89</p> <p>{ 90</p> <p>{ 91</p>

91 cont.

1 this room, that because when we had start-up airlines,  
 2 they couldn't get good gates and they couldn't get good  
 3 time slots, so they took what they could, and they were  
 4 always trashy.  
 5 It seems like Jet Blue with its dynamic  
 6 presence and its successful operation should be able to  
 7 get time slots spread through the day rather than bunched  
 8 in the evenings or bright and early morning.  
 9 I think we have a time limit. They say a time  
 10 limit. We've got, of course, for the noise ordinance, but  
 11 that means nothing. They do what they do, and they pay  
 12 the penalty later.

92

13 I think without a comprehensive health risk  
 14 assessment, including the monitoring and, of course,  
 15 conditions and testing of individuals, I think the real  
 16 effects will be avoided and the truth unknown except for  
 17 the personal experiences of residents, and I think that's  
 18 a fact.

93

19 I think most of the people that are on the  
 20 payroll both of the City -- who did a great job on the  
 21 EIR, although it stops short of really being  
 22 all-encompassing. I think the problem is we've got people  
 23 that are on the payroll of the airlines and people on the  
 24 payroll of the City who are trying to get this thing  
 25 moving forward.

109

94

1 I would like to see it moved forward. I really  
 2 want to see -- I want to see Chris finally get his  
 3 terminal that he's always wanted all these years.  
 4 The historic building, I want to see it  
 5 preserved. I don't want to see that parking structure  
 6 anywhere's near the front of it. I think it's been a  
 7 grand thing since those buildings came down on Douglas  
 8 Drive there. I think it's great to be able to look right  
 9 at it.

95

10 Water quality concerns. In 1.7, it says there  
 11 were no wells nearby that could be possibly affected by  
 12 airport runoff. I beg to differ with you because if you  
 13 go over to Clark, you can see the pumping station for the  
 14 well there. So there is also a storm drain that runs  
 15 probably 300 to 400 yards from it. I think they missed  
 16 that one.

96

17 Recreation. Yes, recreation for all those  
 18 folks. I think it's been said -- I think Chris has said  
 19 it many times -- Long Beach isn't necessarily a place  
 20 where people are coming, but a place that people come to  
 21 pass through.  
 22 I think we're building a lot of additional  
 23 comfort in a place for people who don't live in Long  
 24 Beach, and I think it's time we look at designing this  
 25 thing around Long Beach and Long Beach's needs and let

110

1 Orange County and those folks fend for themselves. I hate  
 2 to cut into Jet Blue's success.

97

3 I'll just close with this. I believe that no  
 4 changes in the allowed minimum of the 41 and 25 flights  
 5 out of there should be -- I think that there should be  
 6 none allowed for a period of at least two years after this  
 7 terminal expansion is done, whether they beat the noise  
 8 ordinance or not.

98

9 I think we really need to get forward, move  
 10 forward cooperatively, build this thing, get it done in a  
 11 way that everyone's happy and then take a look at what the  
 12 actual effects of it are before we allow any changes in  
 13 that airport.

14 I've always contested that the one thing the  
 15 sounds ordinance did was it tied our hands. If they had  
 16 one good year where they could beat the budget, all's they  
 17 had to do was put additional flights in, and it would take  
 18 a year before we could get rid of them no matter what they  
 19 did. I felt that was unfair.

20 I hope the success of the EIR, you know,  
 21 trashing it out today, I'm sorry. People worked very hard  
 22 on it. I hope there is a little more time allowed. I  
 23 think we need it. I think everybody needs to really look  
 24 at it.

25 And thank you very much.

111

99

1 MS. DELATORRE: My name is Birgit, B-i-r-g-i-t,  
 2 Delatorre, D-e-l-a-t-o-r-r-e, 4465 Cerritos,  
 3 C-e-r-r-i-t-o-s, Avenue, Long Beach, 90807.

4 As I said, I've spoken before, and I'm still  
 5 working my way through this report and coming up with more  
 6 questions.

7 I went to the scoping meetings that we had  
 8 about a year ago several times and listened to what other  
 9 people had to say, and I myself made several requests that  
 10 comprehensive health impact studies would be included in  
 11 this EIR.

12 I don't know how the process works, and I  
 13 believe the City Council is the one who decides what the  
 14 scope is going to be and gave you people the instructions.

15 Whatever the case may be -- oh, the lady is  
 16 gone.

17 There were -- people were asking for updated  
 18 studies, the impact to be based on updated scientific  
 19 studies such as dispersion models, what is the effect of  
 20 the noise on stress level as far as children being able to  
 21 perform in school the next day if they've been woken up at  
 22 a time that is not normally their wake-up time.

23 I personally know that I am -- on Sundays when  
 24 I wake up at 7:00 o'clock in the morning because of the  
 25 planes, it's my only day that I can sleep, and I do get

112

100

1 pretty stressed about that.  
 2 So having read some of the EIR, I can only  
 3 surmise that these requests were not addressed in the  
 4 scope of the EIR because the EIR says the SQMD advised you  
 5 that you didn't have to do certain health impact studies.  
 6 I'd like to request tonight that you make  
 7 available that correspondence that took place between  
 8 those agencies and you that lead you to conclude you  
 9 didn't have to do those kinds of health impact studies.  
 10 Thanks.  
 11 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. And then we have one more  
 12 speaker. Can I ask how many other people, since we're  
 13 just about at 9:00 o'clock? How many others? One more.  
 14 Okay.  
 15 MR. KOWNAL: My name is Mike Kownal, K-o-w-n-a-l,  
 16 3756 Pine Avenue, Long Beach. I'm with Long Beach HUSH,  
 17 as well.  
 18 And I want to comment on the quality of the  
 19 testimony that was given this evening and what has been  
 20 said by the residents of this community that are impacted  
 21 by the airport. I think it's just overwhelming, and I  
 22 certainly hope that the consulting firm listens to this  
 23 and responds to all the questions in a firm and adequate  
 24 manner.  
 25 Some of the things I intended to bring up

113

101

102

103

1 tonight have already been said and probably said much  
 2 better than I can, but I want to reiterate the importance  
 3 that this study and the size of the EIR certainly needs  
 4 much, much more response time than the minimum.  
 5 And a question I have that I'd like to be  
 6 answered -- and I assume all the questions will be  
 7 answered somewhere in the draft analysis -- is why is only  
 8 the absolute minimum amount of time allowed to respond to  
 9 this, particularly in the timing of the document?  
 10 We were promised it a month, two months, three  
 11 months prior to its release, and then we were only given  
 12 45 days, minimum by law, to respond. I find that is  
 13 disrespectful to the community for sure to say the least.  
 14 To go on, I'd also -- so I would certainly  
 15 expect somewhere between 60 and 90 days further from the  
 16 45-day response time to finish public testimony before it  
 17 goes into Council for a vote.  
 18 I read in the proposed project descriptions  
 19 terms such as, "In most cases the proposed mitigation  
 20 program would reduce these impacts to a level considered  
 21 less than significant. However, even with implementation  
 22 of the mitigated program, construction related air quality  
 23 impacts would remain significant and unavoidable."  
 24 Further, it says, "The proposed mitigation  
 25 program would reduce land use and transportation impacts

114

1 to levels considered less than significant. Air quality  
 2 impacts would remain significant and unavoidable."  
 3 It reads -- through and through the document,  
 4 it says, "Recommended mitigation measures included use of  
 5 emulsified diesel fuel and/or particulate traps that would  
 6 reduce construction impact, but not -- but not to a level  
 7 considered less than significant."  
 8 Again, there's two more quotes in here that I  
 9 could read you.  
 10 My question is if these are not lead to a level  
 11 considered less than significant, where's the mitigation?  
 12 There's no mitigation? We just live with it? We suck in  
 13 more of this pollution day in and day out and put our  
 14 families at risk and peril? They don't understand that.  
 15 But once again, maybe we need more time to read  
 16 the entire document and how you're going to save us from  
 17 already an impacted air quality area.  
 18 I've also been told that the modeling that you  
 19 use in determining the health impacts and quality is the  
 20 older of two models that are now available, with a newer  
 21 one being released just about the time you probably  
 22 started your study.  
 23 If that's true, I would like that confirmed in  
 24 your response, and I'd also like to know if it was  
 25 discussed whether or not to use the older modeling or the

115

1 newer modeling to go forward with your EIR for the  
 2 airport.  
 3 I'd like to know also because part of your  
 4 recommendation, you speak to larger terminal sizings and  
 5 opportunities, and you specifically address the fact that  
 6 it was spoken to that even a larger terminal than the  
 7 voted on by Council recommendation sizing to be the  
 8 largest of the 102,000 square feet could exceed that, and  
 9 you spoke to that.  
 10 I wonder who asked you to do that or why you  
 11 would even include larger planning than you were asked to  
 12 study.  
 13 I'm also curious about the parking structure.  
 14 It's been said a couple of times tonight that because --  
 15 what the sizing of that structure, how do you determine  
 16 how many cars were going to park there.  
 17 We know what parking is there now with the 41  
 18 plus three flights. We don't know what it will be with 25  
 19 commuter flights, but commuter flights obviously are  
 20 coming to pick up passengers that are interim passengers  
 21 from one airport to another, using Long Beach airport as  
 22 the interim airport. That's the reason for commuter  
 23 flights, as I understand it.  
 24 Why the excessive parking is needed, I'm not  
 25 quite sure. I'm kind of concerned about that. And I

116

103 cont.

104

105

106

106 cont.

1 didn't see any data confirming why you needed so much  
2 parking out there, as well as the position of the parking  
3 structure and exactly where it's going to be in the  
4 project.

5 And then finally, the aircraft parking  
6 positions themselves, it's talked about something between  
7 I believe an 11 and 14, and the recommendation is two to  
8 14 sizing. I know three of those are supposed to be  
9 dedicated to the commuter flights if and when they're  
10 used.

11 If indeed that's true, that the three will be  
12 dedicated and only used by commuter aircraft, what will be  
13 the assurance that the regular larger aircraft can use  
14 those parking positions?

15 Thank you very much.

16 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

17 And our last speaker. And then again, I think  
18 Mary is going to need a couple minutes, but she will be  
19 here for a few minutes to take private comments.

20 MR. ROBINSON: I'll be short.

21 Scott Robinson, 1062 East Tehachapi.

22 I only have really one question. Why did you  
23 pick the 45 days? It's a 1700-plus page document. I work  
24 in contracts and pricing. If my company, which is the  
25 largest employer for the City of Long Beach, the Boeing

117

1 itself. I've been to the airport a few times, and  
2 honestly -- several times, actually. I do not understand  
3 why there is a need for more concessions and more waiting  
4 areas. It's a pass-through airport, as someone has noted  
5 before, and I see no need for concessions, no need for  
6 restrooms and no need for much additional parking.

7 Finally, as a resident, I was not in the grid  
8 or the 60 area, I guess, but I certainly hear the  
9 airplanes at night. At 2:00 in the morning I hear them  
10 sometimes, and that's inside the house with all the  
11 windows closed and doors closed, and it interrupts.

12 I'm concerned because our quality of life in  
13 Long Beach is being impacted, impacted greatly, because we  
14 spend a lot of time outdoors. There's been a lot of talk  
15 about what is being done to mitigate the problem. There  
16 is no mitigating factor for that, and everyone's health is  
17 being impacted.

18 That's it.

19 MR. RIVERO: My name is Steve Rivero, R-i-v-e-r-o.  
20 I live at 4327 Myrtle Avenue in Long Beach.

21 As I was sitting and listening to the  
22 presentation tonight, and having participated in the  
23 previous scoping meetings, thought came to me -- and it  
24 was kind of a twist on the Mark Twain quote -- that there  
25 are liars, there are damn liars, and there are

119

107

108

109

1 Corporation, if we got a study like that and it was 1700  
2 pages, there is no way that we would even answer anything  
3 within the 45-day period. We'd say we need 90 days, we  
4 need six months. There's no way that we would have to  
5 make a decision on 45 days.

6 That's all I want to say.

7 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

8 With that, I'm going to conclude. Again, give  
9 the court reporter a couple minutes to get some water and  
10 all, and if you still would like to make comments, she  
11 will be available.

12 I thank you all for your time and your  
13 comments. Have a good evening. Thank you very much.

14 (Brief recess.)

15 MS. CERVANTES: Ester, E-s-t-e-r, Cervantes,  
16 C-e-r-v-a-n-t-e-s, 4327 Myrtle Avenue, 90807.

17 I have three items. One item is there was a  
18 comment about exposure to an adult resident, 70-year  
19 exposure, and the verbal comment was that it was found --  
20 there was an impact, but it was less than significant.

21 And I would like to know what could be less  
22 than significant if there is a health impact on an adult?  
23 How is that measured, and how can they consider any impact  
24 to be less than significant? That's item number one.

25 Item number two is related to the airport

118

1 environmental impact reports.

2 I think during the course of the scoping  
3 meetings, there was a lot of testimony about what these  
4 citizens in the affected communities wanted in terms of  
5 what was going to be reviewed.

6 Now that we're starting to have an opportunity  
7 to look at what has come out, it's clear that the report  
8 is not anywhere near as conclusive as we originally  
9 requested.

10 And so therefore, I think that given the amount  
11 of time that's been given to people to review things,  
12 there really needs to be more time given for people to  
13 review, as well as for the preparers of the reports to  
14 consider some of these other concerns that have been  
15 brought up in -- quite a long time ago.

16 I'll leave it at that.

17 (Whereupon the comments session was  
18 concluded at 9:21 p.m.)

19 O-0-0

20

21

22

23

24

25

120

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) ss.  
 2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES )  
 3  
 4 I, MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143 and Deposition Officer  
 5 for the State of California, certify:  
 6 That I attended the foregoing hearing and that all  
 7 argument and comments made at the time of the proceedings  
 8 were recorded stenographically by me and that the  
 9 foregoing is a true record of the proceedings and all  
 10 comments made at the time thereof.  
 11 I hereby certify that I am not interested in the  
 12 event of the action.  
 13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have subscribed my name this  
 14 23rd day of December, 2005.  
 15  
 16  
 17 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Certified Shorthand Reporter in and  
 for the State of California  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



**Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005**

Name Sandra Gibbons  
 Address 1041 E. Tehachapi Dr. LB 90807  
Street City Zip Code  
 Email sdgibbons@aol.com

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
 City of Long Beach  
 Planning and Building  
 333 West Ocean Blvd.  
 Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

**Comment Card**



**Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005**

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

Great concern that EIR measurements were taken @ } 1  
 Long Beach Blvd & 36th St — not under direct flight  
 path of departures & arrivals. If there are  
 more flights allowed, this will create more automobile }  
 traffic, more pollution, more noise, greater } 2  
 health risks. Make the airport secure, not  
 necessarily bigger. Divert the flight paths. Require  
 quieter, more efficient planes.

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name

*Andrew Kresal*

Address

*4240 Virginia Vista Ct. Long Beach 90807*  
Street City Zip Code

Email

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card

Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005



Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

*Improve the area <sup>terminal</sup> but do not enlarge*

*I have a bad case of asthma please I don't like the noise and dirt.*

*Andrew Kresal*

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name Vivian J. McKee  
Address 2040 Albury Ave. Long Beach, CA 90815  
Street City Zip Code  
Email \_\_\_\_\_

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card

Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005



Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

You have forgotten about the Los Altos area. I live  
right under the flight path & can sit in my kitchen  
and see those planes coming one after another. The  
impact of Airport Expansion will affect Hill School,  
Minnie Cant, Cal State University and other schools in  
the area. It will cause noise pollution and ruin  
property values - people will be moving out.  
Air traffic has been bearable since 1958. But  
now you have no idea what you are doing.

1

2

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name Nancy Pfeffer  
Address 3554 Walnut Avenue\*, LB 90807  
Street City Zip Code  
Email ThePfef@verizon.net

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

\* between 60+65 CNEL  
Contours

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card

Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November ~~29~~, December 3, December 5, 2005



Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

I am in support of the proposed LGB Terminal Improvement Project and the associated EIR. The project is much needed to accommodate air passenger traffic; it will conserve the heritage of the terminal building; and it will not result in an increase in cumulative noise levels. I look forward to its completion (as a not infrequent LGB passenger).

P.S. The Exec. Summary of the EIR refers to the 41+25-flight levels as "minimums." I always thought they were "maximums."

1

2

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name Dodie Soto

Address 4784 Virginia Ave. L.B. 90805

Street City Zip Code

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

While attending the meeting AT the Petroleum  
club on Dec 5TH I detected a sense of fear  
from the entire room of attendee's - The man  
who spoke up and said "Bigger is not better" spoke  
for me AS well. My sadness to those who live around LAX.  
No one entity is going to force me out of my home  
for their own enterprize - For I enjoy the quietness  
and friendliness at what I now consider "my airport"  
As well AS follow Long Beachers - You try living  
in a flight PATH - then you tell me if you approve this

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name Joseph Valles

Address 4330 Myrtle Ave  
Street City Zip Code

Email Long Beach, CA 90807

averagejoe@charter.net  
Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card

Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005



Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

I believe the EIR should provide best  
dolan estimate for recommended size of  
project. If current draft doesn't, I  
strongly encourage it does.

thanks,  
Joe Valles

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
Address \_\_\_\_\_  
Street City Zip Code  
Email \_\_\_\_\_

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

The AQMD is collecting data related to this project @ 36th ELB B1B - This is far outside the flight path - why not @ Carson & Atlantic or Orange

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

1 Long Beach Airport Study Session

2 City Council Chambers December 15, 2005

3  
4 Attendees:

5 Greg Carpenter, Planning Bureau Manager; Angela Reynolds,  
6 Planning Officer; Suzanne Frick, Planning and Building  
7 Director, Cultural Heritage Commissioners, Planning  
8 Commissioners

---

9  
10 Greg Carpenter: All right I think we'll get started. First of all thank you for  
11 coming. This is the first of the very beginning for both of the commissions of what  
12 is going to be a, probably a long process and one that is going to have a great deal  
13 of public involvement and staff really felt that it was an excellent idea to get you  
14 familiar with the project as soon as possible and what the issues are and what you are  
15 going to hear today from Angela Reynolds and Mark Christoffels and our Environmental  
16 Consulting staff are the description of what the project is and what the description  
17 of the draft environmental impact report, discussion of what the significance issues  
18 are and how they are dealt with. We also want to reserve some time for the public,  
19 for those that want to speak. So the program is going to be a presentation for 25-30  
20 minutes from staff and our consultants. PowerPoint presentation is going to be on the  
21 screen and then we would like Matt Jenkins to ask for commissioners to come to the  
22 microphone and ask any questions that they may have, and staff will respond to those,  
23 then we'll open it up to the public. Our intent is to go unto 1 o'clock so we have  
24 quite a bit of time, and this is an informal study session so feel free to ask  
25 whatever kind of questions you may have. I think it is probably a good idea since the  
26 planning commission and the cultural heritage commission get together so infrequently  
27 to do introductions and maybe Matt you can start.

1 Matthew Jenkins: Yes, I am Matthew Jenkins; I'm chairman of Planning Commission.

2 Okay, thank you very much.

3  
4 Angela Reynolds: Okay, good afternoon and we're gonna go ahead and get started. We  
5 did a lot, two hours to this study session because I was uncertain how many folks from  
6 the public would be in attendance and I wanted to be able to have complete public  
7 comments and have the commissioners ask all the questions that they want to ask. So  
8 we are going to start our program. Kathleen Brady will be making the presentation,  
9 from BonTerra. Right behind me, these are our Environmental Consultants that have  
10 helped us put this document together. Today she will be talking about a project  
11 description and then she'll go through all the environmental concerns that were  
12 addressed in the draft EIR. Then there will be time as Greg said for the commission  
13 to ask probably all the questions that they need to ask, either commission. So,  
14 Kathleen would you like to begin?

15  
16 Kathleen Brady: Thank you, Angela. As Angela indicated my name is Kathleen Brady.  
17 And I was the project manager for the preparation of the EIR and the document was  
18 prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.  
19 And with me today are a number of the experts who prepared technical studies on which  
20 the findings of the EIR were based. Jessica Feldman was the architectural historian  
21 with Jones and Stokes who prepared the cultural analysis. Mestre Greve Associates  
22 conducted the noise analysis, however Vince Mestre could not be with us today. His  
23 analysis is presented by Cindy Krebs also with BonTerra consulting, who prepared other  
24 key portions of the document. Janet Harvey, from Meyer, Mohaddes prepared the traffic  
25 analysis and John Pehrson with CDM who's responsible for the Air Quality and Human  
26 Health Risk Assessment. The one thing just so that you know, the handouts, that are  
27 provided at each of the seats, there's a summary document that goes over the key  
28 findings of the EIR. There's also the set of the slides of the public presentation,  
we had three public workshops and the one that we are doing today is slightly

1 abbreviated and we are focusing on the key points. So this is basically a subset of  
2 the slides that's in the handout and then as well as a table that shows the square  
3 footage allocation of the proposed project and the key alternatives, and a 1 page  
4 folding 11 x 17 that has even a further abbreviation of the project. And the EIR was  
5 prepared with the basic premise that the airport noise compatibility noise ordinance  
6 would not be modified. And that the key objective of the project is to provide  
7 airport facilities to accommodate the minimum number permitted flights at the airport  
8 which is 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. And the passengers associated  
9 with those full flights and to ensure that the facilities are in full compliance with  
10 the applicable fire, building and safety codes and other applicable standards. The  
11 key to this objective is the commitment to the compliance with the existing airport  
12 noise compatibility ordinance. And then maintaining the current character of the  
13 airport terminal building as a Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark. This slide  
14 which is in the summary document provides some scope of where the project improvements  
15 are being proposed. This area here is the existing terminal building, here is the  
16 existing parking structure. This is the parking structure that is being proposed.  
17 And then the air field area, you can see the area that is thatched marked, that is a  
18 current lease hold, held by million air from the airport and it is used for valet  
19 parking and for general aviation aircraft and as part of this project the small  
20 aircraft would be displaced and be moved down to parcel "O", which is at the southern  
21 end of the runway at Clark and Willow Street. And the airport development plan does  
22 identify the parcel "O" as the aircraft tie-down and potentially hangers. Another key  
23 component of the project that I am going to point it out now is that currently the  
24 circulation is that you come in by the terminal and then you loop back and out this  
25 way. Because of the location of the parking structure the internal circulation would  
26 change slightly and McDonald Douglas drive would extend to Lakewood Blvd. There would  
27 be a right in, right out only in that area. A question that's come up a number of  
28 times is how does the project affect the airport noise compatibility ordinance. And  
as I indicated before a basic premise of the project is that the tenants of the

1 ordinance would be maintained. Is that it allows for the 41 commercial flights and  
2 the 25 commuter flights and that the facilities have been sized to accommodate the  
3 passenger level associated with the minimum number of flights. The airport noise  
4 compatibility noise ordinance does allow a number of flights to increase over the  
5 minimum 41 commercial flights, provided that the noise budget outline of the ordinance  
6 is not exceeded. In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply  
7 with the airport noise compatibility ordinance the airlines would have to optimize  
8 their flight operations through methods such as quieter aircraft and reducing the  
9 number of late night arrivals, or operations, excuse me, and under the optimized  
10 conditions which have never been achieved at the airport before the estimated number  
11 of increased flights would range from 7 and 11 additional flights. And of the  
12 proposed project would neither directly or indirectly allow the number of increase of  
13 flights at the direction of the City Council the EIR evaluated the impacts associated  
14 with this maximum number of flights that could reasonably be expected. In the EIR  
15 analysis this was identified as the optimized flight scenario and the impacts  
16 associated with the additional flights was broken out and evaluated so that there  
17 could be an understanding and that assumes the 52 commercial flights and 25 commuter  
18 flights. The project proposed improvements in thirteen primary areas and that the  
19 sizing of these improvements for the proposed project as well as the alternatives was  
20 established by the City Council in February 2005. And the distribution of the square  
21 footage for each of the uses is summarized in EIR on table 2.5-1 in the EIR and this  
22 table has also been included in the handout today for your easy reference, and this  
23 shows you what is the existing level which is the alternative seed with no project and  
24 then what's proposed, what the alternative A, which what was proposed as part of the  
25 2003 Notice of Preparation and then a further reduced alternative B. As far as what  
26 was actually evaluated though it is premature to have actually designed for the  
27 airport improvements until the City Council selects an alternative, a schematic layout  
28 showing a potential footprint of the airport improvements was developed for the  
environmental team to give us basic parameters for evaluations in the EIR. During the

1 design the precise size and configuration of the proposed improvements may vary to  
2 ensure compliance with applicable fire and building safety codes, but that this  
3 provides us with something for our evaluation and that the overall size of the airport  
4 terminal improvements will not exceed the square footage allocations and would be  
5 consistent with the parameters that are ultimately adopted by the City Council. And  
6 the key thing in developing this concept plan as well as the ultimate design of the  
7 facility is that there were basic guiding principles that were used consistent with  
8 the historical nature of the airport terminal building. And these are the things were  
9 used to guide the development was of the concept 1990 memorandum of understanding  
10 adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council pertaining to any  
11 modifications to the terminal building and that MOU includes the Secretary of Interior  
12 standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings. There are also the development  
13 and use standards from the airport terminal plan and development ordinance with zoning  
14 requirements and then a 2005 memorandum that was prepared for considerations of any  
15 new construction at the airport. In addition the City has committed to designing and  
16 constructing the new facility to meet high standards for energy efficiency and  
17 environmental design. And the intention to construct the facility consistent with  
18 LEED standards, which stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Designs.  
19 There's several concept plans or exhibits here these are also shown in front of the  
20 dais here the concept for the improvements, existing terminal buildings, hold room  
21 areas, office spaces, security screening, baggage claim, the baggage screening and the  
22 baggage make-up area. The areas in the gray would be enclosed, facilities in this  
23 kind of yellowy color are proposed as being covered but open air and then little areas  
24 of garden. And so as people would come into the terminal areas they would pass  
25 through security screening into the hold room there are concessions in these locations  
26 and there are also areas for ticketing and meters and greeters in these locations.  
27 This shows an overlay of the existing footprint which you can see in the thatch mark  
28 showing the temporary hold rooms and other facilities compared to the scope of what is  
being proposed. So you can see it actually does not result in covering extensively

1 more land space it will provide a more cohesive design as apposed to kind of actually  
2 a clutter of buildings, of combination of temporary and permanent hold rooms. This  
3 shows a view perspective of the concept plan from landside, obviously it is at an  
4 elevation. Here again the existing airport facility and this is from an airside  
5 existing terminal that hold room areas and offices and such on the side and then the  
6 aircraft parking areas and gates. One thing before I go on much, is to realize that  
7 the improvements are proposed as a one story facility so that the project would not  
8 provide for jet-ways were you take access directly from the terminal to the aircraft  
9 it would still require going out through the gates or basically doors in the hold room  
10 that allow you to access out to the aircraft parking area. The EIR did identify  
11 potential significant impacts associated with the proposed project those were in  
12 aesthetics predominately through the construction period, air quality, cultural  
13 resources and hazard and with the mitigation program which is included in that summary  
14 document handout as well as in the EIR all the impacts except for the quality air  
15 impact would be reduced to less than significance. We will be going through the  
16 traffic discussion, cultural resources, and noise shortly. As far as the potential  
17 impacts associated with the optimize flights once again there were air quality  
18 impacts, potential land use and traffic and circulation impacts and only the air  
19 quality impacts would remain significant after mitigation. The project does result in  
20 potential benefits it provides enhanced TSA and airport security services by providing  
21 better facilities. It improves existing and future traffic conditions by providing  
22 enhanced parking on site. It reduces aircraft emission by providing an infrastructure  
23 to support electric ground support equipment. One of the key health risk issues that  
24 is from the aircraft meeting title and the project does provide for electrification of  
25 force of the infrastructure. And though not an impact associated with the project the  
26 EIR does recommend the development of a land use compatibility program associated with  
27 the optimize flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60  
28 CNEL contour and that this would be a voluntary program. CEQA does require the  
identification of an environmentally superior alternative and the no project

1 alternative would avoid construction related impacts. However, it would have more  
2 substantial long term traffic impacts and associated air quality impacts because there  
3 would be insufficient parking resulting in extra trips associated with the meeter's  
4 and greeters and that the no project alternative does not include the mitigation  
5 measures associated with the Human Health Risk Assessment. And therefore the  
6 reduction in emissions through the mitigation program would not apply to the no  
7 project alternative. When looking at the other build alternatives there's not  
8 substantial difference in the level of impact associated because of the same sort of  
9 improvements will be provided for all the alternatives. Each of the alternatives at  
10 one level meet the basic project objective other than the no project alternative. The  
11 proposed project was selected as the Environmentally Superior Alternative because when  
12 looking at the ability to meet the objectives of serving the minimum number of flights  
13 and the passengers associated with those flights. There was a study done by HNTB in  
14 2004 as part of the scoping process to recommend the size of the facilities and since  
15 all the alternatives that were evaluate are actually less than what was recommended as  
16 part of this project. It was determined that the project would best meet those needs.  
17 There is also the question of the IF Certification the EIR signifies approval of  
18 project and it does not. The certification of the EIR by the Planning Commission is  
19 only a determination that the EIR addresses the impacts associated with the proposed  
20 project. It does not approve the project itself. The City Council would need to take  
21 a separate action to approve the project. In addition a certificate of  
22 appropriateness from the cultural heritage commission would be required as part of the  
23 project design. And with that I'm going to turn it over to Jessica Feldman who will  
24 discuss Cultural Resources.

25  
26 Jessica Feldman: Thank you Kathleen. First I'd like to present a little background  
27 information on the airport terminal building's historical significance. Before I  
28 discuss the potential impact from the proposed improvement as most of you may already  
know the airport terminal building built in 1941 was designated in 1990 as a City of

1 Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark a few of the reasons for its designation are  
2 that it's the first municipal airport in Southern California region. It exemplifies  
3 the historical and economic heritage of the community. It is considered a masterpiece  
4 of an early modern style, streamline moderne with a little international and is unique  
5 to the City. The use of ceramic mosaic tile throughout the building was innovative  
6 and the use of representational images reflected the artistic trends of the era. It  
7 is the quintessential theme building of the airport and it is the most prominent  
8 visual feature of the airport, which represents and established and familiar visual  
9 feature of the neighborhood. In order to determine if the proposed improvements would  
10 constitute a substantial adverse change in a significance of this historical resource  
11 was necessary to identify the character defining features of the 1941 terminal  
12 building. Character defining features are those architecturally significant interior  
13 and exterior elements that best convey the original use of the building. Some of the  
14 character defining features identified from historical research, photographs,  
15 interviews, and site visits include but are not limited to the architectural style and  
16 related elements such as the round windows and vents, the geometrical panels on the  
17 rear elevation, curved walls on the interior and exterior, and smooth interior and  
18 exterior surfaces. Additionally, character- defining features include the buildings  
19 footprints, which is shaped as a segment of an arch, the stepped back second and third  
20 stories. The original windows and doors which were carefully designed in relationship  
21 to the building and those ceramic tiles, I mentioned earlier. After reviewing the  
22 design concept plan we determined that the building would retain it's overall historic  
23 character proposed new construction will be differentiate from the old and will be  
24 compatible in size, massing, scale, style and importantly it will continue to be used  
25 as an airport terminal, which obviously is it's original purpose. However, several  
26 components of the proposed improvements would materially destroy or alter some  
27 character defining features. Which under CEQA is considered a significant impact.  
28 The project components which do not meet the Secretary of Interior standards for  
rehabilitation of historic buildings include; damage to historic material where new

1 building would connect to the 1941 building, damage to historic material where new  
2 doors and windows would be introduced, the removal or obscuring of original details on  
3 the rear façade to accommodate the new building and changes in spatial relationships.  
4 However, we feel the proposed mitigation measures and changes to the design would  
5 reduce the impact to a level less than significant. And now I will turn this over to  
6 Cindy Krebs, to discuss the noise section.

7  
8 Cindy Krebs: Thank you. I like to provide a very brief summary of the noise analysis  
9 that is contained in the EIR. Section 3.6 of the EIR is the noise analysis and it  
10 contains very detailed information much more than we can squeeze into this  
11 presentation, it also contains very detailed technical studies and they are in  
12 appendix F. The Noise Analysis can be summarized in two figures, the first is exhibit  
13 3.6-9 from the EIR, it shows the existing noise contours for calendar year 2004, this  
14 is the representation of those. The outer contour is the sixty CNEL, the 65 is yellow  
15 and the pink is the 60 CNEL contour, oh I mean 70 sorry. There are 15 homes located  
16 within the 65 CNEL noise contour and that's the noise and land use standard that's  
17 used by both the State of California and the City of Long Beach. There are no schools  
18 within the 60 CNEL contour. This is a close up showing the homes that are located  
19 within the 65 CNEL contour both north and south of the airport. To the north those  
20 homes are located approximately in this area and to the south there's just a few homes  
21 south of the 405 Freeway in that area. We looked at future conditions with the  
22 project and identified that it will not affect future conditions. That is the  
23 terminal improvement project would not affect future noise conditions. The Long Beach  
24 Airport Noise Compatibility ordinance establishes a noise budget for the airlines and  
25 the cargo operators at Long Beach Airport. That budget permits at least 41 air  
26 carrier departures per day and that includes cargo departures it also provides for 25  
27 commuter aircraft departures per day. In 2004, the 41 air carrier departures were  
28 allocated and on weekends that levels being reached currently there are 2 commuter  
flights operating from Long Beach Airport. The remaining 23 have been allocated. The

1 noise budget permits more flights if the airlines operates below the noise budget.  
2 The precise number of flights that could be realized if the airlines and cargo  
3 operators use the quietest aircraft available to them and reduce the number of night  
4 time violations is an issue that is address in detail in the EIR. That analysis that  
5 under ideal but realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial flights  
6 could be accommodated. Of course, these additional flights would have to be of the  
7 quietest aircraft types and could not occur during night hours. The potential future  
8 case that was analyzed in the EIR is the case where the 11 additional commercial  
9 flights are realized and the 25 commuter flights occur. The noise contours for that  
10 case are shown here and in exhibit 3.6-14 of the EIR. It is important to know that  
11 achieving the budget potential by 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter  
12 flights is not dependant on the project. Could these additional flights occur today  
13 without terminal improvements? The answer is yes. For the case of potential contours  
14 with the 11 additional commercial flights and the 15 commuter flights there are 11  
15 homes in the 65 CNEL contour and two schools within the 60 CNEL contour. Those are  
16 Mini Gant Elementary School and the Special Education building at the school safety  
17 and emergency preparedness offices. This is a close up showing that no homes occur in  
18 the 65 CNEL contour north of the airport but there are 11 within the 65 CNEL contour  
19 south of the airport. So the contour changes just a little bit and this is where the  
20 11 would occur south of the airport, with future conditions. This is a close up of  
21 Mini Gant School showing that part of the school, the building and part of the  
22 playground here fall within the 60 CNEL contour under the optimize flight scenario.  
23 And this slide shows the Special Education Building located just barely within the 60  
24 CNEL contour. This 60 CNEL contour again is that which would occur under the optimize  
25 flight scenario. Even though the potential future noise contours could be achieve  
26 with or without the proposed project the EIR does proposed a mitigation measure, and  
27 it is identified as Measure 3.6-2. That would provide that within 24 months of  
28 certification of EIR the airport would develop a sound installation program for homes  
within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60 CNEL contour. It would be a

1 voluntary program and would provide sound installation treatment generally which would  
2 include sound rated windows and doors and other modifications to ensure that interior  
3 noise environment meets State and local noise limits. Construction noise analysis is  
4 also included in the EIR. Any night construction on Parcel O that will occur will  
5 require noise monitoring and if the City noise limits are exceeded constructions would  
6 stop until a construction mitigation plan is implemented. And with that I will turn  
7 the presentation over to Janet Harvey to talk about transportation and traffic.

8  
9 Janet Harvey: Thank you. The terminal areas improvements themselves any changes to  
10 building size would not cause and increase in traffic but additional trips would  
11 result from the optimize flight scenario due to the additional passengers. So  
12 therefore the traffic study evaluated the optimize flight scenario. This study area  
13 we looked at is generally within Carson, Willow, Cherry and Clark St., and as Kathleen  
14 indicated earlier that the new exit on the south side of Donald Douglas Drive to  
15 southbound Lakewood Blvd. The traffic study looked at two different time periods, one  
16 existing with the project in place, that would be like we woke tomorrow in the  
17 building and the optimize flights were there and then we also looked at 20/20  
18 conditions. The 20/20 conditions also assumes that the Boeing Project, the Douglas  
19 Park Project is in place and their mitigations are in place. The existing plus the  
20 project with the optimize flight study we assume that the off site parking is still  
21 available in Lot D the Boeing lot. And we found that there would be two impacted  
22 intersections at Lakewood and Spring and at Lakewood and Willow, and mitigations  
23 measures were recommended for these intersections as the passenger volumes increased.  
24 When we looked at the 20/20 scenario with the optimize flights we assume that the off  
25 site parking in Lot D up there at the Boeing would not be available and there would be  
26 a parking deficiency because the parking supply was based on the 41 plus 25 flights  
27 rather than the optimize flight scenario. But the proposed project would add more  
28 parking than currently available, so when we have the no project conditions with less  
parking there's going to be a tendency to have more drop off trips because that way

1 you would know you could get into the airport and get back out and not have to worry  
2 about searching for a parking space. In the width project conditions there's more  
3 parking therefore, less of a tendency of being drop off by others. You could just  
4 plan on going to the airport and parking. So in 20/20 the proposed project with the  
5 additional parking generates fewer trips than the no project because more people will  
6 drive themselves and park at the airport. Fewer people will be dropped off,  
7 remembering that drop off trips doubled the number of trips, because someone has to  
8 take you to the airport and drop you off and then make a separate trip back to the  
9 airport to pick you up. So therefore the optimize flight scenario does result in  
10 added trips but the project itself doesn't result in significant impacts. And now I  
11 am going to turn it over to John to talk about air quality and the health risk  
12 assessment.

13  
14 John Pehrson: Good Morning. For those who are interested the detailed analysis of  
15 the air quality analysis and human health risk assessment is found in Appendix C of  
16 the Draft EIR and summarized in section 3.2. The air quality analysis and the human  
17 health risk assessment began with a development of a protocol that describe the models  
18 and methods used in the analysis. It defined the CEQA significance thresholds used to  
19 determine significance and to define the Human Health Risk Assessment exposure  
20 parameters used in the calculations. The protocol was submitted to California  
21 resources Board, and to the South Coast Air Quality Management District for review and  
22 comment. Both agencies provided comments, their comments were incorporate. We  
23 reissued the document to them for final review. The AQMD provided final comments and  
24 the final protocol is now included as an attachment to appendix C. These are the  
25 criteria air pollutants that were analysis in the air quality impact analysis. They  
26 include Carbon Monoxide, Nitrogen Dioxide, the Ozone precursors Nitrogen oxide and  
27 volatile organic compounds particulate matter which was analyze as both PM10 and PM2.5  
28 and sulfur dioxide. In addition lead which is not shown on this list was analyze as  
both a criteria pollutant and a toxic air contaminant. You'll see lead partway down

1 on the metals list on the right side of the slide. In addition to metals, we looked  
2 at, we calculated impacts from diesel particulate matter as well as a number of  
3 volatile organic and semi-volatile organic compounds. The PAH's on this list are  
4 actually the seven most toxic PH's found from combustion sources. The protocol also  
5 developed and provided the health risk exposure parameters that were used in the  
6 analysis. The adults were assumed to be exposed for a seventy-year duration, 350 days  
7 per year and we assumed that adults were located at both school sites as well as  
8 residential sites for the analysis. In addition, workers were assumed to be exposed  
9 for 40 years 245 days per year and were located at commercial and industrial sites  
10 both on and off airport property. These two receptors are required by the AQMD when  
11 doing a health risk assessment in addition we also looked at other receptors for CEQA  
12 disclosures. These other receptors included a child resident, a school child, and  
13 workers and teachers located at school sites. Potential cancer risk and not cancer  
14 risks were calculated for these receptors. None of the project or optimized flight  
15 scenario risks for any of the receptors analyze exceeded the CEQA significance  
16 threshold. However, under The Air Quality Impact analysis we identified a number of  
17 significant impacts. The clean air act addresses air quality by two approaches, it  
18 establishes aim in air quality standards for pollutants concentrations in the  
19 community and it prides emissions limits for specific source types. CEQA significant  
20 thresholds have been developed for both of these concentrations, and emissions. When  
21 we analyzed the construction impacts we found that construction related emissions from  
22 the proposed project would result in short term exceedances of the CEQA thresholds for  
23 NOX and VOC. Therefore, a number of mitigation measures were recommended these  
24 included emulsified diesel fuel and or particulate traps of low sulfur diesel. These  
25 mitigations measures would reduce the impacts however, the reduction would not be  
26 below the level considered significant. These impacts would stop once construction  
27 was complete. In addition, we looked at the optimized flight scenario which is not  
28 actually part of the project but we felt the EIR should analyze the scenario and we  
found that the increased flight activity would result of AQMD's threshold of

1 significance for particulate matter PM-10, due primarily to diesel power ground  
2 support equipment and re-entering road dust. Recommend mitigations measures were  
3 included in the EIR however; we do not believe the impacts would be reduced to a level  
4 less than significant. Finally, under the optimize flight scenario we also found that  
5 emissions would exceed the significance thresholds for CO and NOX, primarily from  
6 aircraft, auxiliary power units and ground support equipment. Again, recommended  
7 mitigation measures were provided and these measures would reduce the impacts of CO  
8 emissions below the level of significance however NOX would remain significant after  
9 mitigation. With that I will turn it over to Angela.

10  
11 Angela Reynolds: So I am just going to finish up with next steps. As of Tuesday  
12 night the public comment period has been extended to January 30, 2006. If you look on  
13 the slide you will see how to make those comments, I am sure everybody already knows  
14 but I will go through it again. You can make them to me in writing, there are comment  
15 cards upstairs that you can write them on or put them in regular mail to me or you can  
16 email. And my email address is Angela\_Reynolds@longbeach.gov that's probably the  
17 preferable way to go, and/or you can see comments can also me emailed to  
18 airportEIR@longbeach.gov and then there's a few next steps. Once the comment period  
19 ends the consultant would take all those comment letters and do what's called response  
20 to comments. Then they will prepare those and complete the final EIR which will then  
21 become before the Planning Commission for public hearing and certification at that  
22 time and that date is not set yet, we don't know how many responses we're gonna get  
23 and how long it may take to complete the final EIR. But at that time everybody who  
24 has sent in comments will be able to, we will notify you of the Planning Commission  
25 hearing so what will be before the Planning Commission will be the certification of  
26 the final EIR and the preferred site plan at that time. Then the project would go  
27 forward to City Council and at that time City Council would determine which one of the  
28 alternatives they would like to proceed with or not. Then once the whole project is  
completed and it will come to the Cultural Heritage Commission for a Certificate of

1 appropriateness. So at that point I think that is the complete process for this  
2 project.

3

4 Matthew Jenkins: Angela, thank you very much. I know there are a lot of questions  
5 you want to ask and you might come forward to the podium, to the mic and voice them.

6

7 Angela Reynolds: I actually have two little housekeeping things as well, Matt. Just  
8 for everyone's information this session is being recorded audio and visually and I  
9 have copies of the 1990 MOU that was mentioned in the presentation between the  
10 Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council if any one wants to read them.

11

12 Matthew Jenkins: Questions? Yes, you have a question? Go to the mic there will you?

13

14 Leslie Gentile: Hi, I appreciate the site plan for the airport and the sensitivity  
15 around the existing building I was concerned about the site plan that indicated the  
16 new parking structure and the amount of additional parking that is going to be  
17 provided. I'm not understanding what the current need for parking is versus the size  
18 of that suggested parking structure. So that's one question, and then also the impact  
19 I see from the aesthetics of that parking structure dominating the approach to this  
20 historic building I think needs to be studied as closely as the addition to any  
21 expansion to the airport.

1

2

22

23 Jessica Feldman: Can I respond to that?

24

25 Matthew Jenkins: go ahead, you want to answer that?

26

27 Jessica Feldman: As far as the size of it that was the size that was determined as  
28 meeting the needs of the minimum number of flights, it also reflects the fact that  
currently there's 2835 parking spaces on site and in addition there is 2100 parking

1 spaces that are currently leased from off site in Parking lot "D". And those are on a  
2 month-to-month basis and Boeing has indicated that those spaces would not be available  
3 on a long-term basis so that the airport is going to need to provide basically all  
4 their parking requirements on site because those 2,100 spaces will not be available.  
5 And so the project does reflect an addition of slightly more than 1,300 over all  
6 parking spaces to be available and those are from included a variety of uses for also  
7 like employee parking, rental car and such like that. As far as some of the  
8 aesthetics there is a simulation done by ARB up there that shows the visual of the  
9 parking structure and there was attention paid to placement. The parking structure  
10 was placed in this location as opposed to there having being some thought at one point  
11 of having it this direction and that way when you come into Donald Douglas Drive it  
12 still maintains the view corridor of the terminal building and that there's the  
13 openness there. It would not provide that walled in look, and that was a factor that  
14 was considered.

15  
16 Angela Reynolds: This is Mark Christoffels; he is the City's Engineer and the project  
17 manager.

18  
19 Mark Christoffels: I would like to add that when we went through the design process  
20 for the parking structure, we worked with the previous Historic Preservation Officer  
21 and she indicated that the area that we had to abide by was as you go down McDonald  
22 Douglas Drive you can't block the view of the historic building. Where it sat and how  
23 far it is set back allows that view corridor to remain intact and so therefore the  
24 proposed parking structure will not affect the existing the historic terminal building  
25 nor will obstruct any views from it. If you note on the property if you have been  
26 there today there's a rental lot that sits immediately in front of the terminal.  
27 There will never be a structure there, because that is the protected view area as you  
28 come down. Today as you travel down you make a, if you are going in the existing  
parking structure you make an immediate left into a service road or you continue on to

1 the frontage road that takes you right in front of the terminal. That area is that  
2 protected view corridor.

3  
4 Leslie Gentile: Okay, and I understand that concept but when you really look at this  
5 I don't know what the property dimensions are but it is an enormous façade of one  
6 vocabulary that I think it takes away the significant of the airport terminal itself  
7 by trying to be a little art deco and its massive and it can't be that kind of  
8 sensitivity. The siting of it and I know I am going to get off Mark because the issue  
9 is the airport expansion but I really think that sizing of the parking garage needs to  
10 be revisited and see if there is another way that the approach to the main building is  
11 celebrated and not dominated by this building.

3

12  
13 Mark Christoffels: Just so you know the current location of the parking structure  
14 meets the MOU that was drafted between the Commission and the Department of Public  
15 Works in 1990. So we would have to revisit that whole MOU then.

16  
17 Angela Reynolds: And if I could just for convenience sake I think that the way the  
18 chairman is going to take the comments and questions is not necessary first the  
19 commissions, then public we're gonna do it whoever is in line next. This is being  
20 recorded and just for convince sake what I am going to do is make sure that these  
21 recordings are transcribed so public when your speaking if you want to have that  
22 included in response to comment for the Final EIR please state your name and your  
23 address and commissioners could you also just say your name we will be able to respond  
24 to those comments in further detail.

25  
26 Leslie Gentile: And then I have another question regarding the 65 CNEL contours with  
27 the additional flights, the properties that used to be in the contours are not out of  
28 the contour. How does that work with additional flights but yet they are not in the  
contour.

4

1 Kathleen Brady: I can address that somewhat I have to admit though that I not the  
2 noise expert. That as the noise ordinance has an allocation and is provide they don't  
3 exceed that they are able to increase the number of flights. And part of that is  
4 removing some of there noisier like the MD-80 the noisier aircraft and bringing  
5 quieter aircraft, however, with the difference in aircraft there is different  
6 characteristics on approach and on landing and I am sure Vince Maestry will provide  
7 response in more detail.

8  
9 Leslie Gentile: Thank You.

10  
11 Matthew Jenkins: Okay, who's next? Questions?

12  
13 Mike Burroughs: Hello I am Mike Burroughs with the Cultural Heritage Commission. I  
14 have a couple of commission related questions and then I have a question regarding the  
15 AQMD requirements that were just presented. And maybe I'll ask that question first,  
16 it appears that the AQMD requirements are exceeded by the increased flights and what  
17 happens with that? How do you mitigate that in the eyes of the AQMD?

} 5

18  
19 John Pehrson: What's exceeded is the significance thresholds in the case of optimize  
20 flights we proposed a number of mitigation measures. Once a significance thresholds  
21 is exceeded and there CEQA you have to provide mitigation and as part of that  
22 mitigation they're proposing to electrify the ground support equipment that services  
23 the aircraft and also use in the case of construction use emulsified fuels or low  
24 sulfur diesel fuels and particulate traps in the engines of the construction equipment  
25 to reduce the air quality impact. A number of other I believe there are eleven  
26 separate mitigation measures proposed for construction and a number more proposed for  
27 the operation of the airport. Those are included in the EIR I don't have them  
28 memorized.

1 Mike Burroughs: How about the particulates from the airplanes itself?

} 6

2

3 John Pehrson: The emission from the aircraft are subject to EPA regulations and the  
4 local jurisdictions do not have control authority over the aircraft.

5

6 Mike Burroughs: I understand that. So is there a proposed plan to go to the Federal  
7 Authorities with the excess particulate matters.

} 7

8

9 John Pehrson: The AQMD and the California Resources Board have been pushing EPA a  
10 number of times to reduce aircraft emissions. That is a good question and I will  
11 provide a more thorough response in the comment responses.

12

13 Mike Burroughs: Great, then the next two questions I have are related to the  
14 historical building and the original plan for that airport itself, I was wondering if  
15 any other alternatives have been investigated regarding the design of the new  
16 terminal. The original plan for that airport actually McDonald Douglas Drive extended  
17 out through the parking lot area where it is proposed to go now it was basically a big  
18 horseshoe loop. And with the terminal at the apex of the loop and the original design  
19 for expansion of the airport was to build additional terminal facilities to the north  
20 and south, in other words to branch out around that ring road rather than stack it  
21 behind the terminal that was the intent of the original architect. I was wondering if  
22 anything has been investigated or any other concepts looked at with that in mind?

} 8

23

24 Mark Christoffels: No other concepts in that viewpoint were explored.

25

26 Mike Burroughs: Was there a reason or is it just cost and construction efficiency or  
27 it seems like there's still quite a bit of open areas or easily modified area to the  
28 north and south of the airport terminal itself and I am not quite sure I understand  
why it is being stacked behind the old building.

} 9

1 Mark Christoffels: There are a lot of site constraints and again I think we can  
2 answer that question in more detail fashion in a response to comments.

3  
4 Mike Burroughs: Okay Great. And then I just wanted to point out in the MOU, the  
5 second guidelines that was agreed upon was that the removal of historic materials or  
6 alterations of features and spaces shall be avoided and obviously if we attached the  
7 new terminal to the old and wrap it around as designed there will be obvious removal  
8 or destruction of the historical features. Is there a mitigation plan for those  
9 aspects? } 10

10  
11 Jessica Feldman: I'll try to answer this the best I can. There are a number of  
12 mitigations measures that were developed that are in the EIR. One of them was to  
13 reduce as much as possible the amount of historic material that will be removed, that  
14 is the short answer and I can respond more fully to your comments.

15  
16 Mike Burroughs: Okay great, thank you very much.

17  
18 Matthew Jenkins: Thank you, next.

19  
20 Chuck Greenburg: Hi, I'm Chuck Greenburg from the Planning Commission. In responding  
21 to one of our members questions the imprint was that you don't want to revisit the  
22 existing MOU between Cultural Heritage and whoever they entered that into with. Why?  
23 Why, for purposes of CEQA why would you take that as a given that you don't want to  
24 revisit that MOU if there are better alternative in mind? For one it would cause less  
25 significance impacts. } 11

26  
27 Kathleen Brady: One also aspect of it is that the MOU does incorporate the Secretary  
28 of Interiors guidelines and so that was part of the analysis as far as looking at what

1 the Federal Governments standards have been established for rehabilitation of historic  
2 buildings.

3  
4 Chuck Greenburg: That would establish then that the original MOU was acceptable. One  
5 also aspect of it, is that the MOU does incorporate the Secretary of Interiors  
6 guidelines and so that was part of the analysis as far as looking at what the federal  
7 governments standards have been established for rehabilitation of historic buildings. } 12

8  
9 Kathleen Brady: We can answer it as part of the comments. Thank you.

10  
11 Chuck Greenburg: I would appreciate that. Second question...which you would probably  
12 want to consult your, who ever is giving you legal advice on this, I don't know if  
13 Mike Mais is or your own people. I am or I was before I retired a CEQA lawyer and I'm  
14 somewhat concerned that since we don't have the actual placement or footprint of the  
15 improvements that will exist. And that's to be done at a later stage and when we have  
16 those will we be required to do a subsequent EIR because that could result in a  
17 changed project description from the rough stuff you're showing us now as it gets  
18 refined. } 13

19  
20 Angela Reynolds: I can respond to that, Commissioner Greenburg. I think that the way  
21 this project will roll out is when it does come to Planning Commission for  
22 certification there will be a site plan attached which is the preferred project  
23 alternative or the environmentally superior alternative. Once it gets on to City  
24 Council for their decision on what kind of site plan its going to be, how many square  
25 feet of use, if it changes significantly, or there are any significant outstanding  
26 changes it will come back to the Planning Commission with a new site plan and either  
27 an addendum or supplemental EIR.

28

1 Chuck Greenburg: So the way the project is now structured the public will not have an  
2 opportunity to comment on the existing site plan because it is not going to be put  
3 into this document until this matter goes before Council?  
4

14

5 Angela Reynolds: Actually, I believe there are renderings in the EIR at this  
6 particular time.  
7

8 Chuck Greenburg: I understand that, but in the oral presentation we were told that  
9 site plan really had not really been put together and that there could be changes of  
10 the location and relationships between the various elements.  
11

15

12 Angela Reynolds: And if that does happen it will have to come back if there is  
13 significant change to what is in the EIR.  
14

15 Chuck Greenburg: Okay and my final question is, I think in my own thinking, I don't  
16 know how to relate it to CEQA except it is at the heart of public concern about this  
17 project. Justice Frankford once said in an opinion on the question you ask depends on  
18 the answer you get. The question that's being asked in this EIR is what is the best  
19 environmental alternative for handling the number of flights presenting allowed under  
20 our existing noise ordinance. The result from that is the bigger the airport the  
21 fewer impacts because you can spread them around and mitigate them more and deal with  
22 them better. And that is certainly true, the concern in the neighborhoods or at the  
23 business peoples learn somewhat differently. The question you would ask is will the  
24 improvements to the airport make it more likely that someday the FAA might not follow  
25 our noise cap and require us to have more flights at the airport and if that scenario  
26 exists or comes about then what effect will the present improvements make? Because  
27 the obvious environmental superior alternative is don't do anything in fact demolish  
28 all the buildings and make it very uncomfortable for people to come there and the next  
thing you know it would be harder to get the added impacts in. I'm not sure that's

16

1 right, it seems to me that if the FAA is gonna impose that on us when 90%, of my  
2 observations both co-airport and anti-airport people accept the noise cap as there  
3 they want to keep it and they are scared of what can happen on both sides if it goes  
4 away. But if that happens I assume the FAA would also can require us to build things  
5 to accommodate those flights within some reasonable modicum. So I am not sure it  
6 makes a difference, further I'm not sure the whole issue has anything to do with the  
7 EIR. It is a social and political problem and yet if you don't address doesn't the  
8 EIR become a not a very useful document, in attempting to solve these problems.  
9 Because of the non-environmental issues that are really driving the dispute around the  
10 airport. Is there someway of bridging that? Is there something that can be done in  
11 the EIR that can help? Or are we best off leaving the whole thing alone and outside  
12 the amber of the EIR? And I appreciate you addressing that one also something in the  
13 response to comments. Thank you.

16  
cont

14  
15 Matt Jenkins: Very well, next.

16  
17 Gary Frahm: My name is good looking Gary Frahm and I live at 6481 Bixby Hill Rd., and  
18 I have a couple of questions for you. Concerning the noise monitoring system, first  
19 of all before I go to that this commission meeting was not on the Long Beach website  
20 by the way and I only saw it posted in the Press Telegram this morning when I was  
21 reading the paper. Back to the noise situation, after looking at your noise  
22 monitoring system, I have some concerns that the residence of Bixby Hill are not in  
23 the noise survey. The noise survey actually starts at Anaheim and Palo Verde and goes  
24 on from there. I happen to live adjacent to Hill Jr. High is my back yard and I have  
25 recorded on hand held, noise metering equipment decibels up to 81 as these planes go  
26 over with an average around 75 decibels. I have also observed duct tape over  
27 microphones that are a part of this system last year and I think we have a real  
28 problem with this noise monitoring system. So one of the things I would like to ask  
is whose monitoring system is it? Is it put together by the City of Long Beach? Or is

17

18

1 it maintained by an independent contractor and why doesn't it monitoring wind speed,  
2 temperature, humidity and other things that are variables that sound is affected by?  
3 I really don't believe that the 65 decibel limit that you have over some of the areas  
4 especially to the approach is even close to what the sound levels are. I have talked  
5 to many of those residents and they're actually awoken in the middle of the night by  
6 these sounds. The other thing is that the EIR pertains to houses that are effected by  
7 it, how many people are effected by this noise is what I would like to know also.

18  
cont

8

9 Angela Reynolds: Well, those are very good questions the noise expert is not here but  
10 we will definitely respond to you in the response to comment.

11

12 Gary Frahm: I will have about 300 questions for him to respond to, don't worry.

13

14 Angela Reynolds: Okay well write them all down and send them to me.

15

16 Gary Frahm: Thank you.

17

18 Matt Jenkins: Thank you very much, next.

19

20 Laura Sellmer: My name is Laura Sellmer, my address is 5474 Daggett, Long Beach  
21 90815. I am concern about the noise analysis and the footprint and the lines we saw  
22 on our presentation and what the community understands about our noise ordinance.  
23 Very few people understand that when the wheels are on the ground of a jet and it is  
24 running up its engine to take off, that noise is not counted in the budget but our  
25 neighborhoods are hearing that clear out to Lowes clear out to Bristol Farms. For  
26 this EIR study of course EIR is looking at the airport. I think the noise ought to  
27 set aside the noise ordinance and measure actual noise, when the jets come in and they  
28 land and are on the ground and they turn on the reverse thrusters that noise is not  
calculated. Yet the impact to the community is felt tremendously. So I think the

19

1 noise analysis in the airport EIR needs to look at actual noise and not just refer to  
2 the Long Beach Noise Ordinance. I was very interested because as I have been looking  
3 at the conceptual renderings, which are gorgeous, they struck me as something was  
4 quite wrong and I couldn't put my finger on it until mentioned here today and I have  
5 been to a few of these sessions. In fact, this is the language, there is a  
6 significant impact on changing the existing special relationships, and I said bingo.  
7 Because what I see now is a tiny airport that's dwarfed by a large structure and then  
8 the airport parking again, so the special relationship is changing because I think  
9 when this airport was built historically we had more open space we had better views.  
10 So I am wondering by making the terminal a little bit smaller could you enhance that  
11 spatial relationship and make it less significant. And again, there's an assumption  
12 that if the parking structure is built that people will no longer have drop off's. I  
13 know very few people, I know that's the beauty of our airport is that we grab a cab,  
14 six dollars, somebody drives us, somebody picks us up. If you build another parking  
15 structure, I don't know that will automatically mean that now I will park my car at  
16 the airport for a week or two. So I think that assumption needs to be questioned. I  
17 have another question here and this is somewhat directed to our commission here today,  
18 is there a subcommittee of commission members who is addressing the CEQA guidelines on  
19 historic preservations? I believe CEQA addresses historic preservation so I am  
20 wondering if our commission is doing any kind of sub senitous study on what's CEQA  
21 requires and is it being address in this Draft EIR?

19  
cont

20

21

22

22  
23 Angela Reynolds: Well, we have the Historic Preservation Officer for the City, Jan  
24 Ostashay, who can respond to the question.

25  
26 Jan Ostashay: Hello, Jan Ostashay, Historic Preservation Officer. As far as CEQA and  
27 historic resources goes, we are also reviewing the EIR. And we will responding in  
28 comments looking at it for its adequacy under CEQA. So we will be responding so

1 please bring any issues that might come up for direct or indirect impact for historic  
2 resources.

3  
4 Laura Sellmer: That's great news, furthermore, I do wonder because we do have  
5 commission members who are members of the community more eyes, more opportunity to  
6 really get this right. My last point is one of my most important points and this  
7 regards the LEED. I am a member of the US Green Building Council, I am preparing for  
8 the LEED professional status so I am study this stuff. It just boggles my mind that  
9 in the guiding principals up here it wasn't high up on the list that we were going to  
10 get a LEED certify airport terminal here. You know there are many, many things we can  
11 do and the concept that the largest terminal is the most environmentally friendly  
12 which is stated in the EIR, flies in the face of having a LEED certify terminal.  
13 We're talking about a program that has been developing in the construction for the  
14 past decade that puts together concepts approaches, it's a collaborate thing and I see  
15 only the scant sense that if you spread it out you'll have a smaller environmental  
16 impact. That would again fly in the face of LEED and because it is mention there it's  
17 traditionally since LEED has been developed it's been kind of an add on, oh by the way  
18 we'll make this LEED. And I think that the City of Long Beach has kind taken this  
19 approach oh, oh by the way we'll make this LEED. I think that the understanding that  
20 the value that LEED brings to any project would make us look at this environmental  
21 superior alternative very differently. Because when you build more buildings you have  
22 to use more cleaning materials to clean them so over 20 years how much are you putting  
23 down into the drainage? You have to tear down more trees, so LEED is actually to be  
24 using more modified, there is a whole host of options and I don't see any of them  
25 address in any of the planning. I appreciate your time.

26  
27 Angela Reynolds: I can actually respond to that as sustainability and green building  
28 comes out of our shop as planning and building several years ago, it has probably been  
3 years or so since the City Council has adopted resolution saying that we were going

23

1 to go to a sustainable city and wanting to do green buildings or LEED certified  
2 buildings at least certified in city buildings we have been moving in that direction  
3 and this airport improvement will be certified to LEED so it is high priority for the  
4 City Council and then we are moving towards that.

5  
6 Laura Sellmer: Again, and I do appreciate that. That's one of the things, I had my I  
7 love Long Beach I love the fact that Long Beach is a member of the US Green Build  
8 Council. It does hold us accountable to being leaders in environmentally sensitive  
9 design again blanketly stating, that the largest terminal, the most parking isn't the  
10 environmentally most friendly, there are other options you can look at how you can  
11 transform the whole taxi cab situation by looking at vehicles and helping our taxi cab  
12 company provide different kinds of vehicles in fueling that serve the airport and it  
13 become part of the larger global community that we have a responsibility, I think that  
14 all of us know we have got a responsibility in the world now to be environmental  
15 stewards. Appreciate your time.

24

16  
17 Matt Jenkins: Thank you Ma'am, next.

18  
19 Mike Cole: Hi there my name is Mike Cole, address 3756 Pine Avenue. Commissioners  
20 and Staff I have a few comments to make and a couple of questions and I am curious  
21 number if the commissioner's comments and questions are going to become part of public  
22 record.

25

23  
24 Angela Reynolds: Yes they will Mike.

25  
26 Mike Cole: Oh that's terrific, Mr. Greenburg gave some terrific questions and  
27 overview of exactly where we've been going through with this process. I thought it  
28 was marvelous and I am glad it's going to be part of the record. Regarding noise  
other have spoken to some of our concerns and so far as our glimpse that we've had of

26

1 the draft EIR. I find it interesting and I'd like to ask the question if any thing  
2 other than the 65 CNEL identified area was studied? In particular, the SNEL, which is  
3 single event noise impacts to neighborhoods particularly with late night flights.

26  
cont

4  
5 Angela Reynolds: Do you want to go ahead and go through your questions and comments  
6 and then we can respond at the end?

7  
8 Mike Cole: Well, that's the only one I have regarding noise. But I will.

9  
10 Angela Reynolds: I will say again that the noise expert is not here but and I am no  
11 noise expert but I do know CEQA. And they did measure single event noises, but it  
12 gets calculated into the CNEL which is the average noise.

13  
14 Mike Cole: The reason I ask the question, in reviewing other EIR findings with other  
15 airport areas. That was a very important question and actually it had an EIR sent  
16 back to get re-certified. The single event noise occurrences and the impacts that  
17 those have on neighborhoods. It somewhat leads into the next question, that it was  
18 also the publics believe and also certainly Hush's belief that the Council when they  
19 gave the scope of what the EIR would contain directed a full and complete Human Health  
20 Risk Assessment. And now we find that no new data and no testing information was  
21 gathered, analyzed it was just the old data that was available out there. When we  
22 questioned staff at the beginning of this process we asked why isn't there new data  
23 here? And the answer was as Mark can probably tell you is that when they began the  
24 study, the Human Health Risk Assessment portion of it, they talked to CARB and to AQMD  
25 and they said well you don't have to do that. Just go ahead and use the existing  
26 data, we have this data over here on Long Beach Blvd. and 36<sup>th</sup> St. and that should be  
27 adequate. But it kind of flies in the face of well Council asked for one thing and it  
28 came back without that. I am wondering how that happened?

27

28

1 Angela Reynolds: We will definitely respond to that in comments.

2

3 Mike Cole: Okay, then the last question I only have is these impacts that are  
4 identified in the draft study that are considered significant, what do we do about  
5 them? How do we mitigate them? Because I see no mitigation there, so far, that's  
6 all.

7

8 Angela Reynolds: Is that your last question?

9

10 Mike Cole: Yes.

11

12 Angela Reynolds: I can respond to that one. We do apply mitigation measure and as you  
13 know we are in a non-attainment air basin and so almost any project that comes before  
14 the planning commission for certification in the EIR is going to have some kind of air  
15 quality impacts we do as much as we can with modern technology today to mitigate that.  
16 But from a process standpoint what would have to happen is an adoption of a statement  
17 of an overriding considerations for those non-mitigated below threshold impacts.

18

19 Matt Jenkins: Very well, come on down here young man and shoot your questions. Try  
20 and keep your remarks a little abbreviated because we want to try and accommodate all  
21 the questions here because we are kind of pushed for time. Thank you.

22

23 Joe Sopo: Yeah, Joe Sopo 3061 Armourdale Long Beach. Commissioners and staff, Ms.  
24 Reynolds you just gave an answer to Mike Cole and I didn't understand what you said, I  
25 mean I am having a hard enough time reading the EIR. Would you repeat your answer  
26 please and would you make it a little simpler for me?

27

28 Angela Reynolds: Okay, Joe go ahead and ask your questions and at the end I will  
respond.

1 Joe Sopo: Well I do want to make a statement then I ask some questions. I believe  
2 that what we really have is a scheduling problem of flights not a terminal sizing  
3 problems. As a, I have a lot of visitors coming from out of town, and it is important  
4 for me and I know the Cultural Heritage Commissioners here. I just want to know when  
5 I am driving down Long Beach, oh excuse me Lakewood Blvd. and I want to show my out of  
6 town guest this beautiful terminal that was just built at what point and time do I  
7 tell them to look to the left or right depending on whether I am going North or South  
8 because they are going to see this parking structure. I just need to know the bearing  
9 for that because this parking structure here and what's proposed for the terminal to  
10 keep it in the same era, doesn't seem to coincide but I wouldn't want to be staring at  
11 this parking structure. One of the gentlemen from the HTNB was very concerned about  
12 my comments during the scoping meetings, that I talked about my son going to Mini Gant  
13 school breathing and running and like that and I wrote everything down. And what Mr.  
14 Cole said that there were no air sampling taken for this draft EIR or for the Health  
15 Risk Assessment is that right there were no air samplings taken for this current  
16 Health Risk is that right? Okay, Thank you very much. And then there was a statement  
17 made by one of you, the presenters here about the 11 steps of the mitigation, trying  
18 to get the level below acceptable levels and what was mentioned was the  
19 electrification of the parking spaces. If that was done would that lower the  
20 emissions below the acceptable level? And if all eleven steps were done would that  
21 also lower the emissions below and acceptable level, I would appreciate that very  
22 much. Thank you. Were you going to give me an answer to the first one?

23  
24 Angela Reynolds: Actually, yes. Mike Mais is here our City Attorney, who will talk  
25 to you about hopefully in more laymen terms than I can statements of overriding  
26 considerations.

27  
28 Mike Mais: Mr. Sopo, I will try. As you know, as with any Environmental Impact  
Report, what they are trying to do is study the significant impacts that any project

1 will impose on the local environment. Once they make the study and identify what  
2 those significant impacts are they impose mitigation measures to try and reduce those  
3 impacts to a level of insignificance. With a lot of projects that occur in the City  
4 even though you try and impose the best mitigation measures possible you still can  
5 mitigate below a level of significant. This is very true with air quality and as  
6 Angela said you are in a non-attainment basin. So most any problem you have is going  
7 to add some negative aspect to the local air quality. So the bottom line is if you  
8 can't mitigate to a level below significance then the only way, in this case the City  
9 Council or the Planning Commission could certify the EIR is to adopt what the call a  
10 "Statement of Overriding Considerations" and what that is, it's actually a part of the  
11 standards resolutions that we prepare for CEQA and in the statement of overriding  
12 considerations what they do is really a balancing test you balance the positive  
13 aspects of the project against the negative environmental consequences. And the  
14 elective body, or the Planning Commission has to make a determination that on balance  
15 it still makes more sense to go forward with the project for social, economic or for  
16 some other reason. Even though the negative affects can't be reduce to a level of  
17 insignificance. I know that was longer but hopefully it was simpler.

18

19 Joe Sopo: Yeah, that works. Thank you Mr. Mais. One other last little question that  
20 I have was that the noise of the 60 CNEL and it went through Mini Gant and I know Mini  
21 Gant, it went through Mini Gant school and half of Mini Gant school is in the 60 CNEL  
22 and the other half is in the 55 CNEL, just a shake of the head do I have that right?

34

23

24 Kathleen Brady: It would be of less than sixty.

25

26 Joe Sopo: It would be of less than sixty? That sort of reminds me of the times before  
27 smoking was prohibitable on airplanes and I asked for a ticket in non-smoking section  
28 and they gave me a ticket in the non-smoking section but it was right next to the  
smoking section. I never smoked so much smoke in all my life.

35

**Commenter 282 Stanley Poe, 283 Brian Ulaszewski**

1 Matt Jenkins: Sir, Sir...Next.

2

3 Stanley Poe: My name is Stanley Poe, Cultural Heritage Commission. I live at 144  
4 Savona Walk, Naples Island. I have been on the Cultural Heritage Commission since  
5 about 1993. My general feeling about the EIR is that it been very well put together.  
6 I personally am not opposed to the improvements that are being proffered. My biggest  
7 problem is with the destruction of the historic fabric of the terminal. And in  
8 looking back at the MOU, May 7, 1990, it does state that the guidelines that the  
9 building exterior and interior should be regulated by the provisions in this ordinance  
10 any alterations, modifications, or repairs of the building should be consistent with  
11 its historic character and that is my concern in the connection of the new additions  
12 to the historic building and how we are going to address that and before I could  
13 accept this EIR I'd like to have some further explanation of that, Thank you.

36

14

15 Matt Jenkins: Thank you.

16

17 Brian Ulaszewski: My name is Brian Ulaszewski, I'm also a member of the Cultural  
18 Heritage Commission, my address 762 Toledo Walk. Basically, I would like to see some  
19 further information on what is the current existing terminal and what might be  
20 affected by like more quantitative description of what might be affected by the  
21 expansion. But outside of that the information that I have been able to review as an  
22 architect, I do actually appreciate the direction of the addition, where it is set  
23 away from the structure and thus kind of limits the extent of the engagement with the  
24 existing terminal. As a design, I do appreciate the horizontal design nature of the  
25 direction of the design, which will also compliment the existing terminal without  
26 directly mimicking it as well as the style more futuristic but does owe a bit to the  
27 terminal. But my concerns also I do have concerns more so about the sites design  
28 specifically the parking structure. It does affect the site lines as you approach it  
is also the size of the structure. I would say I don't know, the direct cost

37

1 relations but a more incremental growth pattern might be more appropriate. And there  
2 is also with the structure, the parking structure where it is being proposed, pretty  
3 much limits future growth opportunity of development on the overall site acting as a  
4 bookend. I think there is a strong opportunity to create an access through the site  
5 the airport complex based on the terminal that would be pretty much eliminated by this  
6 parking structure and that's about it. Thank you.

37  
cont

7

8 Matt Jenkins: Thank you, next. Is that it? Well thank you very much for your input  
9 and staff will try and get some of those answers that you requested and hopefully you  
10 will be satisfied with the responses. So if that's all this meeting will come to a  
11 close. We want to thank the Cultural Heritage Commission for participating with the  
12 Planning Commission and we will be visiting with this item in the future. So thank  
13 you very much.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name Donald L. Brown  
Address 460 E. CARSON Long Beach 90807  
Street City Zip Code  
Email \_\_\_\_\_

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

I am 100% for improvements at the airport.  
I have lived in my house for 38 years  
and not bothered with planes flying  
over head - we need these improvements so  
people can visit our great city!

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN  
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name ERMA KEMP

Address 290 W. Taylor, Long Beach Ca 90805  
Street City Zip Code

Email \_\_\_\_\_

Comments can also be submitted to:

Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer  
City of Long Beach  
Planning and Building  
333 West Ocean Blvd.  
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

### Comment Card



Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR  
Public Meeting  
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.

*The improvements need to be made at the airport. We really need the expansion. I am for the improvements that have been suggested.*

1

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_