

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MEETING OF THE AIRPORT ADVISORY COMMISSION
FOR THE CITY OF LONG BEACH

TRANSCRIPT OF DISCUSSION
STUDY SESSION REGARDING PROPOSED
FIS FACILITY AT LONG BEACH AIRPORT

OCTOBER 20, 2016

6:38 P.M.

LONG BEACH GAS & OIL FACILITY

2400 E. SPRING STREET

LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143

JOB NO.: 16-158

1 COMMISSION MEMBERS:

2 KAREN SHERMAN, Chairwoman
GLENN RAY, Vice Chairman
3 JEFFREY ANDERSON, Commissioner
WAYNE CHANEY, SR., Commissioner
4 ELIZABETH CRUZ, Commissioner
HAL GOSLING, Commissioner
5 ROLAND B. SCOTT, JR., Commissioner
JEFF ROWE, Commissioner

6

CITY REPRESENTATIVES:

7

JESS ROMO, Director of Long Beach Airport
8 CHARLES PARKIN, City Attorney
MICHAEL J. MAIS, Assistant City Attorney

9

CONSULTANTS:

10

DAVID TOMBER, Jacobs Engineering

11

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WHO ADDRESSED THE COMMISSIONERS

12

13 ANN CANTRELL
DONNA SIEVERS
GAYLA TOTARO
14 NANCY LOPEZ
JOSEPH MELLO
15 GREG ROSSOFF
LISA OCHSNER
16 JOE SOPO
BOB JOY
17 LINDA SOPO
MIKE RODSATER
18 RAGHIB TAUQIR
WENDY NICOLLE
19 LORI ANGEL
RUENA WOOD
20 JEAN YOUNG
LAURIE SMITH
21 JIM CLOONAN
DAVID RAIKLEN
22 TERRI PFOST
LUZ BAG-AW
23 CARMEN LOPEZ
BILL PEARL
24 WASEEM MATHEWS
CURT CASTAGNA
25 PAT BLISS
BELINDA WATSON

1 THURSDAY, OCTOBER 20, 2016; 6:38 P.M.

2 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA

3

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Okay. So I am going to now
5 introduce our Airport Director, Mr. Romo.

6 MR. ROMO: Thank you, Madam Chair, Honorable
7 Commission Members. On behalf of the City of Long Beach
8 and the Airport, I want to welcome all those in
9 attendance tonight for taking time out of your busy
10 lives to listen to this evening's presentation.

11 We have valued community input since the
12 outset of this process and look forward to your
13 continued engagement as it moves ahead.

14 We ask that you keep an open mind as the
15 information is shared this evening. Lastly, we welcome
16 community comments at the appointed time and ask for a
17 mutually respectful approach as the study findings are
18 presented, along with your comments and the Commission's
19 questions that will be presented tonight.

20 At this time I'd like to introduce
21 Mr. David Tomber, who will be making the presentation on
22 behalf of Jacobs. David is an aviation principal for
23 Jacobs Buildings & Infrastructure. He joined Jacobs
24 earlier this year, and prior to joining Jacobs, he spent
25 16 years at Seattle Airport, where he was head of

1 planning. Prior to that, he was a principal at aviation
2 consulting firms in Seattle, San Diego and Los Angeles.

3 Overall, Mr. Tomber has 35 years in
4 experience focused entirely on aviation planning, design
5 and construction for airport management, tenants,
6 federal agencies and airlines all over the world.

7 I want to introduce Mr. David Tomber to
8 begin the presentation.

9 MR. TOMBER: Thank you very much. I'm delighted
10 to be here to present the results of our study to both
11 the Commission and the public.

12 Many people might be wondering what is an
13 FIS facility. FIS is an acronym that stands for federal
14 inspection services. It's a single facility that serves
15 as the base for Customs and Border Protection to process
16 immigration, customs and agriculture functions and
17 operations.

18 All aircraft flying to the U.S. from
19 foreign countries must be cleared by CBP. That occurs
20 at every airport in the United States.

21 The FIS facility unifies processing of
22 passengers and baggage and cargo for safe and efficient
23 flow of passengers and goods into and out of the United
24 States.

25 Why I'm here tonight, there was a request

1 by JetBlue to seek creation of a U.S. Customs facility,
2 an FIS facility at the Long Beach Airport.

3 City Council authorized a feasibility
4 study, and an RFQ was issued. That was a wise decision.
5 I've viewed many airports proceed with projects without
6 doing the feasibility out front to identify issues.

7 As a result of that RFQ, Jacobs was
8 selected to conduct the study. The study was recently
9 released on October 4th, and it was available for
10 viewing on the Airport's web site, and I'm here tonight
11 to present findings of the study.

12 Our job as a consultant is to provide
13 technical information to decision makers so they can
14 make informed decisions.

15 The outreach has been fairly significant.
16 There were two community meetings, one in March of this
17 year and a second one in April. Before Jacobs started
18 any work on the study, we were instructed to listen to
19 the community, understand what their concerns were.

20 The way we did that was to hand out comment
21 cards. Additionally, people were able to email
22 comments, and we conducted an economic impact survey.
23 All of the comments, the emails and the survey
24 instrument for the economic impact survey are part of
25 the report in the technical appendices.

1 Tonight's meeting is actually a continued
2 effort in our outreach. It's to the Airport Advisory
3 Commission. Next week we'll have a similar outreach to
4 the Economic Development Commission on Tuesday,
5 October 25th, and then we tentatively have a date
6 scheduled November 15th to present the findings of all
7 of our outreach, including the meeting tonight, to the
8 City Council.

9 The scope of the study included six major
10 elements. The first one was a market analysis. They
11 performed the basis for sizing the facilities and
12 understanding the environmental issues.

13 Second major component was environmental
14 compliance assessment, a third economic impact analysis,
15 what are the economic benefits to both Long Beach and
16 the region.

17 We looked at physical siting alternatives
18 to determine if there was enough space to locate a
19 facility, financial feasibility and security risk
20 assessment, and I'll go into each of these in my
21 presentation, what our findings were.

22 So an overview of the study, we looked at,
23 first of all, is there a demand for the facility;
24 secondly, what types of environmental clearances might
25 occur if a decision was made to proceed with an FIS,

1 what is the economic impact and benefit to the
2 community, does the facility fit within the airport
3 terminal area, how much would it cost, who would pay for
4 it, and does it increase security risk to the airport
5 and the community.

6 The fundamental assumption for every aspect
7 of our study was the Long Beach Noise Compatibility
8 Ordinance. It's one of the strictest in the world.
9 It's a great protection for the community. It's been
10 adopted into the City's Municipal Code.

11 The law has been in effect for 21 years.
12 It was codified in 1995. It's consistently been
13 reaffirmed by the City Council. It limits aircraft
14 noise. It's not specific to routes, for example, what
15 cities airlines fly to and whether it's domestic or
16 international. It's dealing purely with noise both as a
17 continuous event, as well as single event, and it was
18 the basis for everything in the study.

19 Recently the FAA has issued a letter as of
20 a couple of days ago that confirms that an FIS will not
21 negatively impact the noise ordinance. Specifically,
22 the conclusion was that dating back to 2003 that the
23 noise ordinance is exempt from ANCA. That's an acronym
24 for the Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990.

25 And specifically, the FAA stated in their

1 recent letter that it does not find an issue of current
2 compliance or noncompliance under ANCA or the City's
3 noise assurances. So in essence, they don't feel that
4 the current noise ordinance would be undermined by the
5 FIS facility.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. Does that mean
7 just the facility or does that mean the planes?
8 Facility is on the ground and walls, and then planes are
9 flying --

10 MR. TOMBER: Everything from air to land, but it
11 deals -- I'll go into more detail later, but impacts
12 such as aircraft noise emissions.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

14 MR. TOMBER: So the first part of the study was
15 the market analysis. The finding was that Long Beach is
16 located within a competitive market in Southern
17 California.

18 Southern California is fortunate that
19 passenger traffic is up for both domestic and
20 international flights. Domestic is growing at a faster
21 pace than our -- or international is growing at a faster
22 pace than domestic, but it's a very strong economy in
23 Southern California, and it's an opportunity to tap into
24 that market.

25 The market analysis also forecasted

1 approximately 379,000 annual arriving FIS passengers
2 after a three-year ramp-up period.

3 Another aspect of the market analysis was
4 that based on historical use, between 2006 and 2015,
5 there was a utilization rate of 79 percent, or 32 and a
6 half flights per day.

7 So based on historical use, there was the
8 ability to provide additional international flights
9 within the restrictions of the noise ordinance.

10 General aviation forecasts were actually
11 proved to be positive impacts in the improved efficiency
12 of the air space and an incremental reduction in
13 emissions.

14 The way that would occur, many of the
15 flights for general aviation that happen today at Long
16 Beach, they'll clear Customs and Border Protection at
17 another airport and then reposition to Long Beach. So
18 two flights instead of one for every flight that arrives
19 from outside the United States.

20 Long Beach will never become a 100 percent
21 international airport. This table here, it just shows
22 based on historical passenger distribution that the
23 Department of Transportation issues statistics they call
24 T100 database.

25 Across the United States, 80 percent of the

1 flights are domestic and 20 percent international. So
2 there's no airport in the country that is 100 percent
3 international.

4 This slide shows current and past activity
5 at the airport. Long Beach is served by four U.S.
6 passenger airlines, American, Delta, JetBlue and
7 Southwest. They provide nonstop service to 13
8 destinations, including seasonal service to Anchorage.

9 What you'll see in the rings, these are
10 different types of aircraft, CRJ-900 and A-320, which is
11 what JetBlue flies. That's the only aircraft in their
12 fleet, and that was the basis for our study. That has a
13 stage length of about 3200 miles, so that's the distance
14 roughly from Long Beach to Boston.

15 As an example, this shows probable
16 international destinations that -- within JetBlue's
17 network. JetBlue was proposing to fly the same planes
18 that they do today, the A-320. So the distance to the
19 south edge of Central America is the same distance it
20 would be within the continental United States.

21 The forecast of six to eight international
22 destinations is based on JetBlue's anticipated network
23 strategy, and the destinations are really based on the
24 type of aircraft and facility constraints at Long Beach.

25 This slide here shows some of the potential

1 airports that JetBlue might fly to. Only six to eight
2 of these destinations might be considered by JetBlue.
3 The countries, as you can see, include Mexico, Costa
4 Rica, Guatemala, Panama and El Salvador, but they're all
5 based within the distance that an A-320 aircraft could
6 fly.

7 A key aspect of the market analysis was
8 that the international flights must operate within the
9 constraints of the noise ordinance. There's a market
10 for international flights at Long Beach to and from
11 destinations in Mexico and Central America.

12 It was estimated in the market analysis
13 that six to eight flights per day, totaling
14 approximately 379,000 annual passengers, would be the
15 activity for an FIS facility.

16 The economic impact analysis used results
17 from a 2016 tenant survey that was conducted based on a
18 list of all tenants on airport property, as well as
19 business and airline leaders. It identified economic
20 markets of Long Beach and potential contribution of an
21 FIS facility.

22 The net result before an FIS was that the
23 airport is a huge economic engine for the region. It
24 generates approximately 45,000 jobs and \$10.3 billion in
25 output. And those numbers are based on direct, indirect

1 and induced --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What were those numbers
3 based on?

4 MR. TOMBER: They are based on the output of a
5 survey software called IMPLAN. They take inputs on
6 things like jobs and wages, and they calculate direct
7 jobs, indirect and essentially wages that people would
8 make and the multiplier effect for the region.

9 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Let's try to let him finish
10 his report first.

11 MR. TOMBER: So the impact locally to Long Beach,
12 before an FIS, there's a direct employment of 9,000
13 individuals. That represents 6.4 percent of the
14 employment in the entire city.

15 Based on our survey, 28 percent of the
16 current employment are residents of the city. The
17 average annual wages are very high. They're \$9,000
18 higher than the rest of LA County.

19 So the jobs produced by the airport are
20 high, good paying jobs. The airport produces 170 jobs
21 and \$50 million in annual output. The tax impacts are
22 significant. \$360 million in state and local tax
23 revenues.

24 So looking at adding an FIS to that, there
25 are four areas of economic contribution. The first is

1 from the construction of the facility itself. That
2 would result in approximately 200 to 250 jobs and 31
3 million to 38 million in a one-time output.

4 The actual number is dependent on the size
5 of the facility built, and in the report we show three
6 possible options. The ongoing contribution of the FIS
7 facility is approximately 350 jobs and \$36.4 million in
8 annual output.

9 International travelers would spend
10 estimated \$104 million per year, and that potential
11 economic impact of the traveler spending would be 1400
12 jobs and just over \$185 million in annual output.

13 This table here is a summary of the results
14 that come out of the software. The tool that our
15 subject matter expert used was called IMPLAN. It's a
16 leading software tool in determining economic benefits
17 to regions.

18 Next aspect of our study dealt with
19 environmental compliance. Environmental compliance
20 requires both State and federal approval. So the State
21 approval is called CEQA, the California Environmental
22 Quality Act.

23 A key finding of the study was that the FIS
24 facility could be accommodated within the impact
25 envelope from the prior federal final EIR for the

1 terminal area improvement project in 2006.

2 Second type of approval, it's a federal
3 approval. It's called NEPA, National Environmental
4 Protection Act, and the study concluded that a
5 categorical exclusion would be appropriate.

6 I should note that the subconsultant to
7 Jacobs that did the environmental compliance was the
8 same consultant, Kathleen Brady of Psomas, who did the
9 environmental impact review for the 2006 terminal area
10 improvement project, so she's intimately familiar with
11 the --

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you speak up?

13 MR. TOMBER: Yes.

14 The subconsultant for Jacobs, who is the
15 subject matter expert on environmental consultants, is
16 Kathleen Brady with Psomas. She was the lead who did
17 the environmental impact review for the 2006 terminal
18 area improvement project, which is FEIR 3703. So she
19 was intimately familiar with that.

20 This is a list of the many areas that CEQA
21 requires. Among them are air quality emissions and
22 noise. The original -- as I said, the original
23 consultant, Kathleen Brady, was -- locally from Psomas,
24 was retained to perform the review.

25 Her evaluation determined that no

1 additional environmental impacts would occur that were
2 not anticipated as part of the 2006 analysis.

3 Therefore, no new environmental impact review was
4 required.

5 One of the strategies of CEQA is to use
6 existing studies to streamline the process where no new
7 impacts are developed as part of the project, that prior
8 impacts have been reviewed previously.

9 So a summary of the net result of that
10 final EIR, it evaluated 102,850 square feet of terminal
11 facilities. It was based on what was called an
12 optimized flight plan, which was within the requirements
13 of the noise ordinance of 52 commercial flights.

14 In April of 2007, the City Council took
15 action and authorized the design for 89,995 feet of
16 terminal facilities. The EIR allows phased improvements
17 based on funding of availability and priorities.

18 So the completed terminal project was just
19 over 73,000 square feet, so the remaining terminal
20 improvements that could be constructed under that EIR
21 would be just over 37,000 square feet, assuming that
22 some 8600 square feet of terminal facilities were
23 removed.

24 The next part of our study was facility
25 siting alternatives. We prepared three conceptual

1 options. It was based on a simulated flight schedule
2 that had six to eight international arrivals with a peak
3 demand of 255 passengers per hour.

4 The peak demand I would say is probably one
5 of the most important aspects for sizing the facility.
6 Facilities don't use annual numbers. They use peak
7 period volumes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can you keep your voice up?

9 MR. TOMBER: Yes.

10 The size was also based on Customs and
11 Border Protection design standards, and the options were
12 evaluated for feasibility only. The preferred option
13 has yet to be determined, but all three of the
14 conceptual options are feasible, and I'll step through
15 these one by one.

16 This is a conceptual massing diagram of
17 option one. It's just over 35,000 square feet at a cost
18 of 21.6 million, and I would say these are very
19 conceptual. The final design would be, if the City were
20 to proceed with an FIS, would be based on much more
21 detailed design drawings and discussions with CBP.

22 The way this would work, gate aircraft
23 parking position 11, which is here, would get
24 decommissioned and rebuilt in this area, and there would
25 be a new aircraft parking position No. 12 here.

1 The people get off the plane, they go
2 through what's called a sterile corridor into the FIS
3 and they're flowing in this direction. They would first
4 go through primary inspection where there's a
5 determination made as to whether they are allowed to
6 enter the United States or not.

7 People then claim their bag, they go to a
8 secondary inspection point, where the majority of
9 passengers are cleared at that point. Some are referred
10 to secondary inspection for customs and agriculture.

11 When they clear, this is a pathway that
12 leads to the terminal for people who might be
13 transferring to a connecting flight or going to the
14 arrivals curb.

15 The second option that we looked at is
16 30,672 square feet, roughly \$17.3 million. Difference
17 in this scheme is that it's at the south, one of two
18 options at the south that we looked at. Aircraft
19 parking positions 1 and 2 would be used, and people
20 would flow through the facility this way going through
21 the same functions that I described, either to a
22 connecting flight or to the arrival curb.

23 This is a third option at the south, just
24 over 28,000 square feet at \$20.3 million. Again, the
25 aircraft parking positions 1 and 2 would be used for

1 arriving flights. People would be processed through the
2 facility. It anticipates repurposing the existing
3 security screening checkpoint for outbound passengers
4 and rebuilding it over to the north in this area.

5 So at this point, there's no preferred
6 option, no recommended option that's subject to more
7 detailed design. That design has to occur both with the
8 airport and with CBP, but all three options are viable.
9 They all fit on the site, subject to more detailed
10 review later what would be the best option. New options
11 may be identified if the City decided to proceed with an
12 FIS.

13 Another important part of our study was
14 financial feasibility. I note that no City of Long
15 Beach General Fund dollars support the airport or
16 taxpayer dollars. So no General Fund dollars or
17 taxpayer dollars would be used to construct or operate
18 an FIS facility.

19 Per FAA regulations, the funds have to stay
20 on airport. Airport revenues can only be used for
21 airport activities. Airport revenues cannot be used to
22 pay for City services not related to the airport.

23 So our financial consultant, Frasca, came
24 up with a financial model where the airport could commit
25 up to \$3 million in passenger facility charges. The

1 airport has a very strong financial record with the
2 types of metrics that are looked at by bonding agencies,
3 things like that, debt, cash on hand.

4 Another key assumption of the financial
5 feasibility was that the balance of the capital cost
6 would be funded directly by JetBlue Airways as the
7 primary user of the FIS facilities. Other airlines
8 could use it also if they wanted to.

9 Facility charges would be approximately \$13
10 per FIS arriving passenger the first year, and then \$6
11 per FIS arriving passenger for the next ten years.

12 These charges are within a range of comparable
13 California airports.

14 The ultimate financing plan would be
15 negotiated by all the parties. That's set to occur if
16 the City were to make a decision to proceed with an FIS,
17 the City would and the airport would enter into
18 negotiations with JetBlue and any other relevant parties
19 like CBP.

20 The net result is that the potential FIS
21 facility is financially feasible based on this model.

22 This is a chart showing fees at comparable
23 airports in the region. Orange County, for example, is
24 an FIS fee of \$6.80. Oakland is \$10. So the fees that
25 are assumed in the financial model are very

1 conservative, and they're in line with comparable
2 airports in Southern California.

3 The last aspect of our study was a security
4 risk assessment by Research Associates, performed the
5 study. They were focused on examining potential for
6 additional risk to the community.

7 They concluded that the FIS facility would
8 not increase risk to the airport and the Long Beach
9 community. Greater risk exists with two major seaports
10 and a land border in San Diego, that actually the
11 presence of Custom and Border Protection on site is
12 actually an additional protection and deterrent.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Couldn't hear who did the
14 study. Please repeat. Speak up.

15 MR. TOMBER: Yeah. The presence of CBP on site
16 actually provides additional protection.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who did the study?

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Please hold your questions.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear what he's
20 saying.

21 MR. TOMBER: I'll try to speak louder.

22 There is always the possibility of risk,
23 but the Long Beach Airport currently -- thank you.

24 Yeah, elimination of risk is seldom
25 possible, but the Airport currently commits significant

1 resources to protect traveling public. Regardless of
2 the addition of international service, the risk to Long
3 Beach will continue to be managed by the Airport with
4 very robust security operations.

5 So the next steps in our process, next week
6 on October 25th there will be a presentation to the
7 Economic Development Commission. We'll take the results
8 of that meeting and tonight's and report to the City
9 Council on feedback from the community and
10 commissioners.

11 A City Council decision on whether or not
12 to proceed with development of an FIS in Long Beach
13 would follow that. If the City should decide to proceed
14 with the development of an FIS, this is a list of some
15 of the next steps.

16 It involves contacting CBP to request an
17 additional site visit, requesting a letter from the
18 Governor in support of the FIS to the CBP commissioner.
19 Subject to CBP approval, negotiating a financial deal
20 with the participating airlines, programming and design
21 via an RFP, request for proposal process, constructing
22 the facility and then CBP acceptance, occupancy and
23 commission of the facility.

24 That concludes my presentation.

25 MR. ROMO: Thank you, Dave.

1 At this point, Madam Chair, I'll turn it
2 back over to you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Actually, at this point I
4 feel we're going to have a presentation from our City
5 Attorney Parkin.

6 MR. PARKIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Charles
7 Parkin with the Long Beach City Attorney's office. I'm
8 going to ask Mike Mais, the Assistant City Attorney, to
9 give a brief presentation on the opinion that my office
10 wrote at the request of the City Council when they
11 decided to proceed with the feasibility study.

12 MR. MAIS: What I'm going to try to do is not use
13 the microphone if possible. If you can't hear me,
14 please let me know and I'll use it.

15 I want to be able to see you while I'm
16 talking, and I'm sure you'll want to see me, and I want
17 to be able to look at the Commission, as well. So if
18 you have problems hearing me, tell me and I'll move up
19 to the microphone.

20 As Charlie indicated, my name is Mike Mais.
21 I'm the Assistant City Attorney. I've been with the
22 City Attorney's office for about 32 years. I've been
23 the primary in-house attorney for the City Attorney's
24 office at the Long Beach Airport since about 1995.

25 As Charlie indicated, the City Council back

1 in July of 2015 when they knew at the direction of the
2 City Manager's office to conduct this feasibility study
3 asked us to do sort of a parallel study to look and do a
4 risk assessment of what it would mean to the City's
5 Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance if the FIS
6 facility was ultimately approved and got up and running.

7 So I would say at the beginning that our --
8 obviously, we're not advocates either for or against the
9 project. We're trying to give the best legal opinion
10 that we have of what such a project would mean if it
11 came to the Long Beach Airport.

12 We did not work on our opinion in
13 consultation with Jacobs. We did our own independent
14 evaluation of the ordinance based on what we know of the
15 ordinance, the history of the ordinance.

16 We also, for those of you that have been
17 involved in other airport projects, such as the
18 terminal, you'll know that we also from time to time and
19 certainly with large projects use outside counsel, and
20 we did have an outside counsel, Lori Ballance from
21 Gatzke, Dillon & Ballance, to assist us and do a peer
22 review of our evaluation to make sure that we were on
23 the right track. That's the same law firm that assisted
24 the City with the airport terminal in 2006 and the years
25 before.

1 We did do the written opinion. I believe
2 there are copies of the written opinion here available
3 for you. If there are not enough copies, you can read
4 it online at the City Attorney's web site. It's also on
5 the Airport's web site.

6 If for some reason you don't have access to
7 the web site, you certainly can call me at the City
8 Attorney's office, and I'll be happy to mail you a copy.
9 So that's no problem.

10 I will say I want you to understand the
11 perspective at which we approach, you know, our task
12 here. The City Attorney's office has been at the
13 forefront of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance
14 literally going back to the 1980s when we adopted the
15 first noise compatibility ordinance.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And what is the ordinance?
17 I want the time when they have to shut that airport down
18 at night.

19 MR. MAIS: I'm probably not going to go over the
20 details of the ordinance, but I will try to answer all
21 of your questions and the Commission's questions as they
22 come up.

23 What the Airport Noise Compatibility
24 Ordinance, it's part of the Long Beach Municipal Code.
25 It is, as one of the speakers, Mr. Tomber, said earlier,

1 one of the most restrictive noise control ordinances in
2 the United States literally.

3 (Multiple unidentified speakers at once.)

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Hold on, hold on. Please let
5 him finish his presentation.

6 And it's very available online, by the way.
7 You can find it. And we will get it to you, but not --

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who do I complain when a
9 plane goes over at 11:00 o'clock? That's who I want to
10 talk to.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Right now if you'll sit down,
12 we will tell you that. Thank you, ma'am.

13 There is a phone number where you can call
14 24/7 to make that complaint. Let's not get into that
15 now. Let's --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Help us, not lecture us.

17 MR. MAIS: I'm not trying to lecture. I'm trying
18 to explain where we're coming from.

19 The Noise Compatibility Ordinance, I know,
20 obviously, some people are not happy with it, but the
21 truth of the matter is it literally is one of the most
22 restrictive noise ordinances in the country, and the
23 reason for that is that when we are involved in
24 litigation to try and uphold our ordinance -- that
25 litigation took place from 1983 through 1995 in the

1 federal court, and during the course of that litigation,
2 we were able to enter into a settlement agreement with
3 the air carriers that were involved in that litigation,
4 and that settlement agreement was blessed by the federal
5 court, and it allowed us to adopt with environmental
6 review the current ordinance we have.

7 But more importantly, along with that
8 ordinance, what we were able to negotiate through our
9 representatives in Congress at the time was an exemption
10 from a federal law that you heard one of the speakers
11 talk about called ANCA, which is the Airport Noise and
12 Capacity Act of 1990.

13 And what that law does, it basically
14 prevents airports that have to comply with it, which are
15 most airports in the country, from having any kind of a
16 curfew at all, from having noise budgets or single event
17 noise limits, as our ordinance does, and that's what
18 makes our ordinance special.

19 So the perspective that we have come at
20 when we're doing our evaluation is our job as
21 representing the Airport is to do everything we can to
22 make sure at the end of the day that noise ordinance is
23 protected because it truly -- I know some of you don't
24 like it, and I know some of the planes fly late.
25 There's no question about that.

1 But without that ordinance, we'd be like
2 some of our airports that are in the Southern California
3 region, and look at some of the LA airports, Burbank and
4 some of the others that have no curfew and literally fly
5 24 hours a day without a restriction on the number of
6 flights.

7 We are lucky in the sense that we have a
8 cap, total cap on the number of flights, we have the
9 curfews, and we have the noise budgets. We do
10 everything that we can to make sure that that is
11 protected.

12 So when we look -- when the City Council
13 asks us to look at something, that's our first goal, to
14 make sure that whatever is done at the airport, at least
15 give the best advice that we have to make sure that at
16 the end of the day, we have that ordinance intact.

17 So that's how we started out.

18 The opinion itself is basically in three
19 parts. It gives the history of the airport noise
20 ordinance, which I've given you a short brief, and I'll
21 go over that again unless people have questions later.

22 And by the way, if you have questions
23 later, feel free to call me at the City Attorney's
24 office because I can probably answer it more thoroughly
25 in that kind of a forum. So please feel free to do

1 that.

2 So we have the history of the Noise
3 Compatibility Ordinance. And once we dealt with that,
4 we looked at the project itself. And you heard about
5 what some of the project components are tonight. And in
6 doing our analysis, the components of this particular
7 projects were very important.

8 The first thing we looked at is that this
9 is what's called a bricks and mortar project.
10 Obviously, they're building a structure out at the
11 airport. You saw some of the potential what they would
12 look like. It's not what they call a regulatory
13 project.

14 In other words, this project, if it were
15 built, would not and does not require any change to the
16 existing ordinance that we have in place. So no one is
17 proposing, neither the City Council or the proponent of
18 this project, is suggesting that the ordinance is
19 changed, be changed in any fashion, and that is a good
20 thing.

21 If the project ultimately were built,
22 anyone using that facility, whether it was an air
23 carrier or general aviation aircraft, would be required
24 like all of the other air carriers or general aviation
25 aircraft that fly in and out of the airport currently to

1 comply with the Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and that
2 means they'd have to comply with our existing curfews,
3 with the single event noise limits, the existing noise
4 budgets, and this is important, the cap on the total
5 number of flights, which you heard earlier is 50 right
6 now for air carrier flights.

7 What the project would do, it would allow
8 air carriers to fly to destinations they cannot
9 currently fly to. Not because of the noise ordinance,
10 but because, as you heard, in order to fly to
11 international destinations, it's necessary to have a
12 facility that's controlled and operated by the Customs
13 and Border Patrol folks.

14 So the ordinance itself as written does not
15 prohibit where a flight currently goes or where it comes
16 from, and but for the fact that this requires Customs
17 and Border Protection, we wouldn't even be looking at
18 this issue because otherwise, flights can fly out of our
19 airport, they can go to New York, Washington, D.C.,
20 Seattle, Anchorage, wherever the carrier wants to fly.

21 And, in fact, the City has no ability to
22 control itself where air carriers fly. We can't dictate
23 if they choose to fly their routes to New York or D.C.,
24 Salt Lake City, Reno. The City can't dictate that, and
25 that is federal law.

1 So what we're looking at is to give the
2 existing carriers at the airport the ability to fly to
3 international destinations.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Will we get a chance to
5 reply, or will we get more than three minutes? Because
6 we want to reply to a lot of his comments, too.

7 MR. MAIS: So when we did the risk assessment, one
8 of the things that we're being asked to do is sort of an
9 impossibility. What really Council is asking us to do
10 was to predict things that are really not in our
11 control.

12 In other words, we have said at many public
13 meetings, including this one and in the legal opinion,
14 that anyone can sue the Airport or the City at any time
15 virtually for any reason. So no matter what we say or
16 do, that threat exists today, it existed yesterday, and
17 it will exist tomorrow.

18 What we need to do is make sure that we
19 position ourselves so at the end of the day, if there is
20 a litigation, we'll be successful in that litigation.

21 So we can't predict what the future is. I
22 couldn't tell you. There might be a carrier out there
23 right now that is interested in suing the Airport for
24 some reason, challenging the noise ordinance for some
25 reason. It's possible. I don't know.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Then why build it? Why
2 build it and invite them to sue?

3 MR. MAIS: In doing the assessment, the best thing
4 that we can do -- I can't predict the future, but what
5 we can do is look to the past and see what has actually
6 happened at the airport as a predictor of the future.

7 As I indicated at the beginning, this
8 ordinance has been in effect since 1995. We've never
9 had one legal challenge to the ordinance. There's never
10 been a court case challenging the ordinance. There's
11 never been what they call an administrative proceeding
12 filed with the FAA to challenge the provisions of the
13 ordinance. So we haven't had that in the history of
14 over 21 years.

15 We've had other bricks and mortar projects
16 at the airport within the last 21 years. None of them
17 resulted in any sort of legal challenge in court to try
18 and get rid of the ordinance.

19 And some of those facilities or some of
20 those projects, obviously the airport terminal expansion
21 that was approved in 2006, which made the airport, as
22 you all know, because I'm sure some of you or most of
23 you have flown in and out of there, a very attractive
24 airport for carriers.

25 We haven't had any outside carriers try to

1 challenge the ordinance since that was built. Same with
2 the large parking structure that we built that makes the
3 airport much more attractive to air carriers because it
4 provides more parking for the patrons that use the air
5 carriers. That didn't result in any further litigation.

6 Even the two new hotels that were built
7 just off-site of the airport property that really
8 facilitates passengers that come in and out of the
9 airport -- one is built. It's the Marriott. The other
10 one is currently under construction. That hasn't
11 generated any litigation.

12 So the history is we haven't had litigation
13 from bricks and mortar projects. And there's really two
14 sides to the question. We can say can we be sued? The
15 answer is yes. What happens if we're sued?

16 We get sued, City gets sued all the time
17 for different things, but the real key is if someone
18 does sue us, can they successfully challenge the
19 ordinance. And the factors that we looked at were that
20 we are in a much better position now with our current
21 ordinance than we were when we first adopted the first
22 noise control ordinance back in 1981, and the reason
23 we're in a better position is we currently have the --
24 and we didn't have any of this when we started down this
25 road to adopt noise control ordinances.

1 We have the federal court decision that I
2 mentioned and the settlement agreement to rely on. Both
3 of those validate the existence of our ordinance and all
4 of the parts of the ordinance, including the curfew, the
5 budgets, the cap on the number of flights.

6 We have approved environmental documents
7 that support the ordinance that have never been
8 successfully challenged in court. We have what I
9 mentioned before, ANCA, which we did not have when we
10 adopted our first noise control ordinance or even at the
11 time of the settlement of the litigation. We're exempt
12 from that.

13 We're not treated like other airports. We
14 have a special status that remains in effect. And we
15 have at least three letters dating back from 2003 up
16 until this week from the FAA acknowledging that we are
17 exempt from ANCA and indicating, as one of the speakers
18 mentioned, that a project such as this, this bricks and
19 mortar FIS facility, in the view of the FAA as of this
20 week would not implicate any challenge to the ordinance.

21 So can we be sued? Yes. So that's the
22 risk assessment. We always can be sued. We will never
23 -- nobody from our office will ever stand up and say
24 there's not a possibility of being sued.

25 Are we in a good position if we are sued?

1 Yes, we think we are because of all of the things I've
2 mentioned. There has been no history of litigation
3 arising out of these types of projects to challenge the
4 ordinance.

5 So basically, the bottom line assessment
6 that we made is that whether or not this FIS facility is
7 built or the City Council determines that it goes
8 forward, we are no better or no worse position than we
9 currently are today.

10 So that's it, the bottom line. I'd be
11 willing to talk with anybody after on the phone if you
12 want to pursue that any further. And I'm sure the
13 Commission will have questions for us, and we'll try to
14 answer those, as well.

15 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much, Attorney
16 Mais and Mr. Tomber, for the report.

17 What we've attempted to do is give you the
18 basic information that we have. What we're going to do
19 now is open it up for each person, and these are
20 strictly for your public comment. This is not a
21 question-and-answer period. That's not the format set
22 up.

23 And each person will please identify who
24 they are so that she can get your name very clearly, and
25 address the Commission for three minutes.

1 Would you like to speak first, ma'am?

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to ask you --

3 THE REPORTER: I need speakers to identify who
4 they are.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Hold on. Hold on. Please
6 come up to the microphone.

7 MR. ROMO: Madam Chair, with respect to the folks
8 in attendance here tonight, as the Chair has indicated,
9 the public comment is for comments and/or questions by
10 the public.

11 Our commitment to you as the Airport would
12 be that any question that the public would like to
13 submit to the Airport, we will provide an email address
14 so that you can send it to the Airport. We will respond
15 to it.

16 For those who don't have email access, we
17 have Airport staff here who can take your name and phone
18 number, and we can engage that way relative to questions
19 you have. And then if I may, ma'am, and then finally,
20 Councilman Supernaw has graciously offered that if you
21 would like to contact his office with any questions or
22 concerns, those would be forwarded to the Airport.

23 But in the interest of making sure that the
24 questions that are put forth before the presentation
25 team are made by the Commission itself, you're more than

1 welcome to offer up a question. If the Commission deems
2 that they may want to ask that same question, it's at
3 their discretion.

4 But again, I can provide that email address
5 now. Maybe I should for those who may be interested.
6 We want to make sure that we're full and transparent and
7 responsive to questions that may come up.

8 And I hope people can recognize and
9 appreciate that the potential volume of questions that
10 may come up tonight, it's going to be I think much more
11 effective for us to receive those either by email or
12 phone call or --

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: But that way we don't get
14 to hear them. We don't get to hear their questions, so
15 we don't get any schooling from it.

16 MR. ROMO: I said I will make the offer --

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And this young lady said to
18 us that we were going to be able to ask questions and
19 not to hold our questions.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Excuse me. I never said
21 that.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You did.

23 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I said --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And you said there will be
25 a time for us to ask questions and for you to answer

1 them.

2 MR. ROMO: Not to answer them. Just questions.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did anybody else hear it?

4 MR. ROMO: I'm sorry, Madam Chair.

5 You can ask a question. You can make a
6 comment. But this is for public comment. Your question
7 is not going to be responded to because this is the
8 public comment period.

9 As an alternative, if you have a question,
10 we will gladly take that question and respond to it.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Could you take the
12 questions, like an inventory of all of the questions
13 that were asked today and then reply in the written
14 manner and --

15 MR. ROMO: Absolutely. Absolutely. So if I may
16 -- and a reminder that the study contains an appendix,
17 Appendix H, that already has a compilation of questions
18 and answers, and it also even breaks it down to the top
19 questions that were asked and answered.

20 You're more than welcome to submit a
21 question that's already been asked. You may want to
22 look at that appendix if you like, but if you don't, I
23 will provide the email address.

24 And again, we have staff here who can take
25 your name and number and engage with you separately, but

1 we will compile all those questions, and we can put them
2 all in one document and make them available.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Would you like to come
5 forward and state your name nice and clearly?

6 MS. CANTRELL: Good evening. Ann Cantrell, and
7 I'm disappointed we're not going to get answers to the
8 questions tonight. That's why I was here.

9 Looking at this feasibility siting
10 alternative, I cannot make heads or tails out of what's
11 happening. Mr. Mais indicated this is a brick and
12 mortar, you're going to be building something.

13 I'm wondering what's going to be built. I
14 can't tell from these pictures. All of these buildings
15 that -- it looks like there's one building that's going
16 to be built. I'd like to have confirmation about that.

17 When the airport was first improved in
18 2006, we were told there was not room for jetways and
19 baggage claim, indoor baggage claim, and now we're
20 finding room to put in an FIC.

21 I'm also very concerned about the fact
22 there's not going to be an environmental impact report.
23 You're relying on the 2006 CEQA report, and that's ten
24 years old.

25 I think if you're going to be building new

1 buildings, you have to do at least the California
2 Environmental Quality Act, and I would think you'd have
3 to do NEPA also.

4 There's been a change in the last ten years
5 in air quality, in especially noise, and these things
6 need to be addressed in the EIR.

7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

9 MS. SIEVERS: Good evening. My name is Donna
10 Sievers, and I'd like to thank the last speaker because
11 one of my comments was to emphasize also the issue of
12 having a mandatory CEQA as part of this whole process.

13 I'm not surprised this evening to hear the
14 conclusions of the airport feasibility study. Many
15 projects may be feasible. I looked up the definition of
16 feasibility, and it's something that could be workable,
17 something could be attainable or practical.

18 So while this project may be workable or
19 feasible, my question is is it wise or is it necessary.
20 I personally don't think so. I don't think an
21 international terminal in the middle of our city is
22 either wise or necessary.

23 The feasibility study notes that there's
24 various benefits for the City, but I would urge the
25 Commissioners and the City Council to consider there are

1 many other ways to expand tourists and convention
2 attendance.

3 We have two international airports within
4 close proximity, and they're not even used to full
5 capacity. We need to grow jobs in our city and have
6 tourists, but we can do that through the expansion of
7 green energy jobs, Internet technology jobs and by
8 making our city more attractive to tourists.

9 I don't think landing at John Wayne or LAX
10 is a deal breaker for tourists. So I urge all of us to
11 consider that we all have this vested interest in
12 maintaining our noise ordinance.

13 I think we need to seriously consider that
14 if JetBlue is allowed a near monopoly or a monopoly on
15 access to an international airport, that other carriers
16 could very well sue and put our noise ordinance at risk.
17 That is a risk I'm not willing to take just for the sake
18 of JetBlue profits.

19 I urge the Advisory Commission and the City
20 Council to please listen to our residents. We may be,
21 you know, impassioned and we may get a bit uncivil
22 sometimes, but our hearts are in the right place.

23 I for one will promise you that I will
24 never use the international airport in Long Beach, and I
25 hope my neighbors would also, you know, support me. If

1 we need to use an economic boycott we will, and maybe
2 that wasn't considered in the feasibility study.

3 But we can drive a few miles and protect
4 our kids and our community from further noise ordinance
5 lawsuits.

6 MS. TOTARO: Good evening. My name is Gayla
7 Totaro, and I'm here to speak about my concern for the
8 noise pollution and decline of property values that are
9 occurring in Huntington Harbor, a coastal harbor
10 community in Huntington Beach, as you all know, next to
11 Long Beach.

12 We purchased a house in Huntington Harbor
13 in 1998. We loved the quiet neighborhood after having
14 the noise and pollution in the previous home we owned
15 that backed up to busy Edwards Street. We spent
16 thousands of dollars to upgrade this property and make
17 it worthy of a harbor neighborhood.

18 About three years ago, I noticed that there
19 started to be airplanes flying over our home in an
20 increasing amount and not way up in the sky quiet ones,
21 but low and noisy ones. I've been awakened at 6:30 a.m.
22 in the morning, as well as at midnight by airplanes.

23 There is one JetBlue flight that I could
24 throw a Nerf ball at and get pretty close to touching.
25 I could clearly see the company name or logo on them.

1 I work from home, and three weeks ago the
2 noise was so loud, I could not hear the person on the
3 other end of the phone, and that was a land line. I
4 would have never heard them on my cell phone.

5 I was sitting inside my home about ten feet
6 from the open window, and the person said to me from the
7 phone, "Are you in an airport?" So that tells me that
8 this is even being heard through phones.

9 Regarding pollution, in our last home by
10 Edwards Street, we were constantly cleaning off the
11 patio areas of the greasy grime from the street traffic.
12 We didn't have that problem in Huntington Harbor until
13 we somehow ended up in the flight path.

14 Now there is a thick grime on our patio
15 furniture and everything else. My husband has to power
16 wash the outside more frequently.

17 A neighbor who uses his home as a vacation
18 home asked, "What's all the dirt on my deck about? I
19 don't remember having this problem in the past."

20 And lastly, I was speaking with my realtor
21 about the noise, and he said, "Yes, it is a problem. It
22 is never good when you show a property and a plane flies
23 over. More air traffic would be bad for property
24 values," he said.

25 I watch the -- I personally watch the

1 Orange County property ads, and I've noticed that
2 Newport and other coastal areas are increasing in value
3 while Huntington Harbor appears stagnant. I wonder how
4 much the noise pollution has already affected us.

5 So I'm wondering -- I saw and read your
6 Long Beach noise study. Was that noise and study,
7 pollution study, done on Huntington Beach?

8 I agree that more information needs to be
9 distributed. When will a Huntington Beach noise study
10 be done? How did it become -- how did Huntington Beach
11 become the flight path without any notice, and how do I
12 find out about these activities that are going on right
13 now? Because I did not hear from Jacobs company about
14 the outreach notices of the community meetings.

15 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

16 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Sorry. I'm setting my timer. I
17 want to make sure.

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: It's right here. You can
19 just watch these lights if you'd like.

20 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is
21 Nancy Lopez. I'm a member, pretty close, really close
22 actually to the airport.

23 Ultimately, the decision that the City
24 Council will have to make is to concede to the wishes of
25 big corporations like JetBlue or to do what's best for

1 our communities and for American families.

2 There are families that have invested in
3 this community, and this will be taken away by the City
4 Council if this vote moves forward.

5 There were many points that were brought
6 forward today, that it wouldn't be 100 percent
7 international. So when will it stop? How will we know
8 that?

9 You said that you will continue to operate
10 within the noise ordinance, but that's not done now.
11 There are flights that come in at midnight. If there's
12 an international flight and there's delays due to
13 weather, will that flight come in?

14 It says that there will be an increase of
15 3,000 -- I'm sorry -- 379,000 annual passengers. What
16 about the traffic in the area, in the community? And
17 they said in your study about community impacts. There
18 was nothing about the devaluation of homes that are
19 there right now.

20 What will happen to the people that have
21 already invested in this community and the families that
22 have grown families here and want to see their families
23 here in the future?

24 Sorry.

25 It said that there would be an increase in

1 jobs, but with those increase in jobs, again, it means
2 an increase in traffic. And it said that revenues would
3 not be able to be used for Long Beach services. So who
4 will the money be going to?

5 All of these are questions and they're
6 rhetorical questions because you guys can't answer them,
7 but they are topics that are not brought forth in either
8 the presentation by the gentleman that brought forward
9 the study or by the JetBlue representative or the
10 Attorney General.

11 The Attorney General or the District
12 Attorney, whatever, he said that literally this is the
13 strictest ordinance. Literally, it's not.
14 Figuratively, it is.

15 Literally would mean that flights are not
16 coming in at 12:00 midnight or that they're not coming
17 in at 6:00 or 5:00 in the morning and that they're not
18 flying low. That's literally.

19 I think that's all I have to say.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

21 MR. MELLO: Miss Chairman or Miss Chairperson and
22 Commissioners, my name is Joseph Mello. I'm in the 4th
23 District, and I have one comment, and I have a concern
24 about the FAA letters.

25 I know that the 2015 one was from JetBlue,

1 and according to Mr. Mais, the 2016 one is from the
2 City, and that -- I was just told those are online. So
3 if anyone's interested in seeing those letters, the City
4 Attorney said that those are online.

5 The other thing I had a question -- or I
6 was involved in the expansion of the terminal
7 controversy, I guess you could call it, and one of the
8 things that we were really concerned about was having
9 more lanes for planes to park.

10 And I noticed that some of the parking
11 situations with the different buildings, they have two
12 more dedicated, apparently, for the international. But
13 that, again, is kind of -- there was a long fight over
14 how many parking places there would be, and this is now
15 going to add two more parking places, and I think that's
16 a concern for the community depending on which buildings
17 that you guys decide if it goes through.

18 The other thing is I know that the Mayor in
19 some of the community meetings was very happy that
20 Southwest came because we're not as dependent on
21 JetBlue. And one of my concerns would be that -- and
22 one of the questions is that if this goes through, what
23 happens to the contracts that happen if JetBlue wants to
24 say I'm going to pull out of the airport, and, you know,
25 who's going to then get stuck paying for the customs

1 facilities.

2 I'm sure that's going to be worked out, but
3 that's a concern. I know that happened in Fresno,
4 Yosemite International, when their international people
5 pulled out and the city was stuck with the bill there.

6 And the final thing is as far as the late
7 night flights go, I know all of you are very familiar
8 with the fines and everything that happens with that.
9 Page 11, Figure 3, that shows the simulated flight
10 schedule. The latest flights that are coming in from
11 Cancun, I believe it says -- and it's a simulated. We
12 don't know what the schedule will be -- is, like, 8:00,
13 8:15 or something like that.

14 And so one of our concerns is, the
15 neighborhood, is when are these flights coming in. And
16 one of the things that we did ask in the community
17 meetings is to compare -- and I don't know if it's in
18 the appendix, but we asked for them to compare the other
19 airports, when those late flights were coming, if those
20 flights were later than expected.

21 We don't have any information on if those
22 flights in Orange County and the other airports are
23 later than expected, how often are they late. We don't
24 know anything about that. Thank you.

25 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

1 MR. ROSSOFF: I'm Greg Rossoff in the 7th
2 District, and I had some concerns over the report that
3 was given for the feasibility study. There are some gaps
4 in that. And they covered some of the areas this
5 gentleman just mentioned, and that is he talked about
6 the noise issue not being impacted.

7 But the question is how many of these long
8 distance flights are now going to be landing and
9 departing between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m.? And I'd
10 like -- if that information is available and included in
11 the study, I would like to have that made public.

12 Also, are there FIS -- if that's the name
13 of the building, are there existing facilities at John
14 Wayne Airport and Ontario Airport at this time? This
15 study doesn't go beyond the scope of just Long Beach,
16 but I would like to know that. I'd like to know what
17 impact the international flights have had on those
18 airports.

19 And, of course, I hear wonderful things
20 about our ordinance here in Long Beach, but actually,
21 John Wayne seems to have done a better job because they
22 have very strict times when you can't land or depart.
23 And it's not just based on individual flights because
24 our fine system does not provide deterrent to the
25 airlines.

1 So I would like to compare our situation
2 with John Wayne and Ontario and how does this impact
3 international flights among the three airports and what
4 is the most efficient way to provide for that growth in
5 the future.

6 Okay? Thank you.

7 MS. OCHSNER: Good evening. Lisa Ochsner. That's
8 O-c-h-s-n-e-r, and I'm here tonight to focus my comments
9 on the environmental compliance assessment.

10 I do not feel that the study was conducted
11 thoroughly and properly by comparing the facility to the
12 EIR. I believe that the conclusion reached that no CEQA
13 review may be required is a false expectation.

14 And the reason why is because the analysis
15 basically does a very simple assessment by comparing
16 what was called the impact envelope to square footage
17 and maximum number of flights.

18 But what it doesn't do is consider the
19 assumptions and factors that were used to develop that
20 envelope for the EIR, which may no longer be accurate,
21 valid or even relevant.

22 For example, in the EIR it stated that if
23 the additional flights occur, they would occur based on
24 carrier decisions rather than the availability of
25 terminal improvements.

1 That's not the case here. This is a
2 classic case of for the project, meaning if you didn't
3 construct the facility, you would not otherwise be able
4 to operate international flights.

5 The EIR is so outdated, it relies on old
6 models from the 2000s. It has a 2005 baseline, and it
7 has a number of other items that I can mention here real
8 quickly.

9 Before I get to that, I will say that a lot
10 of the statements that pertain to no further review is
11 required were misquoted and improperly referencing CEQA.
12 They refer to a program EIR. There was no program EIR
13 done for the terminal improvement project.

14 So you can't take a project level EIR that
15 was certified back in '06 and call it a program EIR and
16 try to treat it in that same manner without going into
17 detail. You can read my comment letter in that regard.

18 And as far as air quality goes, the -- like
19 I said, the models were so old, they were from the early
20 2000s. They only looked at the optimized flight
21 scenario out to the year 2020. So any emissions that
22 would occur beyond that time frame are not even captured
23 in the analysis.

24 They also relied on a SCAG growth
25 projection of 3.8 million annual passengers, and the

1 current 2016 SCAG Regional Transportation Plan now shows
2 Long Beach Airport at 5 million annual passengers. So
3 you would be underestimating by approximately 1.2
4 million.

5 More importantly, it relies on an outdated
6 health risk that was done using 2003 guidelines. Those
7 guidelines have since been updated, and the major
8 difference between the old versus the new is that it
9 underestimates cancer risk for children and the elderly
10 by approximately three times.

11 So the impacts would likely be, if you ran
12 the model today, three times more than what the old EIR
13 shows.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Afraid we're going to have to
15 ask you to conclude.

16 MS. OCHSNER: And then the last point is on
17 greenhouse gas emissions, to state that the EIR did not
18 analyze it and that that's not an issue is just really
19 bad form. It's 2016, SB 32. How can you ignore
20 greenhouse gases and climate change?

21 Thank you.

22 MR. SOPO: Joe Sopo, and I'd like to talk to you
23 about the port of entry.

24 I think that Jacobs Engineering, they're
25 going to benefit from this, not only what they're being

1 paid, but also they're going to do some of the work at
2 the airport.

3 One of the questions to Jacobs Engineering,
4 when they were discussing it with us earlier this year,
5 they were questioned are you going to do any work for
6 the City at the airport, and they couldn't answer that
7 question.

8 I think they make a statement here about
9 port of entry and user fee airport designation where
10 they're proposing that a user fee airport designation,
11 which is more expensive to the airport or the users of
12 the airport. Everybody wants to be a port of entry.
13 Federal government picks up a lot more of the cost.

14 And they make this statement. This
15 statement is included in the first paragraph of this
16 section. It says, "When service and passenger volumes
17 meet qualifying levels of port of entry designation,
18 then Long Beach Airport may apply for port of entry
19 designation."

20 Sure, you can apply, but that's not how
21 it's going to work. Loretta Sanchez has been
22 introducing bills for several years now for John Wayne
23 Airport to be a port of entry. It's still a user fee,
24 and it's costing John Wayne Airport millions of dollars.

25 The reason I'm bringing this up is because

1 it's -- Jacobs just fluffed over this so easy, oh, you
2 can apply for it. What other things in this study have
3 they just sort of fluffed over? It's very complicated
4 report. You all didn't have time to read all of it. If
5 we ran a lie detector test on you, none of you would
6 pass it. We know that.

7 Although aren't we all happy because
8 remember one time standing in front of you, we were all
9 upset that JetBlue kept cutting back on its flights.
10 They were hanging on to those slots legally, but they
11 were cutting them back, and your budget was going down
12 by millions of dollars.

13 Well, Southwest enters the scene, and now
14 it's going to get better, and John Wayne is going to fly
15 more domestic flights. They're going to pick up the
16 slots, and the airport is going to make more money.

17 I'm sorry that we don't -- it's difficult
18 to be on this side of the mike and not be able to have a
19 discussion. We're just going to talk to you and look to
20 see where our answers come from.

21 I'd like to have a discussion with this
22 Mike Mais about -- that our noise ordinance is
23 bulletproof. Jacobs Engineering thinks it is.

24 But weren't we going to be challenged? In
25 2002, 2003, the City received a letter that JetBlue --

1 from another competing airlines that JetBlue had a
2 monopoly on Long Beach Airport, and they were going to
3 sue if it didn't change. Well, it changed.

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Joe, I'm going to have you
5 discuss that with --

6 MR. SOPO: Well, I will do that, but I think
7 everybody here needs to hear that, too, that we don't
8 have a bulletproof noise ordinance.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. JOY: Hi. My name is Bob Joy.

11 Mr. Mais almost resolved my issue here, but
12 not quite. So I'd like to reflect that Mr. Parkin's
13 stated in the contribution to this study in section
14 three that, quote, There are no facts to support the
15 scenario that economic competition could lead to
16 litigation challenging our ordinance.

17 But on May 1st of 2002, as Joe just
18 mentioned, American Airlines threatened the City with,
19 and I quote, a costly legal fight to secure flight slots
20 that were held by JetBlue. The City settled out of
21 court rather than subject the noise ordinance to a court
22 challenge.

23 Contrary to your report, that is a fact,
24 and it directly supports the current scenario of a
25 JetBlue competitor challenging our noise ordinance for

1 more flight slots.

2 In addition, this Jacobs report we are
3 discussing tonight states as a fact in Appendix C that,
4 and I quote, The market analysis identified pent-up
5 demand for many international markets to Long Beach,
6 unquote, and that, I quote again, the international
7 forecast was constrained to estimate potential markets
8 within the 50 commercial flight slots available,
9 unquote.

10 In other words, Jacobs admits that the
11 report data was deliberately modified to make it seem
12 the potential growth of the international flights would
13 remain low enough to fit within the 50 flight slot
14 maximum at our airport.

15 Here's my question to you and any Council
16 members that are present.

17 In light of the American Airlines threat
18 and this new evidence from the Jacobs report, what
19 credible assurance can you give us that the inspection
20 facility will not provide a significant opportunity for
21 a JetBlue competitor to successfully challenge our noise
22 ordinance for more flight slots?

23 And I remind you that all three FAA letters
24 you received reminded you that our ordinance can indeed
25 be challenged by commercial competitors.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. SOPO: Hi. I'm Linda Sopo. I have a couple
3 of comments.

4 First of all, it was not that long ago that
5 we were sitting here at the last Airport Commission --
6 and I don't envy you guys. There's a lot of controversy
7 over the airport all the time, but 2006, 2005, 2004, how
8 many years of our lives did we give up fighting having
9 the airport tripled in size?

10 A lot of us in this room spent a lot of
11 time here and at City Council, and part of the reason it
12 slowed down, we were able to get a reasonable gorgeous
13 facility built was because our PTA and our school
14 district ended up suing regarding the expansion of the
15 airport.

16 It slowed it down. It got Council started
17 listening a little bit to us. And here we are again.

18 In regards to the study, I have a couple of
19 questions and comments. One was the gentleman gave us
20 some details about what we have now currently in terms
21 of employment and everything. I hear a lot about great
22 jobs, jobs, jobs, and I'm all for jobs, jobs, jobs. God
23 knows we need them, but things have gotten better.

24 But if I'm understanding correctly what he
25 told us tonight, he said these great jobs that pay,

1 like, \$9,000 I think is what he said over, you know,
2 similar jobs and everything.

3 And then it also said only 28 percent of
4 the people who work at Long Beach Airport live in Long
5 Beach Airport. That makes no sense to me.

6 So don't talk to me about jobs, jobs, jobs.
7 If they're not hiring Long Beach people and they're
8 hiring people from Orange County, you know, doesn't get
9 me too excited. That means the money is going there,
10 and it means more people on the freeways, which are
11 already hugely impacted.

12 Finally, the whole part about -- God loves
13 all of you who still live under the flight path. I do
14 not, but I did for a long time. And the time that I did
15 back in the nineties, we didn't get woken up at 3:00
16 o'clock in the morning by airplanes going overhead.
17 Once in a blue moon there would be a plane that went
18 over late. Occasionally you might get a 10:00 o'clock
19 flight.

20 Now I understand it's very common. Look at
21 the fines we're getting from JetBlue.

22 So the airport expansion was pushed by
23 JetBlue. The international facility was pushed by
24 JetBlue. We did get some agreements with JetBlue around
25 it when we did the facility, and look at how many times

1 they're breaking our ordinance on a weekly, monthly,
2 yearly basis. Our libraries are getting lots of money,
3 but that's not a good way to go about doing it.

4 Finally, I just have to say we flew in
5 recently -- we were flying into John Wayne from a long
6 trip to Colorado, and as we came in we had to change
7 flights, and we went through all the miseries of going
8 through other airports, and we were so excited to be
9 able to come to John Wayne. We also often fly from
10 Colorado to here. It's fabulous.

11 So there was a problem at John Wayne.
12 There had already been some problems with the flights.
13 We were already delayed, and they ended up saying, okay,
14 we are going to land at LAX because we're going to be
15 out of gas, and they're going to get this thing off the
16 runway in John Wayne. So we're going to go to LAX,
17 we're going to gas up, and then we'll fly you all down
18 to John Wayne.

19 So we sat on the tarmac at LAX for an hour,
20 and then we got -- I know I'm -- this is almost it.

21 Then we got the message, oh, John Wayne
22 Airport is closed now. We are going to bus you all down
23 to John Wayne Airport.

24 Why don't we do that in Long Beach? Amen.

25 MR. RODSATER: My name is Mike Rodsater. I'm in

1 the 4th District.

2 THE REPORTER: Could you spell your last name?

3 MR. RODSATER: R-o-d-s-a-t-e-r. Norwegian.

4 You know, the thing about international
5 flights, Long Beach is a boutique airport. It's a
6 municipal airport. Long Beach has always been a
7 municipal -- kind of municipality that everybody likes
8 because we're kind of isolated from LA, from Orange
9 County.

10 You can always get lower flights
11 internationally. I fly international a lot. You can
12 always get lower flights out of LAX than you'll ever be
13 able to get out of Long Beach anywhere in the world.

14 Secondly, they did a study as to where the
15 market study said where the flights might go. I didn't
16 see any mention about Asia, Australia, the Pacific
17 Islands. What's to say that they won't come in later,
18 and what restrictions or guarantees do we have they're
19 not going to come in later and fly in some A-380 that
20 has 500 passengers where our terminal will only do 255
21 an hour.

22 What's to say they won't -- that we can't
23 let them come in and do that? JetBlue, Southwest,
24 what's to prevent them from doing that? Is there any
25 restrictions in this that says they can only fly 320s or

1 320 extendeds or 737s. Is there any restriction? I'd
2 like to know the answer to that.

3 Also, this thing is very open-ended. This
4 study just really doesn't address anything but the past.
5 It says everything -- if you read American Airlines, no
6 intention of Long Beach at this time. Delta, no
7 intention to use Long Beach internationally at this
8 time. Southwest, no -- nothing -- no intention to use
9 international at this time.

10 Okay. What about a year from now? What
11 about two years from now? What's in the study to
12 prevent that from happening and keep this a small
13 airport even if we vote to have this? There's no
14 guarantees that this won't expand unbelievably.

15 Okay. I got a couple more questions.

16 Also, 40 percent of the people in Long
17 Beach are affected by the airport noise and pollution.
18 Not just noise. Pollution. And there's no pollution
19 ordinance that I see in the City. And there's no
20 pollution environmental study done in this report except
21 for the confines of the Long Beach Airport where the
22 buildings will be built.

23 Now, how shortsighted and how ignorant of
24 what the people want in this community is this report
25 when it doesn't address what our major concerns is?

1 These planes fly over eight schools. They
2 fly over three to five districts. They fly -- they
3 affect 40 percent, about 240,000 people. Okay. I'm not
4 done yet.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Yes, you are.

6 MR. RODSATER: And so where is the health
7 concerns? Where is the pollution? When is the City --
8 when is the City going to admit that this filth falls
9 out of the sky onto these properties?

10 You ought to see my solar panels. I have
11 to clean them once a month from the dirt that flies over
12 my house from the planes.

13 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

14 MR. RODSATER: Okay. I'm not done yet.

15 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Yes, you are, sir.

16 MR. RODSATER: Wait a second. Wait a second.

17 Just --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Go back in the line, and
19 you can have another turn if you want.

20 MR. RODSATER: Why do something that will
21 encourage a noise ordinance violation by increasing the
22 potential of this airport that other flights, airlines
23 might come in? There's no guarantees.

24 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: You're actually bothering the
25 people that are on your side, so why don't you let them

1 hear it.

2 MR. RODSATER: Okay. I'll let them go.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. TAUQIR: My name is Raghib Tauqir,

5 R-a-g-h-i-b, last name T-a-u-q-i-r.

6 My name is Raghib Tauqir. I first moved to
7 Long Beach in 1969. I live in and own the same house my
8 father lived in and owned and went to elementary school
9 here, junior high school and high school here. I raised
10 my kids. They went to elementary school, junior high
11 school and high school here. My mom retired from
12 Boeing. My father retired from the Navy here in Long
13 Beach. Okay?

14 The City has been real good to me, but it's
15 not Mayberry anymore. I remember when this was a little
16 small, sleepy Navy town. It was less than 250,000
17 people here. Now it's a half a million, and it's still
18 growing.

19 Now, I got sons that are grown now and
20 they're getting their careers started, and they're going
21 to have families -- I already got two grandkids -- and
22 they need jobs. Okay? I got one getting ready to
23 graduate college here in May.

24 That airport and this seaport are two of
25 the most valuable things that this City has. Now,

1 someone asked about where the money comes from with that
2 airport. Most of us are affected, if not directly,
3 indirectly or incidentally. Okay?

4 Mercedes Benz is a prime example. When
5 they decided to put that facility there, that airport
6 was a prime example for that. That's over 200 jobs.
7 That's tax revenue, and that's everything that's being
8 spent in this town.

9 Like, I'm a Long Beach resident. Somebody
10 asked about people work for JetBlue. I work for
11 JetBlue. I get paid a six figure salary that I pay
12 taxes for in this town, property tax. I spend money
13 everywhere from brunch at the Queen Mary to going to the
14 movies at the Pike, shopping for groceries at Trader
15 Joe's, getting my car fixed at Harbor Chevrolet. Okay?

16 I go to doctors here in this town, Long
17 Beach Memorial, Saint Mary's, all over this town. I
18 spend a lot of money in this town. My kids, they didn't
19 get free lunch. I paid for everything for them. They
20 got no government subsidies. Okay? I'm paying out of
21 pocket for their college. Okay?

22 That's what I'm talking about as far as the
23 impact here in this city that that airport provides,
24 okay, whether directly, indirectly.

25 And I grew up here in the seventies. You

1 could taste the air. You could taste the air. Okay?
2 We got all these freeways out here, millions of cars,
3 and traffic's getting worse and worse as the population
4 grows. We're going to look up, it's going to be 600,000
5 700,000, 800,000 people in the city.

6 You got a thousand kids graduating from
7 school out of these major high schools here. They all
8 need jobs. There are all these kids graduating from Cal
9 State Long Beach. They're going to need jobs. My son's
10 getting ready to graduate from Cal State LA.

11 We need this growth. I got 50 percent of
12 my neighborhood is Latino. Grandma's from Costa Rica.
13 She asks me every other month when are you guys going
14 international. Every three months she's going back and
15 forth to Costa Rica. It's friends and family. It ain't
16 just tourists.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

19 MS. NICOLLE: Good evening. My name is Wendy
20 Nicolle, and I live in the 7th District. Last name is
21 N-i-c-o-l-l-e.

22 I'd just like to ask the Commission to
23 really study this feasibility report. A lot of big
24 numbers were thrown out, millions and billions of
25 dollars in revenue and all these great jobs and all

1 these great numbers.

2 I work in numbers, and a lot of times you
3 can inflate them depending on the story you'd like to
4 tell. So I'd really like the City, as well as the
5 Airport and you all, to please study those numbers and
6 make sure they're realistic and in long term they're not
7 going to be a cost instead of a revenue generator.

8 The second is that the feasibility study,
9 yes, it's financially feasible, everything sounds so
10 great. Study says everything's great, everything's
11 great, everything's great. It sounds too great to be
12 true.

13 So please take a look at the financial
14 feasibility long term and really assess what this means
15 10, 25 years from now. I still have a ways to go in
16 Long Beach. I know some of us have longer than others,
17 but I do have a long time here. I do live underneath
18 the airport, and I would like to continue to live there
19 and contributing money to this great city.

20 And last is security risk assessment. It
21 says no additional risk. I highly doubt that fact. I
22 think that's a forecast and assessment. I don't think
23 it's a fact. And I strongly urge you to study that.
24 When you open up an opportunity for people to come in,
25 it opens up the risk.

1 Thank you.

2 MS. ANGEL: Lori Angel. I live in the 8th
3 District.

4 I haven't been involved in airport issues
5 for a very long time, and I've been really impressed
6 with the speakers that we've had tonight. A lot of
7 people have done their homework, and I agree with a lot
8 of what's been said.

9 I'm concerned that the Airport's considered
10 the job generator. It's not the only job generator. We
11 need diversity in jobs in the City, and I think it's
12 important to understand that.

13 I don't think we need to hang our hat on
14 having the growth at the airport for the purpose of
15 providing jobs because it's not the only place that it
16 should be.

17 The other thing is that several people
18 mentioned the decline in property values because of the
19 airport and the impacts of the airport, and those
20 property taxes are, like, one of the major income
21 streams to the City.

22 So if you're suppressing the property
23 values, you're really suppressing the general services.
24 Our police and such are funded by the General Fund.
25 That's where the money needs to be, and that is where we

1 have a major constraint. And so you can't underestimate
2 the impact of the reduced property values at all.

3 For me personally and probably a lot of
4 people, the airport's a wonderful place to go. It's a
5 beautiful facility. It has a quaintness and a historic
6 value to it, it has an openness to it, and I really
7 would not want to see that jeopardized by having it be
8 more of a fortress than the open kind of environment
9 that it is now.

10 And I don't have a lot of other details or
11 information to provide. I'm just concerned about our
12 quaint little airport being impacted and overly -- I'm
13 just concerned about its future and what it means to us
14 because right now it's really a wonderful facility, and
15 I would hate for it to be compromised and turned into
16 some major transportation hub where the transportation
17 is more important than just the peace of mind and value
18 of the people who use it.

19 Thank you.

20 MS. WOOD: I am Dr. Ruena Wood, R-u-e-n-a.

21 We live at Wardlow Park, just across from
22 Wardlow Park, which is about three blocks away from the
23 airport.

24 And first I'd like to make a comment on the
25 feasibility study because I am a manager of the research

1 and strategic plan of Orange County.

2 There are many missing and incomplete work
3 in this particular findings, as well as even the scope
4 of the study, some of which have been pointed out by
5 some speakers here. And most critical of all in this
6 study -- this is very important to all of us -- is the
7 health assessment, as well as pollution.

8 And those are very critical to us because
9 personally, I have seen so many things that have
10 happened for the last 14 years that we've been at the
11 Wardlow Park, Wardlow Road.

12 I'd like to point out also there's no
13 literature review that has been incorporated in this
14 particular study that gives comparative data of similar
15 airport, international or domestic airport that went
16 into international airport, and that is very important
17 to us in order to have a very comprehensive look at this
18 particular feasibility study.

19 Second or another thing that I have seen in
20 here, like other speakers said, the reports that were
21 used in here are very old data. Some are 2002. Some
22 are 2006. And we have more data that are more current
23 that needs to be incorporated in this feasibility study.

24 Other things that I -- personally I would
25 like also to kind of make a comment about the

1 observation that my family have had for 14 years, that
2 traffic has escalated at Wardlow Road.

3 Before even I can get out of my driveway,
4 my husband has to get out on the driveway and to kind of
5 motion to me when to get out there because it is very
6 risky. We have seen so many accidents on that
7 particular road, and if you are going to have an
8 international airport there, the traffic is going to
9 increase tremendously. The traffic accidents and
10 injuries would increase dramatically.

11 Also, noise. We are in a situation where
12 we do not only hear the JetBlue and other air carriers,
13 but also helicopters hovering around. So that should --
14 yes, I'm going to be finishing here.

15 And the valuation of the property. My
16 sister is a realtor, and we were once told that if you
17 sold the house, our -- the amount of the market of our
18 house will be decreased.

19 So leaders, please take note of the health
20 of our children and our family and the well-being of our
21 community.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

23 I would like the speakers to be aware of
24 the fact when they're saying the same thing other people
25 have, considering how many people we have who want to

1 speak. So if you're going to be very repetitious, try
2 to calm down a little. It's all being noted.

3 MS. YOUNG: My name is Jean Young, and I live in
4 the 8th District. I'm right under the flight path at
5 Cartegena and California.

6 My question is did the study really review
7 the increase in general aviation flights that are not
8 covered by the noise ordinance, those under 60 or 70
9 decibels, and the environmental impact that the
10 pollution increase from those flights would occur?

11 These are private Net Jet type planes that
12 are used for personal and business use, and they use
13 leaded gasoline, and I understand that Long Beach is
14 already the sixth largest leaded gasoline airport in the
15 entire United States. So that probably contributes to
16 some of the grime that people were talking about on
17 their patios.

18 So these general aviation flights could
19 come and go literally at any time. I would urge, as
20 others have tonight, that a new EIR and health risk
21 assessment be developed, something that's comprehensive
22 that uses current data that takes into consideration the
23 air quality impact of these emissions and their impact
24 on the health of school children under the flight path.

25 And then my other question is if the noise

1 ordinance is contested, would the City have an
2 obligation to litigate to uphold the current ordinance,
3 and then who would end up paying for that? Would the
4 citizens end up paying to fight that legal battle?

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

7 MS. SMITH: Hi. Laurie Smith, resident of 3rd
8 District, Bluff Park historic district.

9 I'm just wondering if part of the
10 feasibility study, you took into account the impending
11 FAA So Cal Metroplex, which is also known as NextGen,
12 which I had mentioned. It begins in November 10th, and
13 that's something that the City hasn't really talked
14 about.

15 I asked them about it at City Council
16 meetings, but as you may or may not know, this is a
17 City-run airport. They manage it. So it's very
18 different from John Wayne Airport.

19 So the City runs the airport, so they have
20 a conflict of interest in that they are tasked with
21 making money at the airport, yet they are the elected
22 officials who represent us, which is their constituents.

23 So that's one point I'd like to make is
24 that I don't see the feasibility study taking into
25 account the FAA So Cal Metroplex, and that requires the

1 planes to be flying at a lower altitude.

2 And so I'm wondering if the environmental
3 impact took into account that with regards to the noise
4 study.

5 Also, the environmental analysis is from
6 2006, and the environmental -- the American Lung
7 Association's annual State Of The Air report, which
8 released in April of 2015, ranked LA and Long Beach as
9 having the worst air quality in the nation in terms of
10 ozone and the fifth worst in the nation in terms of both
11 year-round particulate pollution and short-term
12 particulate pollution. And so there's only five other
13 areas of the 220 nationwide that is worse than us.

14 So recently the Long Beach City leaders
15 green-lighted a study of the port-connected air
16 pollution effects on nearby neighborhoods. So I'm
17 wondering -- and that was called the "Air Quality Impact
18 Zone Plan." And that was proposed by the City Council.

19 So I'm suggesting everyone again please
20 contact your City Council members and let them know that
21 you want a community round table in which it's not just
22 appointed people by the Mayor. It's people from the --
23 from the management of the airport, the constituents,
24 people from neighborhood associations that have bylaws.

25 And this is something that LAX does. They

1 have a round table with regards to all the impacted
2 communities. So, please, call and talk to your Council
3 person and make sure that we get this done because this
4 is just going to keep happening over and over again.

5 The City is managing the airport, and
6 they're not listening to the constituents. These people
7 have been appointed by the Mayor.

8 So what else? So basically, we need to
9 postpone any new flights coming in, which is what I
10 asked last year of Bryant Francis, who was the past
11 airport director, and I'm just a concerned resident who
12 wants to make sure -- I feel that I'm a part of the City
13 projects, and make sure that the residents' quality of
14 life is taken into account as the airport moves forward
15 into the future.

16 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much. I'm
17 afraid you're out of time. You're out of time.

18 MS. SMITH: These are noise issues that are
19 suffered by homes and schools, and so I would also like
20 to know about how this is affecting the children in the
21 flight paths.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

23 MR. SOPO: Madam Chairman, members, you know we've
24 been watching debates on TV.

25 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: You still have to state your

1 name again.

2 MR. SOPO: Oh, Joe Sopo. Member of HUSH and
3 Neighbors First.

4 You know, we've been watching debates on
5 TV, and the poor moderator gets beat to heck, even when
6 you say, "Your time's up, your time's up."

7 So I've been a real estate agent for 35
8 years. We've been talking about property values. I've
9 been selling real estate in Los Altos for 35 years.

10 At this point in time in the market, I can
11 sell houses next to the freeway. There's such a
12 shortage of homes right now, I probably could sell you a
13 house on the freeway. But it's not always going to be
14 that way.

15 The biggest producer of the General Fund is
16 property taxes. When we go back to a normal market,
17 we're going to -- you know, it will be hard to sell
18 properties next to the freeway or other distractions
19 that, like, fly overhead, they will take away from
20 property values. How much, we'll find out.

21 I applaud that gentleman who walked up here
22 and said I think he said he works for JetBlue. I
23 applaud him coming up here to the lion's den and saying
24 that. But doing international flights is not going to
25 -- 50 flights, remember we could have 50 flights with

1 domestic flights. So it's not going to increase that
2 much more in the way of jobs.

3 One thing you gotta watch out for JetBlue,
4 they're sneaky. They're sneaky. I remember a decade
5 ago when they were coming out of those trailers.
6 Remember the trailers they were in? We didn't have the
7 nice terminal. They were in trailers.

8 And what they liked to brag about is that
9 they paid for the trailers. But what we really found
10 out is they didn't pay for the trailers. The City of
11 Long Beach just deducted that from their monthly rent
12 that they were paying at the airport.

13 So we, you, paid for the trailers. So you
14 gotta watch them because I guarantee you they're going
15 to try something again.

16 You guys, you know -- remember we all stood
17 up here before and talked to you before this FIS study
18 came in, and you were instructed not to talk about the
19 airport, you can't talk about this, you can't talk about
20 that, and you get this dumped on you now tonight.

21 The price of the presentation, I don't know
22 whether this was a \$20,000 night or a --

23 MR. ROMO: 10.

24 MR. SOPO: 10,000. So you guys are paying this
25 gentleman from Jacobs \$10,000 to stand up here and give

1 this presentation. All we can do is make comments and
2 that's it. That's not much. Thank you.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

4 MR. CLOONAN: Hi. My name is Jim Cloonan,
5 C-l-o-o-n-a-n, and two issues.

6 On slide 18 of the presentation, he stated
7 that there would be \$360 million increase in tax revenue
8 that would be state and local, but there was no
9 breakdown as to how much we would actually receive in
10 Long Beach. Was it 5 percent? 50 percent?

11 And second, there was two meetings, one in
12 March and one in April, for our community input, yet the
13 biggest changes in noise come after July. According to
14 the Airport web site, it's 680 percent increase in noise
15 complaints.

16 Two things happened. Two runways that were
17 closed temporarily for repairs have now been permanently
18 closed, funneling probably a tenfold increase in general
19 aviation traffic into the neighborhood.

20 What will happen when general aviation
21 flights can now go international? What will that
22 increase look like? They're not monitored by the noise
23 ordinance.

24 And second, about July, the angle of attack
25 of the jets taking off from the airport has increased,

1 so they're considerably higher altitude when they cross
2 the sound barrier or the sound sensors.

3 Sorry.

4 So it looks lower, but what was once
5 background noise of jets taking off is now an incredibly
6 loud roar that drowns out the TV each time a plane takes
7 off.

8 Both of those things happened after the
9 community input, and so I wanted to know how they would
10 be addressed in the future when this comes up again.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

12 MR. RODSATER: I'm back. Mike Rodsater,
13 District 4.

14 This lovely lady over here brought up the
15 property values, and it triggered something. A while
16 back when Long Beach got into budgetary problems, it
17 made a big mistake when they underestimated the value of
18 the oil, barrel of oil cost to be never under \$70 a
19 barrel.

20 Well, they're making another big mistake if
21 they approve this because what plans do you have if the
22 property values go down by 50 percent or more for the
23 people that are affected by this proposal?

24 I mean, the City, in my estimation and
25 based on past history, doesn't have a plan. So I'd like

1 to know what that plan is if we lose millions and
2 millions and millions of dollars of property tax
3 revenue, and where is that in this analysis that shows
4 how much property values could go down based on
5 historic?

6 Inglewood, look at some of the other
7 neighbors around airports and cities and see what their
8 property values decreased for people in the flight paths
9 when flight traffic increased.

10 And finally, one of the things, where was
11 -- let's see. It was about two or three years ago that
12 Long Beach State Economics Department did a financial
13 economic -- an economic study that said there was little
14 to no financial impact for the FIS facility.

15 Where is that study today? I want to know
16 if that was even looked at. All right.

17 And finally, I'd like to thank Councilman
18 Supernaw and Councilman Uranga for attending, and I'd
19 like to know and put on record where are the other
20 seven?

21 MR. RAIKLEN: Good evening. My name is David
22 Raiklen. That's R-a-i-k-l-e-n, and I'm a resident of
23 Long Beach, and I'm also a business owner here, and I
24 also have been here my whole life.

25 And I have seen the airport grow, and it's

1 also transformed. It's not just bigger. It's something
2 completely different. It's gone from being essentially
3 a community general aviation airport to being a
4 commercial airport.

5 And while there's some advantages to that,
6 it's really letting the nose of the camel in the tent,
7 and we knew that that was happening way back when we
8 started to have a significant number of commercial
9 flights because once you start doing that, then people
10 start getting ambitious, especially people who see that
11 the City Council or committees in the City can easily be
12 swayed to see things their way if they offer money.

13 And this happens in every community where
14 there's a potential to make money from something that
15 started out small and then gets a lot bigger.

16 Let me give you a specific example. There
17 was an FIS study done just three years ago, and instead
18 of being 697 pages long, it was considerably less than
19 that. But there's also some significant differences in
20 the numbers.

21 For instance, the enplanements that were
22 forecast about three years ago were about 150,000. Now
23 it's 379,000. So somebody is getting considerably more
24 ambitious in their forecast in just a short time, and I
25 think that there's a factual basis for that. I think

1 that that's not just numbers being pulled out of the
2 air, that we actually are looking at having twice as
3 many passengers added on as we were three years ago
4 because the number of flights and the size of the planes
5 are just going to be more.

6 And yeah, we had this noise ordinance that
7 if it were enforced properly would restrict that, but
8 the affected parties know that it's not going to be
9 enforced.

10 That's the evidence of the past, that it's
11 enforced in a spotty and inconsistent way, and that
12 leaves the door open or the tent or whatever analogy
13 you'd like to use to let more and more in.

14 So something that started out as being
15 local starts to become a regional impact, and yet this
16 study doesn't have the regional information that we
17 asked for.

18 The questions that people are asking
19 tonight were asked six months ago when the study was
20 still in its design phase, but they weren't answered,
21 for instance, things like environmental impact or on
22 street traffic.

23 Okay. So we've asked these questions
24 before, and they still haven't been answered. Why is
25 that?

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

3 MS. PFOST: Hi. My name is Terri, T-e-r-r-i,
4 P-f-o-s-t.

5 People have been really incredible.
6 Excellent information. Can't even argue with it. I
7 mean, blows me away. Point being is that, very quick, I
8 really just kind of get the feeling that this feasibility
9 study is just going through the motion to try to pacify
10 us and the decision's already been made, and it's very
11 disturbing.

12 Secondly, I'm also wondering how many
13 people -- perhaps you haven't noticed because this is a
14 recent thing that I just started noticing and the people
15 in our neighborhood have been noticing, that there have
16 been a number of cars in our neighborhood, not people
17 visiting, not people getting new cars. Our streets are
18 becoming airport parking.

19 But what they do is they park in our
20 neighborhoods, and Uber drives them up to the airport,
21 and they come and they pick up their car that sits in
22 our neighborhood.

23 And like I said, I realize technically
24 they're public streets, but I don't really think our
25 neighborhoods should be remote airport parking.

1 So please, everybody, maybe you might want
2 to keep an eye on that.

3 MS. BAG-AW: Good evening. My name is Luz Bag-Aw.
4 First name L-u-z, last name B-a-g hyphen A-w.

5 I'm here because I'm a concerned citizen.
6 I live in the path in which the airplanes come
7 underneath my house. So here's my question to you guys.

8 Who does the feasibility study benefit?
9 Does it benefit the City of Long Beach? It seems to
10 also benefit you guys.

11 So I'm concerned that the larger that you
12 put in the JetBlue in there, the worse it's gonna get in
13 future generation. So you look at John Airport, you
14 look at the LA, you look at Burbank. You see the houses
15 and homes over there. Their homes has devalued.

16 Look at Inglewood. Used to be a great
17 community. Look at that. Look at how it's devalued in
18 home values. Look at the kind of health risks that this
19 airport is going to do to the city, and look at how it's
20 going to make the city, especially where I live, become
21 part of the parking lot, as most of the people here has
22 seen because I've seen it in my own neighborhood.

23 So look at my neighborhood. I don't know
24 if any of you has lived underneath path. I don't know
25 if anybody hears it in the morning. Say, for example,

1 like, 4:30 I hear helicopters. At nighttime it's the
2 airport. I see the booms.

3 So my question is that if you're going to
4 do all this, how you going to subside the noise? How
5 you going to subside the kinds of things that they bring
6 into -- what is it? The fumes or whatever it is that's
7 coming out of there, the airplane.

8 I want you to ask yourself how would you
9 like to live in my neighborhood so that you can
10 experience what I experience every single day? I have
11 the helicopter. At the same time another airplane comes
12 in. Same time another big airplane comes in.

13 So if all those three airplanes or whatever
14 they are come in, how do you live in a neighborhood that
15 is quiet and has a health risk? You haven't lived in my
16 neighborhood. Come over to my neighborhood at 4:30 in
17 the morning and hear what I hear every single day and
18 hear what I have to hear when I go to bed at 9:00
19 o'clock and I get up at 12:00 because somebody else is
20 coming through my -- through the pathway.

21 So invite you to come to my neighborhood.
22 Stay with me for a whole month if you have to. I have
23 no problem. I have three extra bedrooms, and since I'm
24 Filipino, you know, my generosity is always open.

25 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much. We're

1 going to have to decline the invitation.

2 MS. BAG-AW: Okay? Come over.

3 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Hello. My name is Nancy Lopez,
4 and I just had -- I guess I had more to say.

5 So one thing that I wanted to address that
6 Mr. Mais said was that if this was a national expansion,
7 it wouldn't be looked at at all. We wouldn't even be
8 here. However, the feasibility study says that the whole
9 reason that we're here is because there's an increase in
10 the market for international -- you know, for there to
11 be international travel.

12 So the reason that we're here really is
13 because there's a market for international travel that
14 JetBlue wants to capitalize on. So in here it says,
15 "General aviation forecasted impacts improve efficiency
16 of air space."

17 So you're improving the efficiency of air
18 space by having more flights?

19 "And incremental reduction of emissions."

20 And it says right now -- it says in the
21 historical passenger distribution that domestic right
22 now is 80 percent and international is 20 percent.

23 So I'm assuming that you wish to increase
24 that to 80 percent because it won't be 100 percent
25 international airport, but we don't know what the

1 percentage will be in the next 10, 20, 40 years. And
2 that's what we're concerned about is that once this
3 starts, who's to stop the growth from occurring.

4 And I'm not as knowledgeable as a lot of
5 the citizens or a lot of the people that spoke that I'm
6 really impressed with, but if that's the case -- and
7 it's my understanding now that the City can be sued by
8 other airlines, then we would be footing the bill, too.

9 That's the only point that I wanted to
10 make. Thank you.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

12 MS. CARMEN LOPEZ: Hello. That was my daughter,
13 Nancy Lopez. I'm Carmen Lopez, and I moved from the
14 west side of Long Beach to this area because I was
15 thinking that it was a better community for my children.
16 I raise them here. They graduated. She graduated from
17 UCLA. I have another one graduate SC, and I don't like
18 to -- the airport to grow more.

19 I live in Clark and Willow on the corner
20 where the airplanes just land, and you should see all
21 the wind that comes around my house and the noise. And
22 they said that it doesn't fly at nighttime. It flies
23 11:00, sometimes 1:00 o'clock in the morning, 2:00
24 o'clock, and you can hear it and you can feel the
25 windows moving. And there is nothing we can do.

1 And then they put more flights, what is
2 going to happen to us? I moved from -- not to one
3 neighborhood, to a better one for my children, and I
4 would like my grandchildren to go here, and what is
5 going to happen if we do build an international airport?
6 And I'm really emotional. I'm sorry.

7 Oh, and I fly to Mexico two or three times
8 a year, and I rather go to LA than fly -- come walking
9 with my suitcases from Clark and Willow to here.

10 MR. PEARL: Good evening, Commissioners. My name
11 is Bill Pearl. I'm a Long Beach resident, and I also
12 publish longbeachreport.com, which is an online news
13 outlet now entering our 17th year in Long Beach.

14 I planned to just cover this as a news
15 story. I hadn't planned to speak tonight, but I have to
16 point out that under Roberts Rules of Order -- and I'll
17 stand corrected if the City Attorney chooses to correct
18 me.

19 Under Roberts Rules of Order, any member of
20 this Commission can overrule a decision of the Chair by
21 a majority vote, and in my opinion, respectfully, that's
22 what you should have done when the Chair ruled that
23 questions were out of order.

24 It so happens that the very issue of
25 questions from the audience came up during the Council

1 meeting that discussed paying Jacobs to attend this
2 meeting. There was discussion with Council members
3 about whether people would be allowed to ask questions.

4 Even if that hadn't occurred, before the
5 audience thinned out you should have made that motion,
6 and you can still make that motion before you put this
7 item away. You should make a motion to allow the public
8 to ask questions and not censor those questions, in my
9 opinion.

10 Otherwise, I'm going to wind up writing a
11 story because the big story is censored, questions not
12 allowed. What are you afraid of?

13 Thank you.

14 MR. TAUQIR: Ragh**i**b, R-a-g-h-i-b, Tauqir,
15 T-a-u-q-i-r.

16 I just wanted to talk again about the
17 ordinance. The ordinance is scientific and it's not
18 subjective. It's objective. Okay? A lot of what I'm
19 hearing and I heard for a long time here is subjective
20 and arbitrary. Okay?

21 Again, Long Beach is one of the largest
22 cities in the state, and it's not getting any smaller.
23 Okay? Now, where I live, I live between three emergency
24 rooms. I got College Hospital, Long Beach Memorial, and
25 then to the south I got Saint Mary's. Okay?

1 I got ambulances running up and down the
2 street all day and night on the east side on the main
3 boulevard and on the west side there. I got fire
4 station a block over. There's more sirens. I got
5 elementary school with all the kids running in and out,
6 people dropping off and picking up their kids, all that
7 traffic. I got the metro train two blocks over. More
8 noise.

9 If I wanted to live in Mayberry, I'd move
10 to Indio or something. Okay? This city is not getting
11 any smaller. It's only going to grow, and there's
12 always going to be more need for that, for more jobs,
13 for more tax revenue, to accommodate more people.

14 It's not going to get smaller around here.
15 Traffic is only going to get worse. That's why they're
16 working so hard to expand the Metrorail. Okay?

17 Noise ordinance doesn't mean no noise.
18 That's not what it means. It's never going to be no
19 noise, especially when you live in a large city like
20 this. Second largest city in the county. It's never
21 going to be no noise. Okay? I just wanted to say that.

22 Thank you.

23 MR. MATHEWS: My name is Waseem Mathews, for the
24 record.

25 Obviously, I'll go under my allotted time.

1 I'm a Long Beach resident. I actually live
2 in Huntington Beach. I live about two blocks away from
3 the harbor. If you can't tell by what I'm wearing, I
4 work for JetBlue. Thank you.

5 I've been a pilot for 12 years. I'm
6 familiar with noise profiles better than anybody because
7 I work in this industry on a daily basis. I walk around
8 airplanes when the engine has been running. I've been
9 around them when they are taking off. I've been around
10 airplanes when they are landing. I live in the approach
11 corridor of the aircraft landing to runway 30, and I
12 live across the street from an elementary school.

13 I know that when, like, airplanes are
14 flying across from my house, they're between two to
15 3,000 feet, and I know they're probably doing about 200
16 miles an hour. If anyone wants to ask me about any
17 airplane flying over their house, I'll tell them the
18 speed and the altitude.

19 I had the very similar concerns about the
20 facility being built, and just by flipping through the
21 study in the last couple of weeks it's been published,
22 all my questions have been answered, and I feel
23 personally that this facility needs to be implemented.

24 I'm not being paid by JetBlue to be here.
25 I'm not being paid by JetBlue to say anything I've said,

1 but as a personal statement, both being in the industry
2 and as a resident of the Long Beach and the Huntington
3 Beach area.

4 That was it. Thank you very much.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

6 MR. RAIKLEN: Still time to make one more comment,
7 or are we done?

8 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: No, but someone is in front
9 of you.

10 MR. CASTAGNA: That's all right. Would you like
11 to go first?

12 MR. RAIKLEN: Oh, no. This is just very quick.
13 You go ahead.

14 MR. CASTAGNA: Thank you.

15 Good evening, Commissioners. Curt Castagna
16 with the Long Beach Airport Association and the Aeroplex
17 Aviation Center.

18 I'm here in support of the FIS facility.
19 And yes, I would benefit from it. Yes, our business
20 would benefit from it. And I think that's okay.

21 I will tell you that the airport businesses
22 support the noise ordinance. Thank you to Mike Mais and
23 Charlie Parkin for their continued effort for many years
24 to enforce the ordinance and manage the ordinance.

25 And I think that that's the key words,

1 "manage the ordinance." The FAA's recent letter made it
2 very clear that there was no nexus between the ordinance
3 and international flights.

4 However, it did say that the intent of the
5 ordinance was to maintain a balance between quality of
6 life and commerce. And therefore, managing the
7 ordinance is managing both those aspects.

8 There's a lot of emotion in the room.
9 There's a lot of concern from the community, justified
10 concern about maintaining the quality of life. But the
11 reality is is 50 flights of commercial flights a day or
12 the noise that the general aviation aircraft, which is
13 regulated under the noise ordinance, is permitted by
14 that noise ordinance.

15 It could be 50 flights a day domestic
16 flights or 50 flights a day international flights. The
17 same risk exists.

18 So the reality is that this community, Long
19 Beach, has evolved over the last many years. I've been
20 at the airport since 1978. I've watched the city
21 evolve. I've watched Shoreline Drive. I've watched the
22 Town Center develop, Marketplace. We've evolved and
23 we're growing, and the truth is that the airport is a
24 key component of that.

25 And in order to manage the ordinance, we

1 have to work around managing the quality of life and the
2 needs of economics. We're not advocating for more
3 flights. We're advocating for allowing airlines -- and
4 this is not just JetBlue. This isn't JetBlue. Grateful
5 that they're willing to invest in it, and surely you
6 should protect the security of the funding that's going
7 to be provided so that the City doesn't have risk, but
8 JetBlue is willing to make that initial investment for
9 all the airport. It's not going to be their customs
10 facility.

11 And I think the City has to recognize that.
12 It's not for everyone. And whether or not you support
13 international or not, I'd like to point out though that
14 international flights have been operating out of Long
15 Beach for many years.

16 It wasn't until 2006 when the customs, U.S.
17 Customs decided to stop serving Long Beach with
18 on-demand service, and prior to that we had several
19 flights a month coming in from international
20 destinations.

21 The efficiencies that were pointed out in
22 the study point that there's aircraft coming in today
23 from international destinations. The only difference
24 would be is that an international clearance facility
25 would allow them to come here directly.

1 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Your time is up.

2 Before we go any further, there's been some
3 thought that with limited levels, we could answer some
4 questions because we're down to -- well, we don't have
5 7,000 people sitting here.

6 Would we open these questions to the
7 facility, to the FIS, to the City Attorney or to staff?
8 And I would say that when you ask the question, are we
9 going to open it that you don't just ask a question.
10 Direct it.

11 And I don't want to have -- what we're
12 trying to prevent is this banter back and forth. If you
13 would ask a specific question and let us give a specific
14 answer and leave it at that so we're not here 'til
15 midnight, I can see opening questions.

16 MR. ROMO: Madam Chair, just a point of
17 clarification. I believe it would be best to make a
18 motion to allow for the questioning, see if it's a
19 second and if it's carried.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I was kind of trying to say
21 what I was thinking, and then with that thought in mind,
22 I would -- before you go any further, I would like to
23 make that motion and see how the rest of the
24 commissioners feel about it.

25 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: I second it.

1 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: Kind of late.

2 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I know, but --

3 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: I mean, half the audience
4 is gone.

5 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: So I guess I'm going to take
6 it up for vote. Let's have a discussion on it first.

7 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: I'm sorry this came so
8 late. Most of the people have gone. I don't know if
9 there would be much value for the remaining people here.

10 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: They're saying no.

11 Any comments on this?

12 COMMISSIONER CHANEY: Madam Chair, I think we all
13 have the right intent. We're concerned, we love Long
14 Beach, and I think than more than anything, we want to
15 be honest and appear transparent, and if I think it's
16 reasonable, I'll agree with the motion that we should
17 have the opportunity for people to ask questions.

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: It seems like most of the
19 people who want to do that seem to be departing.

20 Hold on one second. Let us work on this.

21 More comments on it? We're going to have
22 to take a vote on it.

23 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Is there a motion?

24 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: We have a motion that's been
25 seconded. We're opening for comments on it now.

1 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Okay.

2 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Comments from the
3 commissioners.

4 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: I'm willing to take a vote
5 anytime you guys are ready.

6 COMMISSIONER MINEGHINO: At this point of the
7 evening and the fact that we have allowed the crowd to
8 somewhat leave, and whether they're disappointed or not,
9 we do have multiple opportunities throughout the year
10 for them to come ask questions of us at our regular
11 meetings.

12 At this point, unless it's regarding our
13 meeting itself, commission meeting, I would say no.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: So all those in favor say,
15 "aye."

16 (Voting aye were Sherman, Scott,
17 Cruz, Anderson, Chaney and Rowe.)

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: All those opposed?

19 (Voting opposed were Mineghino and
20 Gosling.)

21 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: The motion has passed. So
22 I'm going to limit it to direct questions and --
23 question time-wise is going to -- whoops. Hold on. We
24 have somebody in front of you, ma'am.

25 MR. MATHEWS: My name is Waseem Mathews. I was

1 the JetBlue pilot. Couple of comments I forgot to make
2 earlier.

3 I just want to make it absolutely clear
4 that the number of flights coming in and out of Long
5 Beach would not be changing based on my understanding of
6 the feasibility study. It's just the destinations.

7 So it could be 50 flights a day to San
8 Francisco, or it could be a range of other destinations.
9 It's not so much a change in the amount of noise that's
10 going to be created by a customs facility. It's
11 strictly the destinations that would be allowed to fly
12 in and out of Long Beach.

13 That's it. Thank you.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

15 MS. SMITH: Just to clarify, he's assuming that
16 they're commercial flights and not private jets coming
17 in from another country or a Net Jet type of usage.

18 Okay. So I had some questions.

19 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: A question. One question.

20 MS. SMITH: Oh, one question.

21 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Yeah. Otherwise, you're
22 going to be here all night. I have a limit.

23 MS. SMITH: Oh, that's so generous.

24 So maybe, like, three questions. I mean,
25 you've already waited 'til the end of the night to say

1 that we could ask questions.

2 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Which was against --

3 COMMISSIONER CHANEY: I don't think that was the
4 intent of it. I think what we're trying to accomplish
5 is that we're switching gears now, and we want to hear
6 your questions.

7 There was a different motion initially, but
8 the intent is to, after conversation with Mr. Pearl, to
9 actually listen to your questions.

10 MS. SMITH: That is terrific that you want to
11 listen to our questions.

12 So since most of the people have left, I
13 just want to address any City Council members that --
14 nope. No one's here from City Council.

15 Oh, of course, Daryl.

16 So, Daryl, because we waited 'til the end
17 of the evening to say that they're going to allow
18 questions, it seems to me that we need to have another
19 community meeting in which we can have these questions
20 answered. Otherwise, it's just again another speaking
21 to the City Council.

22 So you've had everyone leave. It's not
23 very responsible of the City to have a forum in which
24 you presented something and then you can't have any
25 questions answered.

1 So I suggest that we have another meeting.
2 I think you need to be responsible representatives of
3 our City government.

4 And these people have been appointed by the
5 Mayor, and they're not representing the constituents.
6 They're -- a large part of them are --

7 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: Is that a question? Because
8 I represent the community.

9 MS. SMITH: Yeah. So I'm asking for another
10 meeting. Thank you. So let's have another meeting.

11 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Ask your questions. Ask your
12 questions.

13 MS. SMITH: With regards to the findings about
14 economic impact analysis -- so are you answering any of
15 these questions, or you're just answering from the point
16 of --

17 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I'm going to ask you to
18 direct it to someone who could. We can't answer those
19 questions.

20 MS. SMITH: So could you point out to --

21 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: We're just an advisory
22 commission.

23 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: Why don't you ask your
24 question, and we'll figure out who can answer it.

25 MR. ROMO: Madam Chair, I would suggest the

1 question be asked, and we can determine to who --

2 MS. SMITH: Thanks, Jess. Thank you.

3 So the annual economic contribution of Long
4 Beach and its tenants pre FIS is approximately 45,000
5 jobs and 10.3 billion in output. So what is -- if
6 that's not input, I'm curious what the input is.

7 And this was based on a survey software.
8 So I'm curious if he could again mention what the survey
9 software was for the economic impact analysis and the
10 direct employment of the 9,000 individuals. I'd like a
11 list breaking out the jobs of what types of employment
12 these are.

13 6.4 percent of the employment in the City,
14 I just wanted to see what all of the percentage, like a
15 pie chart of employment in the City is.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: That's not a question we can
18 answer this second.

19 COMMISSIONER MINEGHINO: What was your question?

20 MR. ROMO: If I may offer, the first part of that
21 question as to the IMPLAN software, I'm looking across
22 the room to Dave Tomber to address that.

23 The other parts, I'm not sure that we're in
24 a position to readily answer that, but I'm going to at
25 least let Dave take an opportunity to answer the first

1 one.

2 MR. TOMBER: Thanks. That's a great question.

3 IMPLAN is --

4 MS. SMITH: I don't know how he's spelling it
5 because I want to look at that software.

6 MR. TOMBER: You can look it up on the Internet if
7 you search I-m-p-l-a-n. It's an industry leader in
8 economic modeling software.

9 MS. SMITH: Great.

10 MR. TOMBER: What it does, it takes inputs, number
11 of employees that work at the airport, inputs -- inputs
12 such as construction, and it translates that into
13 outputs.

14 So there are three types of outputs that
15 come out of that. First one, direct outputs, people
16 directly employed, indirect businesses or suppliers that
17 purchase from those direct outputs, and then third is
18 which are effectively households, what they spend,
19 sometimes called a multiplier effect.

20 MS. SMITH: So these are going to be, like, travel
21 agents that are in another state that are arranging
22 travel?

23 MR. TOMBER: No. The way the supply chains work
24 are we specifically in the survey contacted on-airport
25 businesses, how many employees do they have.

1 In fact, if you look in the report, there's
2 a list of the 21 questions that were part of the survey.

3 MS. SMITH: Okay. Great.

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Okay. Really, this is all
5 the time I can give you right now. Number of people
6 behind you.

7 MS. BLISS: My name is Pat Bliss, and I'm
8 directing my question to Mike Mais.

9 And my question, what happens if JetBlue
10 decides to pull up and leave in the midst of this thing,
11 this facility?

12 MR. MAIS: So what would happen is that, as one of
13 the speakers mentioned earlier, if the facility were
14 approved by the City Council and moved forward to the
15 next stage, would take a while to do this.

16 There would be a negotiation stage with
17 JetBlue, who's the proponent of this project, and the
18 key part of that negotiation would be how would JetBlue
19 pay for it, number one, what percentage would they pay
20 for, number two, and number three, what financial
21 guarantees would they put on the table to ensure that if
22 they did walk away at some point in time, whether it was
23 while the facility was being made ready or, say, within
24 two or three years or five years, how would that
25 structure be paid for.

1 So that would be part of a contract
2 negotiation with JetBlue, and I am quite sure that the
3 City Council, if they approved a project like this,
4 would direct the City Attorney's office, who would be
5 negotiating the contract, to ensure that JetBlue or
6 whatever other carrier might be involved would put
7 enough financial -- financial incentives on the table to
8 make sure that that facility was paid for in full
9 whether JetBlue was here or not.

10 MS. BLISS: The City Council has not been
11 particularly fine-tuned.

12 If they did not, would you then insist that
13 they -- this should be part of the negotiation?

14 MR. MAIS: If we didn't, I'm sure the Financial
15 Management department of the City would and the Airport
16 would because the Airport would not want to be stuck
17 with a building that they have no use for. So --

18 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Okay. That's -- thank you
19 very much.

20 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Hello. Nancy Lopez.

21 Given that there's no guarantees and if
22 there are negative repercussions to the homes in the
23 area and the neighborhoods, who would then be
24 responsible?

25 Would there be, like, any money, monetary

1 if values go down, if home values go down if there's an
2 increase in crime? How would and who would address
3 those issues?

4 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I don't know who to address
5 that to because it's --

6 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: It's more of a --

7 MR. ROMO: Madam Chair, again, the question's a
8 little general when you talk about what no guarantees.

9 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: So if homes decrease in value
10 and if there's an increase in crime for -- in the
11 surrounding community, what measures would be taken or
12 how would that be handled and by who? Because we don't
13 know.

14 MR. ROMO: Well, in looking to Mr. Mais, I'm going
15 to try to get a specific enough answer to what you're
16 asking, but without an overcommitment because some of
17 these I think are speculative in terms of what might
18 happen. But keep in mind --

19 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Just like the report, it's
20 speculative.

21 MR. ROMO: So keep in mind that the activity
22 generated with international flights, should that be
23 approved by the City Council and successfully negotiated
24 between the Airport and airline partner and CBP, it's --
25 beyond that, it is speculation as to where crime trends

1 might go, where home values may go.

2 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: But internationally, in the
3 nation it's -- there's been various articles about what
4 international flights or what it does for communities.
5 It does bring values of homes down.

6 So if that happens, who would -- who would
7 community members go to?

8 MR. ROMO: I'm not familiar with that finding in
9 terms of what international flights or any flights may
10 do to terms of impacting the community.

11 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: You guys haven't looked at other
12 airports, other communities where this has happened?

13 MR. ROMO: I'm actually just -- I'm --

14 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Well, I'm just saying. I'm just
15 saying.

16 MR. ROMO: I'm trying to -- I thought that was
17 something that you stated as a --

18 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: It is. There's a lot of
19 articles, but I'm --

20 MR. ROMO: I'm not familiar with them.

21 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Okay.

22 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: We'll have to look into that,
23 and we will.

24 MS. NANCY LOPEZ: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR. RAIKLEN: Hello. This is David Raiklen,

1 R-a-i-k-l-e-n. Thank you so much for letting us speak
2 again and have questions. I'll try and be brief.

3 Three topics. The first is the cost.
4 Again, back in 2013, there were \$117 million in
5 outstanding airport bonds. In 2016, that's only down to
6 110 million. Now we're going to be taking on more debt
7 that everyone in the City has to service.

8 So how much is this really going to cost us
9 even to just make it happen, let alone what the side
10 effects are?

11 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Let's stop with that question
12 and answer that one.

13 MR. ROMO: So the financial models that
14 contemplate how this would be funded do not include any
15 debt. They are a combination of passenger facility
16 charges, which are fees collected by passengers
17 departing the airport, getting on planes leaving to
18 destinations from Long Beach, and that commitment or
19 again, subject to the Council approving everything, is
20 up to \$3 million.

21 So that's not debt. The balance would be
22 funded by JetBlue and/or any other carrier that may
23 participate in the funding, the capital funding of the
24 project. How they choose to fund it, debt or otherwise,
25 would not be debt that the Airport would be responsible.

1 MR. RAIKLEN: Well, interesting. But that doesn't
2 change that there is debt that we're already servicing.

3 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Different story. You asked
4 how we were going to service FIS, and that's the topic.

5 MR. RAIKLEN: Okay. Second, the capital cost
6 changed quite dramatically from 2013 to 2016. The low
7 end back in 2013 was \$6.3 million, and the high end in
8 2016 was \$21.5 million.

9 So I'm not going to ask a question. I'm
10 just going to observe that there's a huge price
11 difference.

12 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: This is question time, so
13 let's stick to it.

14 MR. RAIKLEN: Okay. Well, obviously, there is a
15 big difference in the cost. So there must be factors
16 that are making that different, and we should
17 investigate what those factors are because that's a lot
18 of money.

19 For the cost to more than triple in three
20 years means that there's got to be some very significant
21 differences in the assumptions that were made in 2013
22 and the ones that were made in 2016.

23 So I would ask that you look at those
24 closely, and I'm not asking you to describe in detail
25 what all the factors are that go into describing the

1 cost of building the facility. I'm just pointing out
2 that there's a huge difference there, and that needs to
3 be investigated into detail by people who are experts on
4 building --

5 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you. We'll do that.

6 Do you have a third question? And then we
7 have to go on.

8 MR. RAIKLEN: The third question is that we asked
9 a whole bunch of questions in writing that we wanted to
10 have answered by the study, by this FIS study 2016, and
11 many of them don't seem to be answered, and I'd like to
12 know who decided what questions would be answered and
13 what questions would not be answered in the study.

14 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: You mean all these questions
15 in the back that have been answered? There are more?
16 Did you look at all the back part of the study?

17 MR. RAIKLEN: I looked at a lot of it, yes. I
18 can't say I read every word of it, but no one can say
19 that.

20 MR. ROMO: Ma'am, we made a commitment earlier
21 that any question that any member of the public wishes
22 to ask may submit it to the Airport. We have an email
23 account that it can be submitted to.

24 MR. RAIKLEN: That's not the question I asked,
25 sir.

1 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I don't think anyone in our
2 Commission would know the answer to that.

3 MR. RAIKLEN: Maybe the people who made the study
4 would know.

5 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: I believe Jacobs did say
6 they looked at all the questions that were submitted and
7 grouped them into sections, and then we responded or
8 tried to address them in your report.

9 Is that correct?

10 MR. TOMBER: Yes, we grouped the questions into
11 different categories, many questions were dealing with
12 the same issue, and provided a response to each one of
13 those. They're all in the technical appendix.

14 MR. RAIKLEN: I strongly disagree with what you
15 just said.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. CANTRELL: Ann Cantrell, and I have a question
18 about the findings for the financial feasibility.

19 I see that you checked Santa Ana Airport
20 and San Francisco and Oakland, and I don't know what
21 "FAT" is and --

22 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Fresno.

23 MS. CANTRELL: Fresno? Okay.

24 Why wasn't LAX included in this financial
25 feasibility?

1 MR. TOMBER: Well, it's a much different type of
2 scale of FIS facility than this. It's not a comparable
3 benchmark. It's a large international gateway, which
4 Long Beach would never be for many years, and their cost
5 and their scale of operations is just so much larger,
6 it's not a comparable benchmark.

7 MS. CANTRELL: So I assume that that means that
8 they won't -- they aren't charging as much as we'll have
9 to charge; is that correct?

10 MR. TOMBER: I don't have any statistics on what
11 LAX charges.

12 MR. ROMO: If I may, only because I'm formerly
13 from LA World Airports. LAX is a port of entry facility
14 with a totally different model in terms of how costs are
15 allocated and/or recaptured.

16 The airports used for comparison for this
17 study are all user fee airports, meaning that they need
18 to pay for themselves both in terms of the facility as
19 well as the staffing.

20 The specific costs that are incurred in LA,
21 they are, in fact, complicated, but much of the costs
22 there are covered really by the federal government in
23 terms of providing the staff that's there.

24 The airport itself does pass through
25 through its -- I don't want to get technical, but

1 through its rates and charges to cover custodial,
2 electricity, maintenance, things like that. But it is
3 kinds of an apples and oranges comparison.

4 MS. CANTRELL: So my feeling is it will be more
5 expensive to fly internationally out of Long Beach, and
6 right now all of us are comfortable going to LAX or John
7 Wayne and retaining our domestic flights.

8 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you very much.

9 MS. CANTRELL: Thank you.

10 MR. MELLO: Thank you for allowing questions, and
11 thank you for being so attentive tonight. I appreciate
12 that. Joseph Mello, no W at the end.

13 I believe this is probably for Jacobs.

14 What percentage of commercial international
15 flights are late from other Southern California
16 international airports, and what's the average late
17 time?

18 MR. TOMBER: I don't have those statistics in my
19 head. I don't believe that was within the scope of the
20 study. I would say that one difference between the
21 international flights that are proposed here and the
22 current flights around the country, for example,
23 JetBlue, is from the East Coast is that they would have
24 more weather delay issues, which could cause
25 unintentional delays to Long Beach.

1 Mexico and South America have much better
2 weather. Without hard statistical data, there would be
3 less of a chance for delays due to weather.

4 MR. MELLO: Thank you. So it wasn't included in
5 the study is what you're telling me? That's your
6 answer?

7 MR. TOMBER: No. That's correct, it was not.

8 MR. MELLO: Thank you.

9 MS. WATSON: Hi. Belinda Watson.

10 My question is along those lines because I
11 know that you talked about looking at past historical
12 data, and so the number of flights coming in
13 domestically late.

14 I would like to know how often that happens
15 and the cost associated with that and the fine
16 associated with that. Because does the fine structure
17 increase over the years, or is it the same rates as it
18 was in 2000 when it first was started?

19 And because it sounds like the airlines
20 have a -- can and will be able to come in late. And so
21 if there is no penalties associated with that, if I were
22 an airline company, I would just bake it into my cost of
23 doing business in Long Beach.

24 So the penalties for not adhering to the
25 noise issue and coming in late, I did not hear in the

1 study as to how those will be addressed, even by legal,
2 if those do occur. It sounds like, as well -- but it
3 all goes along the same line because we're going to be
4 having flights from international. They may not be all
5 from Mexico. They could be coming from other different
6 areas.

7 We could be having more and more flights
8 delayed coming in more and more at 12:00 o'clock, 1:00
9 o'clock, 2:00 o'clock in the morning.

10 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: The fines situation is
11 increased. I can tell you that. I'd like to have maybe
12 Ron answer that.

13 Ron?

14 MR. MAIS: I can try to answer that.

15 The Airport has basically two different
16 penalty systems. They have an administrative penalty
17 that can be issued if a flight comes in late. Those
18 penalties are very, very low and are not a deterrent, in
19 my estimation, to airlines flying late.

20 But what's happened over the years dating
21 back to 2003, the City Prosecutor's office has filed
22 criminal charges against various airlines that have
23 flown late.

24 And for the air carriers that consistently
25 fly late, they've entered into what they call a consent

1 decree, which is basically a settlement of a criminal
2 case, and the fines that are assessed in those instances
3 are very significant, in the two to three to \$4,000
4 range for violations, and those accumulate over time
5 during the course of the year, and different carriers
6 that have flown out of Long Beach, you know, from 2003
7 through and including today have paid, you know, over
8 time hundreds and thousands -- hundreds of thousands of
9 dollars in fines for late activity.

10 MS. WATSON: Thank you.

11 So does that mean it has been increasing
12 or --

13 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Yes.

14 MS. WATSON: It has been increasing?

15 MR. MAIS: The criminal court system has served to
16 be somewhat of a deterrent much more so than our fine
17 structure, quite honestly.

18 MS. WATSON: Can I just add one follow-up
19 question? Is that okay?

20 So why do we hear more and more flights
21 coming in? So is there something coming now or soon
22 with all the different flights coming in late?

23 MR. MAIS: There's nothing pending. Nothing has
24 changed. The ordinance remains the same. Some of the
25 flights that come in late may or may not be commercial

1 flights. They may be a military flight. They can be
2 commercial flights. That's why they're getting fined.

3 There are other reasons, due to mechanical
4 or weather delays in other parts of the country. They
5 can make a case to the Airport that they should be
6 exempt from a fine in a particular situation if they
7 have some sort of an emergency that requires them to fly
8 in late.

9 So I don't know why you're experiencing
10 more now than maybe you have in the past, but really,
11 nothing has changed over the years.

12 MS. WATSON: Thank you.

13 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you.

14 MS. SIEVERS: One quick question. My name is
15 Donna Sievers, S-i-e-v-e-r-s.

16 So my question is on page 23 of the
17 environmental compliance conclusion that was made that
18 they didn't think there should be a CEQA or the other
19 national environmental, you know, investigation.

20 So my question would be how as community
21 members, what would we need to do to ask and request
22 that kind of environmental study do take place before a
23 decision would be made? What would be our steps to try
24 to request that kind of environmental study?

25 MR. MAIS: I can try to answer that.

1 You know, we've talked about this being a
2 bricks and mortar construction project. It will go
3 through an environmental review. What you saw in the
4 feasibility study is not the environmental review.

5 Once if a project is approved or the City
6 Council gives approval to move forward with a project
7 and someone actually identifies which project is going
8 to be built, there will be CEQA review. It has to
9 happen. I don't know what level it will be at. It will
10 depend actually on what the actual project is, but it
11 will go through a full CEQA evaluation and possibly
12 NEPA, as well.

13 MS. SIEVERS: So the conclusion on page 23 would
14 be irrelevant? Because he said, I think, that their
15 recommendation would be that it would not be necessary.

16 MR. MAIS: If you read the evaluation of that
17 section, the environmental section of the feasibility
18 study carefully, it's not saying that there won't be any
19 environmental review.

20 The person that did the study looked at
21 what the situation currently exists at the airport as
22 far as past environmental reviews and has concluded it's
23 possible that you wouldn't have to do a full EIR based
24 on the fact that the 2006 EIR studied a much larger
25 envelope, if you will, than what was actually approved

1 by the City Council, and there may be room there.

2 But that doesn't mean CEQA won't be done.
3 It will have to go through every step of the process and
4 make a determination to see if what's in the feasibility
5 study is actually accurate, and then there will have to
6 be some level of CEQA review.

7 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: I'm almost afraid to ask are
8 there any other members of the audience who would like
9 to make a public comment?

10 Seeing none, we are now going to turn to
11 the Commissioners and have them make comments. Want to
12 start down here?

13 COMMISSIONER CHANEY: No. I think we've covered
14 all the concerns about the questions. Hoping for an
15 opportunity to really just ask some direct questions,
16 and I think we just handled it well.

17 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Elizabeth?

18 COMMISSIONER CRUZ: I think I really woke up when
19 Bill Pearl talked about us being censored, and it's
20 funny because I felt that way, but I was -- I didn't do
21 anything about it. I regret that.

22 Another good question, I was really
23 impressed with all the things that the community had to
24 say, and I think one of the big questions is where are
25 the other seven Council people.

1 The reason we are where we are right now is
2 because when JetBlue wants something, the City just
3 says, "What do you want? We'll give it to you." And
4 you were speaking about, you know, how we can trust the
5 City of Long Beach to protect our noise ordinance.

6 Now, how can we trust them if the City does
7 whatever JetBlue wants? They would not -- we wouldn't
8 be here right now if the City wasn't so up to doing
9 whatever JetBlue wants to do in that airport. We've
10 been here before because of the expansion.

11 Now, why should we trust the City to
12 protect the community? I think the community's
13 important to the City, and I think we need to -- I'm
14 sorry. I'm a little sick.

15 I think we need to -- like, for instance,
16 all the questions that were put in the book that the
17 community made, some of the questions were our home
18 price, traffic, schools, kids being interrupted every
19 few minutes because of having to stop what they're
20 learning because of a plane, asthma, our elderly.

21 I mean, there's a lot of elderly people who
22 bought homes in the community because they want to
23 retire, they want to have a home to stay in, and their
24 home prices are going to be nothing.

25 None of that was addressed in here, and

1 they were questions that were asked.

2 So I feel we have these meetings and the
3 community speaks. They say very intelligent things,
4 they have great questions, but nothing is ever done.
5 Nothing is ever followed through.

6 So I have a lot of the things I wrote down
7 all of the community already addressed, so I won't go
8 into them, but I'm glad I had the opportunity to speak,
9 and I'm sorry that you were censored. I truly am.

10 Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: It wasn't that the public
12 wasn't allowed questions. It was answers you were
13 seeking which you weren't getting. I think a round
14 table or some other discussion would benefit the public,
15 answer some of these questions.

16 The study was an economic study, and many
17 of your questions were outside that envelope of
18 economics, even though there's the implied economic
19 benefits or not benefits to all these other things that
20 you're asking, health, property values, et cetera.

21 The IMPLAN software, it's widely accepted
22 and it's used pretty much everywhere. It is known to
23 have some deficiencies in incremental multiplier
24 coefficients. So sometimes the numbers, like our bullet
25 train ridership, that was all projected for that sort of

1 thing, you have to take the numbers with a grain of
2 salt.

3 But recommend that the community keep on
4 pursuing their getting their answers from the City
5 before this moves too far forward.

6 Thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER ROWE: Couple quick things. I
8 thought the -- I actually did read the study, and I've
9 got highlights throughout that would be some proof to
10 that guy who was saying he was going to run a lie
11 detector test. It wasn't the most riveting reading, but
12 I did feel an obligation to go through it. I thought it
13 was very thorough. Thank you for a good job.

14 I have a couple of nuts and bolts
15 questions, but I think that I can maybe ask those later.

16 Couple of things. I think it's unfair to
17 accuse the City of being in JetBlue's pocket. I don't
18 think that there's any evidence that that's the case.
19 And I think that the initial format to give everyone
20 time to sort of comment was a smart one and to then
21 allow questions was just a smart management technique.

22 So I don't think there was anything
23 nefarious there we were trying to do.

24 I wonder though if in format for the next
25 one it might be better to perhaps break up the group by

1 interests because some people are keenly interested in
2 some of the health effects, some people are keenly
3 interested in home prices, others are keenly interested
4 in environmental factors, and I wonder if there were
5 smaller groups where they could gather and get maybe
6 direct answers to those questions, so that might work
7 out better.

8 I guess sort of lastly for me, it still
9 seems to me like it distills to this question, and
10 that's the -- I think there's a fear that somehow that
11 this will trigger a lawsuit by someone who will want to
12 undo the noise ordinance, and I'm looking in vain for
13 evidence that that would be the case.

14 And what common sense seems to tell me is
15 that we're much more likely to have a lawsuit from an
16 entity that's upset or angry who's been denied, let's
17 say, the service that's being contemplated here than one
18 for where we granted that service.

19 Anyway, that's sort of the essence and
20 substance, I think, of my reading of all of this.

21 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Yes, I would like to thank
22 the public for coming out this evening and asking tough
23 questions.

24 One of the issues of the FIS study is that
25 it was dealing with feasibility, and the study clearly

1 states that it is feasible.

2 However, that doesn't mean that a lot of
3 people welcome the increase in -- well, there's no
4 increase of flights, but the increase to international
5 flying. The ordinance really requires that we added
6 those flights that we did. Otherwise, we were in
7 violation of the ordinance.

8 And as far as the concern about the
9 lawsuit, as the attorneys have said, there's always a
10 case for the City getting sued, but the ordinance is
11 mature enough, I think, to withstand any type of lawsuit
12 based on somebody not being able to be flying out of
13 Long Beach, and I don't think the FIS facility will
14 generate that type of lawsuit, although it is possible.

15 And really, the only other thought I have
16 about this is that in dealing with the people that are
17 coming into the airport, whether they're international
18 -- when I say "international," most of the people who
19 will be flying out of here will be from here or around
20 here going to destinations and coming back.

21 So you're not really generating -- you're
22 not generating any other passenger growth. You're
23 flying the same airplanes with the same amount of seats
24 and the same number of flights.

25 Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER MINEGHINO: Without parroting
2 everybody's, my fellow commissioners' statements so far,
3 first I'd like to thank the public that has stayed. I
4 would like to thank our two Council members for sticking
5 throughout this whole thing.

6 A lot of these answers are going to be
7 brought to light, to better light when we can get to a
8 decision making position. Right now, as was stated,
9 this is a feasibility. This is just an exercise in
10 feasibility.

11 Whether we make a hard commitment to
12 proceed rests with another group other than this table.
13 We are not in the decision making. We are only a public
14 stage for your comments, for your questions, and to try
15 and bring staff that's adequate to give you answers on
16 the spot or in the future.

17 I've sat here for a little over eight
18 years, and I've held a few positions down the line on
19 this table, and I've got to say that, you know, we're
20 all making the best effort we can to delve into 679
21 pages plus the additional 37 pages of comments that just
22 came yesterday, and I got about 2 percent of it in my
23 head that I could understand, probably 8 percent of it
24 that was familiar, and the other 90 percent was totally
25 foreign to me.

1 Would take a lot of questions and a lot of
2 answers before it would become clear. I'm a patient
3 person. As I said, I've sat here for eight years and
4 asked questions, and I've tried to make statements that
5 were of some wisdom, and I encourage everyone,
6 especially those people who will listen to this later --
7 remember, this is recorded.

8 Remember, you can go back and listen to
9 what the questions are and see if the answers have come.
10 Next meeting, see if those answers are evolving, if they
11 can really bring an answer.

12 I only encourage public and I encourage our
13 Commissioners to continue to review these questions
14 until the answers come.

15 And with that, I'll give it back to the
16 Chairman.

17 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

18 I guess I want to also thank everyone for
19 coming. I'm sorry that those people who left early
20 didn't hear that.

21 One thing I want to say that you should
22 understand is this is an advisory commission. We are a
23 volunteer group of people who strictly listen to reports
24 from the City, staff and who once a year advise our
25 opinions, but we are not in any way a voting operation

1 relative to whether this passes or doesn't pass.

2 There were many things that were stated
3 today that I know personally you may have felt were true
4 that were not, but one that hit me because it's part of
5 my business is the general aviation.

6 All the general aviation is under the
7 ordinance also. It is in the noise bucket. They must
8 obey the same rules, and sometimes they're even more
9 restrictive, and they must be within the noise bucket.

10 So whether it's general aviation or
11 Southwest or JetBlue or American or Delta, they are all
12 under the same rules. So don't get that all
13 flip-flopped.

14 Thank you very much, and we are going to --

15 COMMISSIONER GOSLING: Motion to --

16 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: Motion to accept the
17 feasibility study. Is there a second?

18 COMMISSIONER ROWE: Second.

19 COMMISSIONER SCOTT: Second.

20 CHAIRWOMAN SHERMAN: All in favor, "aye"?

21 Anybody opposed? None.

22 The motion has been moved and seconded.

23 We are now going to take a ten-minute
24 recess and consider the rest of our meeting after that
25 ten minutes. It will not relate to the feasibility

1 study.

2 (Whereupon the discussion of the FIS
3 feasibility study adjourned at 9:34 p.m.)

4 * * *

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF ORANGE) ss.

3

4 I, MARY E. PIERCE, CSR 6143 and Deposition
5 Officer for the State of California, certify:

6 That I attended the foregoing hearing and that
7 all testimony, argument and comments made at the time of
8 the proceedings were recorded stenographically by me and
9 that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings
10 and all 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
14 this 27th day of October, 2016.

15

16

17

18 _____
Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
19 for the State of California

20

21

22

23

24

25