TRANSCRIPT OF PROJECT PRESENTATION
AND FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS
RE: LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

PETROLEUM CLUB
3636 LINDEN AVENUE
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
DECEMBER 5, 2005
6:14 P.M.

MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143
05-268

PRESENTERS:
Christine Eberhard, Facilitator, CommuniQuest
Kathleen Brady, Bonterra Consulting
Jessica Feldman, Jones & Stokes
Cindy Krebs, Bonterra Consulting
Janet Harvey, Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc.
Vince Mestre, Mestre Greve Associates
John Pehrson, CDM

PUBLIC COMMENTS (in order of appearance):

George Longaberger	Gerrie Schipske	Kevin McAchren
Janet Richardson	Jim Saurenmann	Bruce Alton
Mike Donelon	Gary Frahm	Phyllis Ortman
George Gibbons	Randy Nisbet	Suzanne Berman
Sandra Gibbons	Tom Warnke	Carmen Caldes
Ann Cantrell	Steve Wraight	Gerald Mineghino
Lillian Kawasaki	Joe Sopo	Birgit Delatorre
Terry Slavin	Ann Denison	Mike Kownal
Laura Sellmerr	Greg Herweg	Scott Robinson
Gail Ramsey	Paul Gutierrez	Ester Cervantes
Don May	Elena Wraight	Steve Rivero

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, DECEMBER 5, 2005;
6:14 P.M.

MS. EBERHARD: Good evening. My name is Chris Eberhard, and I'm with a firm called CommuniQuest, and I'm a consultant for the public outreach portion for Bonterra, the project managers. I welcome you this evening, and we all want to thank you very much for taking time out of your Monday evening for coming down and listen to the presentation and make comments.

This is the third of three public meetings, and the draft EIR is available for review on the City's web site. You're going to hear about an hour presentation tonight on the highlights on the findings, but if you want the full document, there are several places that you can get it.

The first is the City's web site, www.longbeach.gov, the airport's web site, www.lbg.org, and it's available at each of the City's libraries, the main library in Lakewood and the main library in Signal Hill. It's also available for review at Long Beach Planning and Building Department on the fourth floor.

In addition to making comments this evening, you can also make comments via e-mail, but you do need to be aware that the City's system cannot handle attachments.

So you can write your comments as an e-mail, but you can't -- because of the viruses, et cetera, the City system won't take attachments.

You can submit written comments through the mail also to Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer, City of Long Beach Planning and Building Department, at 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, 90802. And this, I believe, is in some of the information that's being handed out.

As you probably know, there's a 45-day comment period, public review period, for the draft EIR, and that, just so you know, does close on December 22nd. I've been asked to remind you that tonight it's not really a discussion about the approval of the EIR. This is a meeting to take your comments on the draft document.

So this is your opportunity to comment on the document itself, and we want to capture your input regarding the findings.

The CEQA process requires that the City responds to all comments in writing as part of the final draft EIR that will be submitted to the Planning Commission after the conclusion of the public comment period, and therefore, we won't be taking -- we will not be orally responding to many comments that are made tonight.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

As I mentioned, there are handouts at the registration table, and if you didn't sign in, please do so. But there is a power point presentation that's going to be shown. Then you should have that, as well as a project description and a summary of the draft findings.

I know we've got a couple elected officials here this evening. Rae Gabelich from the 8th District is somewhere here.

COUNCILWOMAN GABELICH: Right here.

MS. EBERHARD: Brian Mengino of the office of Councilwoman Tonia Reyes Uranga from the 7th District is with us, and Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell from the 4th District.

The timing for tonight's meeting will be three hours, and as I mentioned, we're going to have a presentation just so everyone has a basic understanding of what the findings are. It will be the highlights really of the findings, and that's going to take close to an hour. Then I'll come back up, and we'll start the public comments, and I'll explain more about that process when we get there.

There's coffee and water in the back. Restrooms are out toward the front. Some of you are probably pretty familiar with this place.

I would like to remind you that this is being

recorded. Some of you have been at our last two meetings, but we do have a court reporter, Mary, here this evening, and so that she can get all of this down as part of the record, it is important that it's fairly quiet.

So if you heard the presentation before and you want to have a side conversation, we really would appreciate it if you'd go out in the hall so that not only everybody can listen, but especially so that Mary can get all of the information.

Also, you probably had the opportunity, but I'll remind you that there's comment cards for you in the back of the room, and we will be taking comments tonight. You can also do written comments or, as I mentioned earlier, you can use the e-mail system. All of those forms are equal. So it isn't like if you come up and make verbal comments that that weighs heavier. They're all equal, and they'll all be submitted to the record.

So with that, I would like to introduce Kathleen Brady from Bonterra Consultants, who is the project manager, and she's going to give highlights from the finding of the draft EIR.

Kathleen.

MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.

As Chris indicated, my name is Kathleen Brady, and I'm with Bonterra Consulting, and we prepared the

environmental impact report for the Long Beach airport terminal improvement area.

The report was prepared consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA, and with me tonight are a number of the experts who prepared the technical studies on which the findings in the EIR were based.

Jessica Feldman, the architectural historian with Jones & Stokes, prepared the cultural analysis, which focused on the architectural components of the project. Cindy Krebs, also with Bonterra Consulting, prepared the land use and hazards analysis and is also going to be discussing the visual assessment.

Vince Mestre with Mestre, Greve & Associates conducted the noise analysis. Janet Harvey, with Meyer Mohaddes, prepared the traffic analysis. And John Pehrson, with CDM, was responsible for the air quality and human health risk assessment.

As Chris indicated, the slides that are presented tonight are all part of the handouts, and much of this information is in the summary document.

The EIR was prepared with the basic premise that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not be modified, that the key objective of the project is to provide airport facilities to accommodate the minimum

permitted number of flights at the airport, which is 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, and the associated number of passengers served on those flights in full compliance with all applicable fire, building, safety codes and other applicable standards.

Associated with that objective is the commitment to compliance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and maintaining the current character of the airport terminal building as a Long Beach cultural heritage landmark.

The proposed improvements would be implemented in the area surrounding the existing airport terminal, the airport parking area, the aircraft ramp and Parcel O, which is the area located by Clark and Willow Streets.

To give you some orientation, here is Lakewood Boulevard, here is the terminal building, here is the existing parking structure. This is where the proposed parking structure would be constructed, and then the ramp improvements would be in this area.

And the area with the thatched markings I'll be referring to later. This is an area that is currently leased by Million Air that would be taken back from that leasehold, and the general aviation aircraft would be moved down to Parcel O, which does not show on this exhibit.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

As previously indicated, a basic premise of the project was maintaining the tenets of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance. The Ordinance allows a minimum of 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights.

The proposed -- the facilities proposed as part of the project have been sized to accommodate the passenger levels associated with the minimum number of flights.

The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance allows the number of flights to increase over the minimum 41 commercial flights provided the noise budget outlined in the ordinance is not exceeded.

In order for the number of flights to be increased and still comply with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the airlines would have to optimize their flight operations through methods such as using quieter aircraft and reducing the number of late-night operations.

Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between seven and eleven flights. Though the proposed project would neither directly nor indirectly allow the increase in the number of flights, at the direction of the City Council, the EIR evaluated the impacts associated with the maximum number of flights that

could be expected.

In the EIR analysis, this was identified as the optimized flight scenario because in order to achieve this level, the airlines would be required to optimize their operations. It assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25 daily commuter flights.

The project proposes improvements in 13 primary areas. The sizing of the improvements was established by the City Council in February 2005, and I'll review what is being proposed in each of these areas in just a moment.

While it's premature to develop a final design for the airport improvements prior to City Council selection of an alternative, a schematic layout showing a potential footprint of the airport improvements has been developed to provide the environmental team basic parameters for evaluation in the EIR.

During the final design, the precise size and configuration of the proposed improvements may vary to ensure compliance with applicable fire and building codes, safety and security requirements, operational necessities and with refinement of planning data.

However, the overall size of the airport terminal area improvements would not exceed the square footage allocation and would be consistent with the parameters ultimately adopted by the City Council.

In developing the concept plan, as well as the ultimate design of the facility, there were basic guiding principles that were used to ensure that the building would be consistent with the historic nature of the airport terminal building.

These include the 1990 MOU adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council pertaining to modifications to the terminal building, and this MOU included the Secretary of Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings.

Secondly, there's the development and use standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Plan Development Ordinance, which is the zoning regulations for the airport, and third was a memorandum prepared in 2005 for consideration of any new construction at the airport.

In addition, the City has committed to designing and constructing the new facilities to meet high standards for energy efficiency and environmental design. The intention is to construct a facility consistent with LEED standards, which stands for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design.

I've been told that there's a slight distraction, kind of a murmur in the room, so if people could keep their comments or step outside, that would be appreciated.

As I indicated, there's 13 areas where improvements are being proposed, and the first area are the holdrooms, which is shown in this area here in the concept plan. Actually, I'll take a step back.

For your bearings, this is Donald Douglas Drive. This is the existing terminal building. The areas shown in the gray would all be enclosed buildings. The areas shown in the light green or yellowish color would be areas that are covered but not enclosed, and then the darker green are areas identified as garden areas.

For the -- currently, the airport holdrooms are comprised of both the 1984 permanent holdroom and the temporary modular structures. As part of the proposed project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary holdrooms currently being provided through the use of modular buildings would be replaced with 21,171 square feet of new permanent floor space. That is a net increase of 8,021 square feet.

The concession areas, which are shown here, would be expanded to serve the new holdroom areas. Currently there are 5,460 square feet of concessions at the airport, and the proposed project would add an additional 9,541 square feet for this purpose.

The passenger screening area, shown right here -- so people would come through the terminal and that way.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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.

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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 aerially 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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

in the EIR. Any night construction at Parcel O would require noise monitoring, and if the City noise limits are exceeded, construction will have to stop until a construction mitigation plan is implemented.

Janet Harvey will now discuss traffic impacts.

MS. HARVEY: Thank you.

For the traffic study, the terminal improvement project itself, that is a bigger building, would not cause an increase in traffic. Additional flights would result from the optimized flight scenario due to the additional passengers and workers. So therefore, the traffic study was an analysis of the optimized flight scenario.

The intersections that we studied are shown in red dots on this map. We went from Carson Street to the north, Willow to the south, Cherry on the west side, and Clark on the east side. And it also included an analysis of the proposed new exit from Donald Douglas Drive to Lakewood Boulevard, which would allow you to take a right-hand turn and go southbound on Lakewood.

Assumptions that were made for the traffic study, as I said, included the optimized flight scenario, which is the 52 commercial and 25 commuter flights, the new exit onto southbound Lakewood Boulevard. We considered that to be in place in the with-project conditions.

And the parking demands was based on 2.75 spaces per 1,000 -- excuse me -- 1,000 annual departing passengers. This was based on an earlier study that was conducted for the airport.

The number of vehicle trips for the optimized flights was based on existing passenger data, and we also compared it to John Wayne and Ontario airports, and the trip rates were very similar.

The traffic study also looked at two different time periods. We looked at existing with the project in place with optimized flights. This means that we would wake up tomorrow, and the expanded terminal buildings and all the optimized flights would be in place. And then we also looked at 2020 conditions with the optimized flights where we compared the with project and the no project.

2020 conditions also assumed that Douglas traffic is already on the local roadways, as well as the Douglas Park Roadway mitigations.

The traffic study found that in the existing with the project with the optimized flights, we assumed that the off-site parking is still available on the Boeing lot, lot D, since it's occurring tomorrow, and we found that there would be two impacted intersections at Lakewood and Spring and Lakewood and Willow.

Mitigation measures were recommended as the

passenger numbers increased to mitigate these two intersections.

Now, since waking up tomorrow and having it all there wasn't real realistic, we looked at 2020. That should give us a better picture of future conditions.

So in 2020 with the optimized flights, we assumed no off-site parking was available. Now, for the parking structure, it was originally sized for the flight compatibility ordinance number of flights, the 41 plus 25. So therefore, in the optimized flight conditions, there would be a parking deficiency, but the proposed project supplies more parking with the new parking structure.

And when you think about it, when you have no project, there's less parking, and therefore, there's more drop-off trips because somebody would have to take you to the airport, drop you off, leave, then come back to get you later and go on back home.

And in the with-project conditions, we have more parking and, therefore, less drop-off trips.

So the traffic study results show that in 2020, the proposed project with its additional parking actually generates fewer trips than the no project because more people would be able to drive and park at the airport, you'll have fewer people dropped off, remembering that drop-off trips generate twice as many trips in and out

both ways as just driving there to park and then leave.

So therefore, the optimized flight scenario results in added trips, but the project itself does not result in significant traffic impacts.

And now John will be discussing air quality and the health risk assessment.

MR. PEHRSON: We're almost finished.

The details of the air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment can be found in Appendix C of the draft EIR, and the results are summarized in Section 3.2 of the draft EIR.

The air quality analysis and health -- the air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment began with the development of a protocol that described the models and methods that were used in the analysis.

It defined the CEQA significance thresholds for both air quality and health risk, and it defined the human health risk exposure parameters used in the health risk calculations.

A draft document, a draft protocol, was developed following regulatory guidelines. The document was submitted to the California Air Resources Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District for review and comment.

Both agencies provided comments. Their

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

The first is gates. I'd like to know the basis for the proposal to add three gates. As I understand it, under the proposed reasonable extension of flights which, by the way, I refuse to call optimized, that would be 77 flights per day, currently eight gates with 15 hours of operation.

I went to law school to avoid math, but let me give this a shot.

That's one flight per gate every hour and a half. I guess I don't understand why more would be needed. That seems to be far less than the turnaround expected at other airports, particularly if you've sat in the Southwest terminal at Los Angeles. They'd be happy to have the luxury of an hour and a half to turn around a flight.

I'm also curious as to why Alternative B did not consider not increasing the number of gates from eight to eleven.

The second area where I'd like some additional information is on noise. I'm wondering if the noise analysis considered commercial operations from runway 25. I know they're usually done off runway 30, but that's not always the case. If that was not considered in the noise analysis, why not?

I'd also like some information about the

details of the easement that residents would be expected to provide in exchange for insulation and if that easement would be for noise levels exceeding the ordinance.

Finally, I'm interested in information about the TSA. The handout refers to TSA requirements, and I'm wondering where I could find the document -- I presume it's a public document -- where the TSA specifies what its requirements will be for the Long Beach Airport terminal. If it's in one of the appendices to the very large EIR, that would be great. Otherwise, I'd like to know where I might find that.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

MR. DONELON: Good evening. My name is Mike Donelon, D-o-n-e-l-o-n. I live at 3747 Gundry Avenue.

Over the past 18 years, I found and lead the efforts to rezone California Heights, create the California Heights Historic District and the California Heights Neighborhood Association. I've been involved in protests against increased flights at the Long Beach airport. I served as Councilmember for the 7th District.

During my term, we implemented the current noise ordinance that limits flights that we all want to protect.

In April I cofounded and am presently co-chair

of the Long Beach Alliance. I have no financial interest in the Long Beach Airport or any airport businesses. I'm here to speak as a resident living in an airport-impacted neighborhood. My record of commitment to preserving the quality of life in this city's neighborhoods is clear and consistent for almost 20 years.

It appears that many have distorted what the EIR and the terminal improvements are all about. Some have distributed misinformation stating the terminal improvements sets the stage for expanded flights. Not true. Flights will continue to occur whether the proposed improvements are built or not.

There have been many concerns about the pollution from aircraft. The improvements will not increase the number of flights over the neighborhoods. The 102,000 square feet, 14 aircraft parking pad proposed terminal improvements will reduce pollution and enhance the quality of life in my neighborhood by allowing a more efficient operation of existing aircraft.

It will buy newer nonpolluting ground service equipment. It will improve traffic management and increase available parking, thereby reducing double trips at the airport. And if the Long Beach City Council does not act to improve the airport as recommended in the EIR, this may be viewed as an attempt to restrain efficient use

of the airport, which can invite a challenge to our noise ordinance.

If that challenge occurs, with the ongoing effort to regionalize flight activity in Southern California, the potential to lose control of the ordinance is the real threat to the quality of life in my neighborhood.

I've always said the safe path is cooperation, not confrontation, and mitigation, not litigation, but the environmentally superior alternative of our 102,890 square feet and 14 aircraft parking pad, and let's work together to protect our ordinance. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

Next speaker, please.

MR. GIBBONS: My name is George Gibbons. I'm at 1041 East Tehachapi Drive.

I have a question on the AQMD is collecting data related to this project at 36th and Long Beach Boulevard. That's far outside the flight path, and I'm wondering why it wasn't put someplace like Atlantic or Orange and Carson, in that area. That's where the flight path currently is, and that way we get more accurate information. So I'd like to have information on that. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

1 Next speaker.
2 MS. GIBBONS: My name is Sandra Gibbons,
3 G-i-b-b-o-n-s, and I'm at 1041 East Tehachapi with him.
4 I agree we need to do, you know, upgrade some
5 things for security reasons, but a big concern is that
6 they took the air quality and the noise issues from a
7 location that is not under the air flight path. Whether
8 they're arriving or departing, depending on the winds,
9 they go both ways.
10 This is going to impact both the schools, it's
11 going to impact the homes. If you're sitting in our
12 backyard and the flights are going off, you can't even
13 have a conversation. You have to stop your conversation
14 totally. And it doesn't have to be a big C-17 for that to
15 happen.
16 Many times, there are flights that are
17 departing after 10:00 o'clock -- in fact, I think last
18 night there were a couple -- that are going off at 2:00 in
19 the morning. Sometimes -- I understand if it's related to
20 a mechanical problem or weather, that's acceptable, and
21 I'm certainly understanding of that. But this isn't
22 always the case. I'm not sure what the flights are that
23 are going off at that time.
24 I also don't understand how by not having -- by
25 having more flights, that it won't create more pollution.

1 There's going to be more car traffic getting to the
2 airport by more passengers.
3 The whole issue about parking structures,
4 people wanting to use those versus having drop-off and
5 pick-ups, I don't understand that philosophy either
6 because it's going to cost them more to park for three
7 days than it is to have someone drop them off whether
8 they're coming from Orange County or who knows, they're
9 just coming from Long Beach or the South Bay.
10 Another big question I have is who's paying for
11 all these improvements? Are the airlines paying for this,
12 or are the taxpayers of Long Beach paying for this?
13 I also think that they're not allowing enough
14 time for the study in general for everyone to look at it,
15 to study it. It's obviously about six inches thick. You
16 can review the executive summary, but that's not
17 necessarily going to give you all the nitty-gritty
18 details.
19 The presentation tonight was very helpful, but
20 I know there are a lot of details that you couldn't cover
21 possibly on something like this.
22 Thank you.
23 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
24 MS. CANTRELL: Ann Cantrell. I live at
25 3106 Claremore in Long Beach.

1 In fact, my second grade class visited the
2 airport in 1941 when it first opened, and I can tell you
3 that it wasn't in the middle of the city and that the
4 airplanes that were there at that time aren't the ones
5 that are flying in now.
6 I have a number of questions. I love to fly
7 out of Long Beach, first of all, because a member of my
8 family can drop me off at the airport and I don't have to
9 pay for parking. And I think that this will continue, and
10 I don't think that this is going to make the traffic less
11 to have more parking, or it's not going to do anything for
12 the pollution.
13 The things that I see that need improvement at
14 the airport are the passenger security screening and the
15 baggage security screening and the baggage claim device
16 area. I see it's going to be 500 square feet, whereas the
17 administration part of the airport is in the thousands of
18 square feet.
19 I am very happy with the amount of concession
20 area. I have no desire to eat or drink at the airport
21 since I live in Long Beach. The restrooms have been
22 adequate. Even -- I flew last year out at Christmastime.
23 I had no problem in the restroom.
24 But one of the things that's glaringly missing
25 as far as I'm concerned is a jetway to get onto the

1 airplane. There are many people who do not need
2 wheelchairs but have a hard time walking out to the
3 airplane with their luggage, and I'm finding that I'm one
4 of those now.
5 And I heard your explanation tonight that it
6 would need a second story. The original airport has a
7 second story. It has a third story. And I would think
8 that as long as you are changing this historical building,
9 you could change it to put a second story onto the new
10 portion so that there would be jetways.
11 Thank you.
12 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
13 MS. KAWASAKI: Good evening. I'm Lillian Kawasaki.
14 That's L-i-l-l-i-a-n, last name K-a-w-a-s-a-k-i, and I
15 live at 4281 Country Club Drive.
16 What I wanted to comment today was that CEQA is
17 very clear that while we can't do piecemeal projects, that
18 we can't just grow an airport by increments, but that is,
19 in fact, what has happened.
20 This airport -- my understanding is the last
21 comprehensive environmental document was back during the
22 part 150 back in the eighties, and so much has changed at
23 the airport and surrounding area.
24 And in the meantime, what we've seen are some
25 negative declarations and some categorical exemptions that

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

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

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.

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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.

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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, might 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.

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.

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

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,

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

1 here. We live in our patios. We've got outside
2 fireplaces. We have swimming pools, that kind of thing.
3 How is outside noise pollution going to be
4 mitigated? I'd like to know how that's going to be
5 handled at my house.
6 And that's it. Thank you very much.
7 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
8 MR. SOPO: Hi. Joe Sopo, 3061 Armourdale, S-o-p-o.
9 And I live on the east side. Thank you.
10 You know, I was around in the eighties when the
11 City Council approved eight and 16-unit apartment
12 buildings in their infinite wisdom, and it was rushed
13 through. I wasn't -- I guess I wasn't awake and neither
14 was anybody else, but now we have eight and 16-unit
15 apartment buildings that have destroyed communities, and
16 it was done quickly, and all of us would like to take them
17 back. Probably the one thing that has really hurt this
18 city.
19 In this study, what we need to do is we need to
20 do it right. If it takes a little bit longer time, then
21 we'll have to put up with that because once that's done,
22 we can't take it back. It will be done.
23 If we build a terminal that's too big -- who
24 knows what too big is. But if we build a terminal that's
25 too big, what we're doing is we're putting a bull's-eye on

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

1 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
2 MR. McACHREN: Good evening. My name is Kevin
3 McAchren, it's spellec 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

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 want 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.

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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.

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

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.

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

this room, that because when we had start-up airlines, they couldn't get good gates and they couldn't get good time slots, so they took what they could, and they were always trashy.

It seems like Jet Blue with its dynamic presence and its successful operation should be able to get time slots spread through the day rather than bunched in the evenings or bright and early morning.

I think we have a time limit. They say a time limit. We've got, of course, for the noise ordinance, but that means nothing. They do what they do, and they pay the penalty later.

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

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

I would like to see it moved forward. I really want to see -- I want to see Chris finally get his terminal that he's always wanted all these years.

The historic building, I want to see it preserved. I don't want to see that parking structure anywhere's near the front of it. I think it's been a grand thing since those buildings came down on Douglas Drive there. I think it's great to be able to look right at it.

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

Recreation. Yes, recreation for all those folks. I think it's been said -- I think Chris has said it many times -- Long Beach isn't necessarily a place where people are coming, but a place that people come to pass through.

I think we're building a lot of additional comfort in a place for people who don't live in Long Beach, and I think it's time we look at designing this thing around Long Beach and Long Beach's needs and let

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

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

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

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

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

And thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

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

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

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-o
20
21
22
23
24
25

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5

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

121

3947eb44-fd8e-4eae-a55f-27c8342d1fe5