Draft

Terminal Facilities and EIR Referral Issues Study Committee
Airport Advisory Commission

Minutes for Meeting #12
September 16, 2004

MEMBERS PRESENT	***MEMBERS ABSENT***	***STAFF PRESENT***	***OTHERS PRESENT***
Ron Salk		Chris Kunze	See Attached sign-in
Alan Fox		Dottie Jones	(Available on request)
Bruce Alton		Lonnie Mitchell	
Bernhard Clever		Malcolm Oscarson	
Douglas Haubert		Rachel Korkos	
Bob Luskin		Sharon Diggs-Jackson	
Carol Soccio		Ken Ashmore	
Deborah Veady		Sileneka Smith	
Don Temple		Steve O'Keefe	
		Christine Edwards	
		Jerry Caliguiri	

Call to Order
Chair Ron Salk called the Study Committee to order at 6:00 p.m., at the Long Beach Energy Department.

Roll Call
Chris Kunze called roll and certified that a quorum was present.

Minutes
The minutes of July 15, 2004 were approved.

Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved as submitted.

Chairman Salk Opening Statement
Chairman Fox opened the meeting and thanked the public for attending. He stated that Commissioner Ron Salk has chaired the study session meetings and turned the meeting over to him.

Chairman Salk stated that if and when there is a motion, that remarks should only address that motion. He stated that he feels that all areas of the community have been heard from and any further comments should be summarized.

Chairman Salk asked Mr. Chris Kunze to begin with his presentation. Mr. Kunze reviewed the language of the City Council referral to the Commission. Mr. Kunze stated that HNTB had presented to the Commission its recommended Long Beach Airport terminal improvements, for the purpose of defining a proposed project scope to enable the EIR process to be completed. Mr. Kunze stated that in the staff recommended proposal, dated June 17, 2004, included were a set of guiding principles, meant to be the context within which the proposed project was offered. Mr. Kunze introduced Mr. Joe Grogan from HNTB to present two downsized

alternatives from the staff recommended proposal, based on the Committee's direction to staff at the July 15, 2004 Study Committee meeting.

Mr. Grogan distributed handouts and summarized the report in a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that HNTB has gone through the analysis that the Commission asked them to do and are still comfortable in recommending the original staff recommended program.

Mr. Kunze reviewed the guiding principles as it pertains to the alternatives in HNTB's presentation. Mr. Kunze stated that the staff recommendations are still the most responsive to the forecast needs from the Airport staff's perspective and from the consultant's perspective. He stated that the Noise Compatibility Ordinance is the key to retaining control of flight activity, and the second best mechanism is aircraft parking positions as outlined by the consultant. Mr. Kunze reviewed the recommended action as follows:

"Authorize the Chair to transmit the following terminal facilities project scope recommendations to the City Council for purposes of conducting an EIR only. The scope of the terminal improvements proposed project for EIR purposes should be the recommended proposed passenger terminal improvements presented to the Commission at the June 17, 2004 meeting. It is recommended that a phase-in plan for commuter airline related facilities be developed, and that the Commission be tasked to generate a recommended protocol for aligning commuter slot allocation with available capacity. The actual design of terminal improvements is critical to ensuring facilities that are in keeping with the Airport's unique history and architecture, and as such, it is recommended that the Airport Advisory Commission and the Cultural Heritage Commission jointly establish a design review and input process which allows for timely progress, while at the same time results in a product to which the Long Beach community can be proud".

Commissioner Alton asked about the Airport being categorized at a Category III Airport. Mr. Grogan reviewed the process of how airports are categorized. Mr. Kunze noted that the FAA categorizes by a percentage of the national annual enplanements. He stated that the recent reference to the Airport being recategorized relates to Homeland Security Department categories, and TSA would typically be authorized to have more staffing, office and meeting areas, etc., based on prior year passenger counts.

Commissioner Alton asked if the criteria for baggage claim area was based on a B-757. Mr. Grogan stated that the B-757 criteria was only used for the baggage claim area so that any carousel could accommodate a B-757 aircraft.

Commissioner Alton asked for clarification regarding what gates would be designated for commuter and commercial aircraft. Mr. Grogan stated that there are three of the 11 to be used for commuter gates. Commissioner Alton asked if those gates are to be phased gates. Mr. Grogan concurred.

Commissioner Alton asked how the Ordinance could be best defended based on alternative layouts. Mr. Grogan stated that HNTB's perspective is to recommend a facility that meets traffic forecast scenario one, pursuant to the Ordinance.

Commissioner Haubert asked about any two-story facilities in the alternatives. Mr. Grogan stated that in the recommended layout, there is an option for second floor office in one area that was away from the Aircraft Operating Area and could never be used as a departure lounge or other flight capacity generating facility.

Commissioner Haubert asked about an alternative of one terminal versus two terminals and how that sizing would be used efficiently. Mr. Grogan stated that the only area affected by that alternative would be baggage claim, that there are no other pieces of the terminal that could be more efficient if they were consolidated.

Commissioner Haubert asked about the 44% projected increase, and that his calculations came up with 22%. Mr. Grogan stated that the 44% is based on annual enplanements and peak hour demand.

Chairman Salk asked if Mr. Kunze considers the June 17th recommended Long Beach Airport terminal improvement to be above, below or at a minimum standard. Mr. Kunze stated that in light of analysis brought forth by the consultant, the staff recommendations are reasonable to address the forecast peak hour issues including the commuter traffic.

Commissioner Soccio stated that she would like to see the parking positions be reduced by at least two.

Chairman Fox asked if improvements, at any level, might affect the Noise Ordinance compared to making no improvements.

Mr. Mike Gatzke, outside legal counsel, stated that in his opinion there is no relationship between the defensibility of the Ordinance and anything being considered in terms of the size of the facility. Mr. Gatzke stated that the failure of the City to take reasonable steps to accommodate what it has already authorized could itself be made the basis for an argument that would put the Noise Ordinance in jeopardy.

Commissioner Alton stated that he suggests that the parking positions remain at 10.

Comments were taken from 37 members of the audience. (Audiotapes available on request)

Chairman Luskin made a motion as follows:
"To recommend to City Council to accept the staff recommended facility program as submitted."

Commissioner Clever seconded the motion.

Commissioner Haubert reviewed the requirements of the Ordinance, stating that the misconception is that the 41 commercial flights is not the maximum, but the minimum, and wanted that fact to be clear for the community.

Commissioner Clever stated that in addition to the 41 commercial flights, there are 25 commuter flights yet to be assigned. He stated that in planning the Airport, instead of doing hopscotch buildings, to do it right, he is supportive of the staff recommended proposal.

Commissioner Alton stated that he would like to make the kind of decision that would allow the Commission to move forward with confidence on both sides that they are doing the right thing. He asked how HNTB would determine “wiggle room” to make the right kind of trade.

Chris Kunze stated that his input to the consultant regarding minimum requirements was to identify the true capacity elements, versus things that were not capacity, including those related more to revenue production. He stated that the things that did relate to capacity should be used as a minimum baseline, keep what is there presently, and enhance that based on the forecasted passenger growth including commuter passengers.

Commissioner Alton asked about HNTB’s interests and whether it could have colored their input.

Mr. Kunze stated that he knows of no consultant, who does what HNTB does regarding facility requirements analysis, that does not also do design work. He stated that any company that would help in sizing options would also have as part of their organization, a design component competing for additional work. Commissioner Alton stated that he is comfortable with the consulting and design process, but not where the decisions being made during consulting and design, end up in big dollar construction projects. Mr. Grogan stated that HNTB are planners and designers and are not builders. He stated that they are occasionally on a design/build team, but their role is only as a design consultant, and not a constructer or builder.

Commissioner Alton stated that he cannot support the motion as currently framed because of lack of balance where the community is impacted, and stated that he is for going with alternative #2 if it included aircraft parking positions at 14.

Chairman Salk asked Mr. Kunze to describe the Commissions’ process for putting their recommendations before the City Council. Mr. Kunze stated that the Notice of Preparation contained four project alternatives as follows:

1. Recommended project, since revised from the initial NOP
2. No build option
3. Build what was originally designed in 2000, before experiencing actual use by large aircraft and load factors
4. Take out temporary facilities

Mr. Mais stated that what the Commission is being asked to do is to provide the City Council with a recommendation as to what the project should be simply for the purposes of analysis in the EIR. He stated that as part of any motion, depending on which project is recommended, the Commission could also recommend that either of the two alternatives or a third alternative could be one of the alternatives required to be studied as part of the EIR.

Commissioner Soccio asked if one of the alternatives would be given priority with the motion. Mr. Mais stated that the one given priority is the one identified as the proposed project, but the alternatives would also be studied.

Commissioner Temple stated that his concerns are and have been safety and security for all. He stated that he does not want more than 41 flights, and does not see how improving the terminal would have any affect on the pollution or noise.

Chairman Fox stated that his concern is the issue of health, and stated that the quality of life and health issues are essential to what the Commission is considering. He stated that regarding the spacing issues, that he could be flexible with any alternative, but does not feel comfortable challenging staff recommendations, and is comfortable approving the motion as stated, with the understanding that EIR and health issues will be addressed.

Commissioner Haubert asked where the 3,900 sq. ft. of vehicular parking is located. Mr. Kunze stated that that figure represents parking spaces, not square feet. He stated that 2200 spaces are currently offsite at a Boeing site, and the balance is distributed on Airport property within the structure and surface lots. Mr. Kunze stated that the 3,900 parking space figure is on-Airport , new structured parking spaces. Commissioner Haubert asked if the new parking structure has been awarded to HNTB to build. Mr. Christoffels, City Engineer, stated that a different firm has been awarded that contract, and HNTB has not been involved in the contract. Commissioner Haubert asked if the parking structure is contingent on approval of the terminal facilities improvements. Mr. Christoffels stated that all the facilities including the parking structure, are combined into one EIR.

Commissioner Haubert asked if the temporary 3,600 sq. ft. office space facility for TSA, is part of the Terminal. Mr. Kunze stated that they are currently in modular buildings, which is within the terminal area. Ms. Rachel Korkos stated that they would be removing a temporary building, converting it to a permanent structure, and adding to it.

Commissioner Haubert stated that he will vote against the motion, based on baseline information that the airlines can operate with 10 gates. He stated that the amount of office space for TSA does not need to be at the terminal itself. He stated that he would support alternative #2.

Chairman Salk called for a vote on the motion. The vote was taken as follows:
Ayes- Luskin, Fox, Salk, Clever, Veady, Temple
Nays- Alton, Haubert, Soccio

Chairman Salk stated that the motion passes with 6/Aye, 3/Nay.

Chairman Salk stated that a special meeting will be held on September 30, 2004 at 6:00 p.m. to discuss the EIR recommendations.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:53 p.m.
Respectfully submitted, Dottie Jones, Airport Secretary
Long Beach Airport

Draft