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1 Officer, City of Long Beach Building Department at
2 333 West Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach, 90802.
3 And as you probably know, you can also submit
4 comments via e-mail, but you cannot -- because of the
5 City's computer system, you can't include any attachments,
6 and that e-mail address is airportEIR at LongBeach.gov.
7 Again, this should all be in your handouts.
8 There's going to be a 45-day public review
9 period for the draft EIR, and that will be closing on
10 December 22nd, 2005. Comments tonight pertaining to
11 environmental issues received at these meetings will be
12 addressed in writing as part of the final EIR.
13 I want to emphasize that this is not really a
14 discussion on the approval of the EIR. It's about the
15 document that's just been released. And so this meeting
16 is to take comments on your thoughts on the draft EIR.
17 This is your opportunity to comment on the document.
18 Really, as in past meetings with the
19 scoping, it's not a question-and-answer session per se.
20 Any of your comments will be taken whether it's through
21 e-mail or on the written comment forms or speaking
22 tonight. They're all the same, and they have the same
23 weight.
24 We want to capture your input in whatever form
25 you're most comfortable with. Some people prefer talking
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Commenter 189 Birgit De La Torre
Some people prefer the comment sheets.

The handouts regarding the draft EIR findings, the project description and the power point presentation are the ones that are out front.

I'd like to now introduce public officials that are with us this evening. Jerry Miller, the City Manager, has joined us this evening. Director of Public Works Christine Anderson is here. Councilmember Patrick O'Donnell from the 4th District. I am Pattons is staff representing the 5th District. Rae Gabelich from the 8th District is with us. There's Rae. And Councilmember Val Lerch from the 9th District is with us.

Any other City officials or public officials that would want to be recognized?

The timing for tonight's meeting is three hours. The format today is going to be first we're going to have a presentation by the technical consultants just to be sure that you all understand the highlights from the draft document. That's going to take 45 minutes to an hour.

Following that, I will come back up here, and we'll open the session for the public comments. So we'll have plenty of time. There also will be meetings which I can identify for you later. There's one Saturday at Long Beach City Hall from 9:00 to 1:00, so that's going to be about three hours of public comment. And then also next Monday, the 5th, at the Petroleum Club.

There are restrooms. The men's is not too far down the hall. Unfortunately, I found the hard way that the women's is closed for, I guess, remodeling. So that women go past the lobby all the way to the end into -- you'll see kind of almost like a ballroom with wood floor, and it's right there. Sorry for that inconvenience.

There is coffee and water in the back, so feel free as you need to to get up and move about.

The meeting is being recorded by a court reporter, and she will record all the comments that you provide this evening. I will talk later during the comment period, but I do ask that if you have side conversations or anything to please take it outside, partly for the rest of the guests, but also because the court reporter may not be able to hear if there's a lot of side conversations going on.

With that, I'd like to introduce Kathleen Brady with Bonterra, who is going to make the first presentation regarding the project description. Thank you.

MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.

Thank you for coming tonight. As she said, I'm Kathleen Brady. I'm the project manager for Bonterra Consulting for the EIR, and the report has been prepared consistent with the requirements for the California Environmental Quality Act, or CEQA.

With the tonight are a number of the experts who prepared technical studies on which the findings in the EIR were based. To my left here is Jessica Feiman, the architectural historian with Jones & Stokes, who prepared the cultural analysis, Cindy Krebs from Bonterra Consulting, who acted as the project manager and prepared the hazardous materials assessment and public services.

She'll also be talking about aesthetics tonight.

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

As Chris mentioned, all the slides tonight are in one of the handouts that you will receive for the meeting today.

The EIR was prepared with the basic premise that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not be modified; that the key objective of the project is to provide airport facilities to accommodate the minimum permitted number of flights at the airport and the associated number of passengers served on those flights in full compliance with all the fire, building and safety codes, as well as other applicable standards.

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

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

The exhibit here shows the locations. Here's the terminal building. Here is the ramp area. And I'll be talking about it later, that proposed improvements would come up into this area, and the hatched marking indicates areas that are leasehold to Million Air, for bearings. Here's the Gulfstream. Actually, should have mentioned it first.

Here's Lakewood and Donald Douglas Drive, the existing parking structure. This is the location of the proposed parking structure. And then also, the project provides for an extension of Donald Douglas Drive through to Lakewood since the current circulation pattern would be interfered with by the proposed parking structure.

As previously indicated, a basic premise of the project was maintaining the sanctity of the Airport Noise
Compatibility Ordinance. The ordinance allows a minimum of 41 commercial carrier flights and 25 commuter flights. The facilities proposed as part of the project have been sized to accommodate the passenger levels associated with the minimum number of flights.

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

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

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

In the EIR analysis and what we talk about tonight, this was identified as the optimized flight scenario because in order to achieve this level, the airlines would be required to optimize their operation.

So this assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25 daily commuter flights.

The project proposes improvements in 13 areas, which are listed on the slide here, and I'll be discussing each of those in just a moment.

The size of the improvements was established by the City Council in February 2005. And while it's premature to develop a final design for the airport improvements, prior to City Council selection of the alternative, a schematic layout showing a proposed footprint of the airport improvements has been developed to provide the basic team parameters, environmental team basic parameters for evaluation of the EIR.

During the final design, a precise size and configuration of the proposed improvements may vary to ensure compliance with the applicable fire and building codes and safety and security requirements and operational necessities. However, the overall size of the airport terminal area improvements would not exceed the square footage allocations and would be consistent with the parameters ultimately adopted by the City Council.

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

This includes a 1990 Memorandum of Understanding adopted by the Cultural Heritage Commission and City Council pertaining to modifications to the terminal buildings, and the MOU includes the Secretary of Interior's standards for rehabilitation of historic buildings.

There's the development and use standards for the Long Beach Airport Terminal Plan Development Ordinance, which are the zoning regulations, and a memorandum prepared in 2005 for consideration of new construction at the airport.

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

Now, I'll go through the various improvements, and these are, as I said, outlined in your -- in the summary documents that is one of the handouts.

The 13 areas, one is the holdroom area, which is this region through here. And currently, the airport holdrooms are comprised of both the 1984 permanent holdroom and the temporary modular structures. As part of the proposed project, the 13,150 square feet of temporary holdroom currently being provided through the use of modular buildings would be replaced with 21,171 square feet of permanent floor space. This is a net increase of 8,021 square feet.

The second area are the concessions, which are shown in this concept plan. They would be expanded to serve the new holdroom areas. Currently, there are 5,460 square feet of concessions at the airport, and the proposed project would add an additional 9,541 square feet.

The passenger security screening would be done through this area. You know what? And I'm sorry. Let me just back up a moment.

Here's the existing terminal building here, and this is Donald Douglas Drive, and you come right up and can drop passengers off and then go through. So the idea would be that it would open up similar to the original configuration of the terminal and then go through the passenger screening areas.

Currently there is 3,900 square feet for passenger security screening, and with the proposed project, there would be an additional 7,000 square feet.
devoted to this use. The passenger security screening -- excuse me -- baggage screening would be done in this area. And currently, the airport does not provide a structure for conducting baggage screening, and since 2003, this has been under a canopy, and the Transportation Security Administration, or TSA, has indicated that this open-air situation is not sufficient because of the sensitivity of the equipment being used. And so the project would provide approximately 7,000 square feet for security screening of baggage. Once the baggage screening is done, it would go into a baggage makeup area, which is here. The area shown in this yellow color would be -- have a cover to them, but they would be open-air. They would not have -- it would be an open building similar to how the baggage claim area is now. And so from the baggage screening, go to baggage makeup and then be loaded onto the aircraft.

Another area that would be provided is a baggage service office, which is here, and a multipurpose room right here where the corner here. And currently, there are not these facilities at the airport. And the project would allow for a 900-square-foot baggage service office and a 500-square-foot multipurpose room.

The area would provide a holding place for unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected or for reporting lost baggage. The multipurpose room would provide on-site meeting space for shift briefings, training and other meetings for airport and tenant staff whose job duties do not allow them to leave the terminal. The seventh area would be additional restroom space right through here. There would be an increase of approximately 2,000 square feet in restrooms in non-secured area.

The eighth area of improvement would be office space for security and airport staff and airline support. And the TSA currently operates out of the temporary modular building. With this project, it would be replaced with a 5,191 square foot improvement space. The airlines would be shown through here, as well as some space in the existing terminal. They currently have approximately 2,000 square feet within the airport terminal, and this would provide the airlines with an additional 3,754 feet and that airport staff would increase from 6,970 square feet to 11,700 square feet. The ticketing facilities would be located right in this area here. The expansion of the ticketing areas is proposed to accommodate existing demand at the airport, and the facilities are broken into four categories, a ticketing counter, a space for ticketing counter queuing, airlines ticket office, and circulation areas for the ticketing, and the combined space for these four functions would increase from 6,423 square feet -- would increase 6,423 square feet for a total of 14,833 square feet.

The airline gates. It's kind of hard to see on here. There's little lines that show the openings for the doorways, and currently there are eight aircraft gates for boarding and deplaning and unloading aircraft. And with the proposed project, this would increase to eleven gates. And as I said, the gates are really used to identity doors in the holdroom that are used for passenger boarding. In the past, there's been questions about jetways. This project would not provide any jetways. It would not be possible because jetways require a second story access, and the holdroom area is one story and could not be retrofitted to accommodate a second story. So gates would just be the openings.

The elevator area for improvements are the aircraft parking positions. There are currently ten positions at the airport, and the EIR addressed for up to as many as 14 aircraft, and this would result in the take-back of property leased to Million Air and used for general aviation tie-down and delay parking. On the earlier exhibits, that's where I showed that it was in the hatched markings. And the general aviation aircraft that are displaced from Million Air would be relocated to a new tie-down area on what's called Parcel O, which is south of the runway 12-30 at Clark and Willow.

This area could also potentially be developed with aircraft hangars, and this is consistent with the March 25th, 2003, Long Beach Airport Development Area's map. The twelfth area, which does not show on this exhibit here, is for vehicular parking. And currently at the airport, parking is available both on-site surface lots and parking structures; and off-site parking lot leased from Boeing known as lot D. There are currently 2,835 permanent parking spaces at the airport and approximately 2,100 leased spaces. And the leased spaces are done on a month-to-month basis. And with the project, they're proposing construction of a new parking structure which combined with the existing parking structure and the surface parking would provide a total of 6,286 parking spaces on site, and this would eliminate the need for the off-site leased parking. The project will provide for 1,351 spaces above the existing number of spaces currently available for airport use.

And as I indicated earlier, the structure would
require the relocation of the east side of the Donald
Douglas Loop.
Also associated with the parking are proposed
modifications to the existing parking structure, which
would include a new facade to match the new parking
structure and compliment the architecture of the terminal
building. And the facades of the terminal building, the
parking structures, would provide a unified appearance and
would enhance the aesthetics of the airport terminal
building.

The last area is traffic and pedestrian
circulation improvements. This would include the
extension that I mentioned earlier to the south side of
Donald Douglas Loop exiting onto — it would be a
right-out only onto Lakewood Boulevard. And then in
addition, a modification of signage, lighting and pavement
markings to ensure that they would be safe for pedestrian
and vehicular movement.

As far as how the project would look as
indicated, the City has adopted the guiding principles for
any modifications to the airport terminal because the City
does value the terminal building and wants to assure its
historic integrity.

To accomplish this, the design ensured the
improvements would not look like an add-on to the terminal
building or a wall of structures upon approach to the
terminal. Modifications to the interior of the building
would be in keeping with the original design of the
building. I showed you that building right there where
people would go out through into the holdroom.

This is an exhibit that shows the view of the
improvements from the side. Here's the existing
terminal building. Here's the walkway, the holdrooms, the
office space, the area for the baggage makeup

The EIR also addressed three alternatives.
Alternative A was based on improvements that were outlined
in the 2003 Notice of Preparation with minor
modifications. Alternative A assumed that the airport
terminal will be a maximum of 97,545 square feet, so
slightly smaller than what's being evaluated as part of
the proposed project.

And the nature of the improvements would
generally be the same as the proposed project. There are
minor reductions in square footage in all areas except for
the following categories: The baggage security screening
would be the same as the proposed project, no additional
space was assumed for ticketing facilities, and the amount
of the airport office space is increased compared to the
proposed project.

The 2003 Notice of Preparation assumed 16
aircraft parking spaces. However, the City Council
determined in February 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft
parking spaces be evaluated in the EIR. So that is one
modification from the 2003 NOP.

The Alternative B further reduces the size of
the airport terminal area compared to the proposed
project. It would provide a maximum of 79,725 square feet
and would also provide similar improvements, though
reduced in size. There would be no change in the baggage
security screening. There was no additional space assumed
for ticketing and no additional airport office space
assumed as part of this alternative.

Alternative C is required by CEQA and is the
no-project alternative, and this assumes that no
facilities would be provided at the airport and the
vehicular parking spaces that are currently leased
off-site would not be available because of the short-term
nature of the leases. And based on current -- recent
discussions with Boeing, they indicated that the leases
are not available on a long-term basis.

And since no vehicular parking spaces would be
provided off-site, this alternative would have a net loss
of 2100 parking spaces compared to the existing
conditions.

The phasing for the project would be based
somewhat on availability of funding and service
priorities, and the design and improvements would follow
the approval of the project by the City Council. And
pending funding, it's anticipated that construction
improvements would be phased to minimize impacts on the
airport operations. And phasing is expected to be the
same for all the alternatives. And as you can see, the
first action would be construction of areas for Parcel O
and then the parking structure and the terminal
improvements themselves.

The F1R did identify significant impacts
associated with the project, and we'll be discussing those
in more detail shortly, but they were on aesthetics, air
quality, cultural resources and hazards with the proposed
mediation program, all the construction air quality
impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

Also, as I indicated, the EIR that's not part
of the proposed project did address the impacts associated
with the optimized flights, and with the optimized flights
there were impacts identified with the air quality, land
use and transportation and circulation, and after
implementation of mitigation measures, only the air
quality impact would remain a significant unavoidable
impact.

There are benefits associated with the proposed
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1. project. It would provide enhanced TSA and airport
2. security services because of the improved facilities.
3. There would be improved existing and future traffic
4. conditions at the airport because of the enhanced parking
5. on site. There would be a reduction in aircraft emissions
6. by providing the infrastructure necessary to support
7. electric ground support equipment.
8. And though not associated with the impact of
9. the project, the EIR recommends the development of a land
10. use compatibility program associated with the optimized
11. flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour and
12. schools within the 60 CNEL contour. And this would be a
13. voluntary noise abatement program.
14. CEQA does require that an environmentally
15. superior alternative be identified, and the no-project
16. alternative would avoid construction-related impacts.
17. However, it would have more substantial long-term traffic
18. impacts and associated air quality impacts because there
19. would not be sufficient parking, resulting in extra trips
20. associated with meeters and greeters.
21. The project would not provide for the
22. infrastructure, as I mentioned before, for the electric
23. ground support equipment, so there would be increased
24. health risk concerns. Therefore, the reduction in
25. emissions provided through the mitigation program would

1. not apply to the new project.
2. Given that there's no substantial difference in
3. the nature of the impacts between the various build
4. alternatives, the EIR determined that the proposed project
5. would be the preferred environmentally superior
6. alternative.
7. The project would provide the additional
8. capacity needed to help serve the number of passengers
9. associated with the minimum number of flights. And the
10. HNTB study in 2004 conducted during the scoping process
11. recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs
12. of the passengers, visitors and tenants actually exceeded
13. the square footage allocation even under the proposed
14. project.
15. And since the project is able to meet all the
16. project objectives and does not result in substantially
17. greater impacts than the other build alternatives, it was
18. identified as the environmentally superior alternative.
19. With that, I'll turn it over to Jessica
20. Feldman, who will discuss the cultural resources.
22. It doesn't mean certification of the EIR is
23. approval of the project. Certification of the EIR by the
24. Planning Commission is only a determination that the EIR
25. addresses the impacts associated with the proposed

1. prominent visual feature of the airport, representing an
2. established and familiar visual feature of the
3. neighborhood.
4. Some of the character defining features of the
5. terminal include the round windows, the curved walls, and
6. the geometric panels on the rear elevation where the
7. restaurant is, smooth surfaces. The building's also in
8. the shape of an arc. The building maintains almost all
9. its original windows and doors, and ceramic mosaic tiles
10. are located on the first and second floor.
11. Now, generally, the building will continue to
12. be used as an airport terminal, which is its original
13. purpose, obviously, and it will retain its overall
14. historic character. And the new construction will be
15. differentiated from the old and compatible in size,
16. massing, scale and style.
17. However, components of the proposed
18. improvements would materially destroy or alter some
19. character defining features that I mentioned earlier,
20. which under CEQA is considered a significant impact.
21. These project components, which do not meet the
22. Secretary of the Interior standard for rehabilitation of
23. historic buildings, include damage to historic material
24. and removal or obscuring of original details.
25. However, proposed mitigation measures and
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1. design changes would reduce the impacts to a level less than significant.
2. And now I will turn this over to Cindy, who will discuss the aesthetics, hazards, hazardous waste and public services.
3. MS. KREBS. Good evening.
4. By the way, "aesthetics" is another word for how things would look or the visual impact of the project.
5. The City's zoning ordinance and the May 1990 MOU, which Kathleen referenced earlier, both set forth guidelines for improvements to the terminal building.
6. Those guidelines involve building siting. And, as Kathleen has said, there's a desire that there is a space between the buildings to avoid the appearance of a wall of buildings.
7. Building heights. The requirement here is that they comply with FAA height restrictions and integrate well with the existing building.
8. Parking structures under the guidelines are to provide roof landscaping planters and observe the height restrictions. And with regards to overall design, guidelines say that the unique architectural features should be preserved and that the design should be consistent with and in harmony with the existing terminal building.

During construction, the proposed project would have some temporary impacts to aesthetics. First of all, there would be temporary alteration of the views at the project site. There are very limited views of the airport off the site. Maybe a few people who live in Signal Hill look down might be able to see onto the airport bed.

Generally, because of the topography in this area, it's fairly flat, there are very few views away from the airport.

The types of impacts that are expected during construction include construction equipment would be staged there. Construction materials would also be stored on site. There would be graded surfaces during construction, some truck traffic and some soil stockpiles.

There could also be some potential light and glare impacts during construction. Those would be associated with the security lighting and light emanating from the proposed improvements. The proposed mitigation program will reduce the impact to a level considered less than significant. The methods that are recommended include low intensity lights, orientation or shielding away from residences and streets and glass that is less than 20 percent reflective.

The proposed project would be compatible with the existing terminal building in size, massing, scale and style.

If you look at how the airport is currently laid out with all the temporary buildings and existing like that, the size isn't really that much larger. The building itself will be larger than the existing buildings and there is an increase, but the way that things are laid out on the project site right now is fairly spread out, and this wouldn't be – cover much more area than that. The smaller buildings will be low elevation, as Kathy mentioned, one story. So the views would still be available from the second story onto the airfield from the restaurant and the deck behind it.

The style of the new construction would incorporate some of the stylistic elements of the Streamline Moderne architectural style. There would be a curved roof. The west wall of the holdover would be mostly windows. The arc shape of the terminal building would be copied in the shape of some of the small detached buildings. The roofs of those would mimic that shape.

And the new roof as it steps from the back of the building forward would have a step elevation again, something that is characteristic of that architectural style.

As consistent with CEQA, the EIR concerns itself with hazards and hazardous waste impacts that could result from the implementation of the proposed project.

Our analysis focused on the terminal areas and parking areas in lot O, not the airport or the airfield as a whole. So when we're talking about hazardous waste analysis, we, in fact, were focused on those.

We did gather a lot of data though from a wide variety of sources and for areas that extend beyond the proposed project limits. The sources from which the data was gathered included existing historic records and the EIR that's referenced here. The report includes state and federal databases that list past spills, past cleanup efforts, the final disposition of anything that happened on site with regards to those.

We also looked at fuel storage and fuel dispensing on the airport, the location of underground storage tanks and above-ground storage tanks and whether or not the proposed project would have to interface with any of those locations.

We looked at the City's - the airport's 1998 asbestos survey and determined that asbestos would be an issue, and there's mitigation recommended for that.

And then we also used some common sense. Because of the age of the building, we know that there's a heightened potential that there could be lead based paint within the existing buildings, and because of the airport's location near the 405 freeway and on a fairly...
1. heavily traveled road, Lakewood Boulevard, we also assume 2. that air-deposited lead could be found on that Parcel O 3. location.
4. Current hazardous waste practices at the 5. airport are very well defined. We've learned in the past 6. that there have been incidents at the airport, but we've 7. also learned through EIR reports and other investigations 8. that all of those have been addressed appropriately and 9. all the cases have been closed.
10. The airport and the City both share an ongoing 11. commitment to the proper handling of hazardous materials 12. at the airport, and those are documented in the Long Beach 13. Airport Certification Manual and the Long Beach Airport 14. Rules and Regulations.
15. The airport also has a storm water prevention 16. pollution prevention plan, that SWPPP that you see 17. there, the City's industrial NPDES permit, which is the 18. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit, 19. and a series of best management practices that are used 20. continuously.
21. These programs set forth FAA-approved 22. documented procedures for the handling of hazardous waste 23. on airport property, and those address fuel handling, 24. inspection, fueler training, corrective actions and 25. hazardous materials cleanup procedures. They also comply 26. with all pertinent local and state construction and 27. building requirement and regulations, including the 28. Uniform Building Code.
29. What we concluded in the EIR was that the 30. terminal building does contain asbestos and could also 31. contain lead-based paint; that Parcel O may contain the 32. aerially deposited lead and trace amounts of DDT.
33. I didn't mention that earlier, but in the past, 34. the grassy areas of the airport were treated with DDT. In 35. a fairly recent project, there were trace, trace amounts 36. of that found. So we haven't ruled out the possibility 37. that trace amounts could be found in this project, as 38. well.
39. During construction, those materials could be 40. released into the atmosphere in the vicinity of the 41. airport. The existing rules and procedures that are in 42. effect at the airport, plus the proposed mitigation 43. program, would ensure that those impacts are mitigated to 44. a level considered less than significant.
45. With regards to public services, the EIR 46. discusses fire and police protection, as well as 47. Transportation Security Administration, TSA, and airport 48. security activities at the airport. It also makes note of 49. the fact that TSA has requested improvements to enhance 50. their security at the airport, such as the enclosed 51. structure of the baggage security screening that Katie 52. mentioned earlier.
53. And again, that's because the type of equipment 54. that they used for that is very sensitive to wind and it 55. does -- activities currently occur in the open air. So 56. the types of improvements that have been proposed would be 57. considered positive from a TSA perspective.
58. The proposed project would provide more secure 59. baggage and passenger screening areas, as I just 60. mentioned. Would also reduce possible safety hazards 61. resulting from overcrowding.
62. I know a lot of you participated in those two 63. open houses that occurred. I think it was about a year, 64. year ago, year and a half ago at the airport. During the 65. peak periods at the airport, it's a crowded facility.
66. It's old. It's smaller than a modern airport would be if 67. it were designed right now.
68. Peak periods, there's a lot of foot traffic 69. going through there. Circulation is sometimes difficult, 70. and that could potentially lead, especially under the 71. optimized flight scenario, to potential safety hazards.
72. The proposed project, though, as I mentioned, would help to 73. alleviate concerns about those.
74. Significant impacts could also occur, as I 75. said, under the optimized flight scenario not only because 76. you have more passengers, you have more baggage, more 77. crowded conditions and more changes to baggage security 78. screening unless the proposed project is implemented.
79. With regard to police and fire services, as 80. well as airport security services, all of those would be 81. -- the staffing levels would all be adjusted as necessary 82. to meet the changing demands of the airport. The City 83. already has the authorization and the procedures in place 84. to make sure that as more people are using the airport, 85. the staffing levels are up to the demands being placed on 86. them.
87. With that, I will introduce Vince Mestre, who 88. is already up here by me, and he's here to talk to you 89. about noise.
90. MR. MESTRE: This is a very brief summary of the 91. noise analysis that is contained in the EIR. EIR Section 92. 3.6 is the noise analysis, and it contains much more 93. information than I can squeeze into this presentation.
94. The very detailed technical studies are contained in 95. Appendix F of the EIR.
96. The noise analysis can be summarized in two 97. figures. The first is Exhibit 3.6-9 in the EIR. It 98. shows the existing noise contours for calendar year 2004.
99. There are 15 homes located in the 65 CNEL noise 100. contour. That's the noise land use standards used by the
<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>State of California and the City of Long Beach. That's the yellow contour right here. There are no schools within the 65 or 60 CNEL contour.</td>
<td>11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights, there are 11 homes within the 65 CNEL contour. There are also two schools that fall within the 60 CNEL contour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The next slide is a close-up of this slide because the other slide was just too far away to see what was going on. This is the area north of the runway, north of the airport.</td>
<td>These include the Minnie Gant Elementary School and the special education building at the School Safety and Emergency Preparedness offices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Those are the homes that are within the 65 CNEL contour or touched by the 65 CNEL contour north of the airport. This is Carson and Cherry Street. South of the airport, this is Clark and I-405. These are the residential lots that are just touched by this 65 CNEL contour.</td>
<td>I'll show a close-up of these two areas. This is a close-up -- changed on me. This is a close-up of the Minnie Gant School showing part of the 60 CNEL contour that falls on part of the school property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>We looked at future conditions with this project and identified that this project would not affect future conditions. The Long Beach Airport Noise Ordinance establishes a noise budget for the airlines and cargo operators. That budget permits at least 41 air carrier departures per day -- and that includes cargo departures -- and 25 commuter departures per day. \n\nIn 2004, 41 air carrier departures were allocated, and on weekdays, that level was reached. The 25 commuter flights is not being used. The noise budget permits more flights if the airlines operate below the noise budget. How many more flights could be realized if the airlines and cargo operators used the quietest aircraft available to them and they reduced the number of nighttime violations is an issue that is addressed in detail in the EIR. That analysis shows that under ideal but realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial flights could be accommodated. Of course, these additional flights would have to be of the quietest aircraft types and not at the night hours. \n\nThe potential future case that was analyzed in the EIR is a case where the 11 additional commercial flights are realized and the 25 commuter flights occur. This shows the noise contours for that future potential optimized condition. That's Exhibit 3.6 dash 14 from the EIR. And again, the yellow contour is the 65, the 60 is the green, and the inner contour, which is purple, is contained mostly within the airport boundary, is the 70 CNEL contour. Most importantly, achieving the budget potential of 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights is not dependent on this project. Can these additional flights occur without this project? The answer is yes. For the case of future potential conditions with</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
trips would result in the optimized flight scenario due to
the additional passengers.

So for the traffic study, we did an evaluation
of the optimized flight scenario. The study area that we
looked at extends from Carson on the north, Willow to the
south, Cherry on the west side, and Clark on the east
side. It also includes that new exit on the south side of
Donald Douglas Drive onto Lakewood Boulevard.

Our traffic study assumptions, again, assume
the optimized flight conditions, which is 52 commercial
and 25 commuter flights, the new exit on southbound
Lakewood Boulevard. The parking demand for the project is
based on 2.75 spaces per 1,000 departing passengers, which
was from a study that was done earlier for the airport.

The number of vehicle trips for the optimized
flight conditions was based on existing passenger data,
and it was also compared to John Wayne and Ontario
airports, and it was found to be very similar to their
trip generation rates.

The traffic study looked at two different time
periods. For the CEQA analysis, we looked at existing
with the project with optimized flights, which would be
like we wake up tomorrow and the buildings are there and
the optimized flights are underway. It’s not a very
realistic thing to say it’s going to happen tomorrow, but

that was one analysis period.

And then we also looked at 2020 conditions with
optimized flights and compared the with project in place
and without the project in place. The 2020 analysis also
assumes that Douglas Park is built and open and their
traffic is on the local roads. And it also assumes that
the Douglas Park roadway mitigation measures are in place.

For the existing plus project with optimized
flights or it’s there tomorrow, the findings assume that
the existing off-site parking, lot D, the space leased
from Boeing, will still be available for use. And under
these conditions, we identified two impacted
intersections, Lakewood at Spring and Lakewood at Willow.
Mitigation measures were recommended as the passenger
numbers increased to a point where the impact would be
significant.

And then we looked at the 2020 conditions with
the optimized flights. We assumed that due to the
short-term nature of the Boeing lot D parking area, no
off-site parking is available.

And when the City originally looked at this
project and the proposed parking structure, it was based
on parking needs for the 41 plus 25 flights, which would
be, you know, from the noise impact deal in the ordinance,
not the optimized flights, which would be the 52

commercial and 25 commuter.

So therefore, a parking deficiency would exist
in future 2020 conditions, but the proposed project
supplies more parking than not doing anything than the new
project conditions.

So when we think about it that way, the new
project has less parking and would cause more drop-off
trips because you didn’t have a place to park, you’re
going to have to get to the airport somehow. So it may be
a taxi or a relative or friend or someone who takes you to
to the airport, drops you off, but then they have to come
back again when you arrive back and pick you back up.

So in the with-project conditions, there’s more
parking. Therefore, there will be less drop-off trips.

So the results for the 2020 analysis showed
that the proposed project with its additional project
actually generates fewer trips than no-project conditions
because more people can drive to the airport and have a
place to park with fewer drop-offs, and each drop-off trip
is twice as many trips as if you just drove to the airport
and parked yourself.

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

And now I’m going to turn it over to John,
We'll go to the impacts that we did find in the analysis. The air quality impact analysis identified construction impacts that exceeded the significant thresholds for NOx and VOC. A number of mitigation measures have been recommended. I believe 13 are actually in the document, but we did not believe that there would reduce the impacts to levels considered less than significant, so there would be an insignificant impact after mitigation.

The increased flight activity under the optimized flight scenario would result in exceedance of the PM10 concentration thresholds developed by AQMD. The area is a non-human area, so it has very stringent thresholds for PM10.

So the sources of the PM10 are primarily the diesel-powered GSC, ground support equipment, and fugitive re-entrained road dust. Again, there are mitigation measures proposed, but it's not considered that these would be below the level of significance after mitigation. And then finally, emissions of CO and NOx from aircraft auxiliary power units and the ground support equipment were shown to be significant before mitigation. However, use of electric ground support equipment and pre-conditioned air and gate power to reduce the use of the auxiliary power units would reduce the CO impacts to a level below significant. However, the NOx emissions would still be significant after mitigation.

With that, I will turn it back to Kathleen.

MS. BRADY: Thank you. That concludes our presentation today, and as Chris indicated, that the public review period extends from November 7th to December 22nd.

And this is in your ballpark, but here's the addresses where you can submit comments in writing. The process does provide that all the comments are received during the public review period, which includes any public comments made tonight will be responded to in writing and will be a component of the final EIR.

MS. EBEBARD: Thank you.

Well, with that, thank you, and thank you for being patient. Again, those of you that came in a little late, I would like to welcome you and again thank you for taking your time out of your busy week, on a Tuesday night especially.

My name is Chris Eberhard, and from here we're going to take your public comments regarding the findings that they have just highlighted.

I would like to mention again for those of you that came in late that Mary is our court reporter, and the best way that we can help tonight is to make sure that she gets your comments accurately.

So I will ask if there are side conversations or whatever, that you take them outside because acoustics are a little interesting, and I know she had trouble from time to time hearing the technical report.

Kathleen just had it up there, but I will remind you again that the review period ends December 22nd, and the comments that are received tonight and at the other meetings and in writing and through the e-mails will be addressed in the final document.

There are comment cards. There's a comment box you can put your comments in over there. I think there are plenty of comment cards in the front if you didn't get them and you're more comfortable making your comments that way or through the e-mail.

I will mention one more time also — I believe it's in your material, but there are three meetings. The next one is Saturday from 9:30 a.m. till 1:00 p.m. For those of you that are interested in attending again or for your neighbors, you can let them know they're Saturday morning and then Monday evening again 6:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Saturday's meeting is at the City Council chambers, and Monday night's meeting is at the Petroleum Club, and I have the address here. It is 3636 Linden Avenue.
Petroleum Club.

I would like to know about how many of you plan
to speak because that will tell me about how long I can
let each of you go. If you all want to speak, we'll have
to limit it more. So if I could just see -- and you can
change your mind, but it will give me an idea.

How many of you do plan to speak? Well, we
should have time, I think, to be able to go probably to
five minutes. Now, if you start lining up, then I may
have to as we go limit that, but I think there's -- we
have about two hours, or a little less. And again,
remember that you can also do comment cards.

I wanted to also let you know that certainly
once you're done speaking, you can feel free to leave, go
home and watch some television or whatever your plans
are for the evening. This basically, other than the
comments, is the end of the formal portion of the meeting.

So I will set it at right now as a five-minute
time limit. Do try to keep your comments as brief as
possible. We will take all of your comments tonight, but
we are particularly and the court reporter is here to take
comments regarding the findings in the draft document,
your thoughts on the draft document.

Each speaker needs to give their name and
address for the court reporter and I guess speak into the
microphone, which maybe wasn't doing real well for a minute.

One speaker at a time. Again, that's to help her to get
this down. I mentioned going outside so there isn't
too much noise in the room. And, of course, let's all be
courteous and respectful of any view that is given.

And if you go beyond five minutes -- should
be okay more than enough for most of you. But if you do go
to the five minutes, I may need to interrupt just so that
we can hear everyone.

With that, give your name and spell it with
your address. And I'll remind you as you come up. That's
my role tonight.

So with that, who would like to -- and if you
would like to make it move a little faster, you can
certainly take one or two up behind the speaker so that
you're ready to go, and that will reduce the time also.

Yes, matam.

MS. DELATORRE: I have a quick question before I
start my questions. There's no chance to get any kind of
clarification tonight on any of the questions? Most of
mine are questions, not just comments.

Ms. EBERHARD: Why don't you go ahead and pose your
questions, and if they're clarifying kind, it's possible
that we can get an answer. But basically, I think the
consultants are here to listen.

But if it's clarifying in terms of the project
description, that's possible.

MS. DELATORRE: My name is Birgit Delatorre,
Bi-r-g-i-t D-e-l-a-t-o-r-r-e. I'm here today as a
resident, as well as a Director of the Board of Council
PTA's of Long Beach, and my first question relates to the
PTA's involvement in this.

We had come to the scoping meetings with a
request that the EIR would look at the health impacts on
children, recognizing that children would be affected in a
different way than adults due to their physiology and
their activity level, and I did not see that addressed in
the EIR.

Ms. EBERHARD: Just go ahead with your comments.

MS. DELATORRE: Okay. All right. There's a slide
-- well, you have a slide that talks about that the EIR
determined the proposed project to be environmentally
superior. Unfortunately, a little confusing to me, some
of the key points on the slide, and I just wanted
clarification.

"Environmentally superior," does that relate
solely to the energy efficiency, such as converting ground
equipment to electric? Is that the main point that the
determination of "environmentally superior" is based on?

I have EIR reference bottom slide on page
47.

seven. I needed clarification. It says, "Air quality
impacts will remain significant." Again, that was kind of
a confusing slide. Throughout really, there's discussion
about construction impacts and airport operation impacts.
Many of the slides I think are quite confusing as to what
are you talking about, and you're talking about
construction, or are you talking about airport operations
now and then, that sort of thing?

So anyway, on this page seven, bottom slide,
"air quality impacts will remain significant." I need to
know if that will be during construction only or if that
would be after the proposed project has been completed and
the airport operations at that time.

MR. PEHRSON: I'll give you a quick clarification.
The construction slide was for the construction
of the terminal project itself, so those impacts would go
away once construction was completed. The other
slide was looking at the optimized flight scenario and
whether there would be impacts associated with optimized
flights.

So when we said "significant after mitigation"
for operations, what this was referring to is an optimized
flight scenario where you get 52 commercial flights and 25
commuters, and that would be ongoing impacts.

MS. DELATORRE: I would have to look at that again.
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1 Honesty, I am completely -- this is the first time I've ever looked at something like this, and you guys are experts, and it's probably second nature to you, and it's not to me.

2 So far as health impact after the proposed project has been completed, then you still have significant -- there's one slide that says there will be significant and unavoidable impacts on air quality.

3 Everything else can be mitigated, but there will be significant and unavoidable after everything is said and done.

4 Okay, that's -- I wanted to make sure that that related to after construction.

5 And would you clarify "unavoidable"? Maybe not now, but --

6 MS. EBERHARD: Exactly the kind of thing -- you got it right. That will be in the comments.

7 MS. DELATORRE: In the EIR, did you consider the possibility that there will be 500-passenger jets coming in, as JetBlue has said in various New York meetings, that they're just waiting for this terminal to be expanded so they can do that? Again, no answer today.

8 And if you have considered it or if you have considered the 500-passenger jets, does the EIR consider the undoubtedly increased traffic from these cars coming in?

9 And as far as air quality mitigation, has the EIR considered mitigating to some sort of a shuttle service as opposed to having a whole bunch of cars coming in? And if not, is there a reason why it wasn't considered?

10 That's it for today.

11 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

12 Next?

13 MS. BYNUM: Good evening. My name is Luanne Bynum. I live at 651 Ultimo Avenue here in Long Beach. Bynum, B-y-n-u-u-n.

14 I'm here tonight on behalf of the Long Beach Alliance. Some of you are aware of this organization. We've been working for reasonable improvements at the terminals at the airport, and we're asking tonight that the EIR be certified as a valid comprehensive and thoughtful document.

15 We believe it was a thorough study by experienced professionals, and we believe it addressed and appropriately mitigated the concerns addressed by the neighborhoods, City Planning, general public and government agencies.

16 Thank you.

17 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

18 MR. BAUCH: My name is Michael Bauch, last name is-a-u-c-n, on Chapman Avenue here in Long Beach. You know, I've been following this issue for quite a while, been going to a lot of the meetings.

19 I think a lot of the neighborhood people here really would like some more time to review this EIR. I think a lot of us feel that the 45 days is really rushing a very big decision, and especially during the holidays.

20 Definitely need some more time to take a look at this.

21 One of the other concerns is, you know, we've just noticed that we've got a lot more late night flights coming in, those coming in between 10:00 and 11:00, and we're just very concerned about having an airport that's much bigger.

22 How can this help these late night flights coming in? We're concerned that it's only going to increase that.

23 One of the other comments I heard was about noiseproofing some of the buildings, and that's also a concern. We're wondering, well, it's almost like admitting there's going to be more noise because some of the buildings will have to be noiseproofed, many of the houses surrounding that.

24 And I believe that that's part of the reason we moved to Long Beach is not to be boxed in our houses, but to get to enjoy the outdoors. So just putting some noiseproofing on a house doesn't solve the problem.

25 I think the biggest issue here is this EIR is assuming that the noise ordinance is going to stay, and I think a lot of us in the neighborhoods are scared that perhaps this noise ordinance will not last forever and that there will be -- there will be chances that something will happen to the noise ordinance, and then all the sudden we have an airport that's tripled its size waiting to accommodate more flights, and I think that's a very big concern.

26 So I hope some of these issues are addressed.

27 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

28 MR. CONLEY: Hi. My name is Steven Conley, C-o-n-l-e-y, 311 Long Point in Long Beach.

29 I have some concerns with regard to the environment and conservation, and I want to give a little background on myself. I'm speaking for myself and not for the organizations I might be affiliated with.

30 I'm president of the Long Beach Water Commission, and I'm also a director of the Aquarium of the Pacific, and I'm also a member of the Scientific Diving Team there.

31 And I mention those only because having those...
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1 experiences has given me a great deal of understanding and
2 appreciation for conservation and the whole environmental
3 issue, and there's one element in the EIR that I think has
4 sort of been overlooked and not enough attention has been
5 given.
6 But it is vitally important that we continue or
7 we don't reduce the number of aircraft parking positions.
8 The EIR calls for 14 aircraft parking positions. If
9 that's reduced, we have more aircraft idling waiting to
10 get into position, which from a conservation point of view
11 means more fuel burned and from an environmental point of
12 view means more exhaust and fumes in the air.
13 I really hope that no matter what comes out of
14 this, there is not a reduction in 14 spaces because from
15 an environmental and a conservation point of view, they
16 are -- that number of stations which have special
17 electrical hookups and such is vitally important.
18 Thank you.
19 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
20 MS. RUSNAK: Good evening. My name is Susan Rusnak.
21 That's R-U-S-N-A-K. My business office is 111 West Ocean
22 Boulevard in Long Beach 90802.
23 I'm here this evening representing the City of
24 Long Beach Economic Development Commission. I am
25 presently serving as chairman of the business development

committee of that commission, and we've been following the
airport issue for about the last year.
I'd like to read a statement on behalf of the
Commission.
The role of the Long Beach Economic Development
Commission is to advise and make recommendations to the
City on matters affecting economic development. The City
of Long Beach Economic Development Commission recommends
timely and immediate action to certify the draft
Environmental Impact Report.
The Long Beach Airport is an important and
dependable asset and sustains the City's economic growth
and viability. The economic impact analysis published in
April 2005 presented persuasive evidence that continued
airport operations have substantial positive impacts on
the City's long term business growth and work force
development.
As this report concluded, the airport is a
fundamental element of the City's employment base,
producing over 16,000 jobs and representing one billion in
earnings.
The Commission has reviewed the draft
Environmental Impact Report, including the detailed
project impacts and mitigation measures presented. The
report concludes that the proposed project, quote, does
not result in substantially greater impacts than the other
build alternatives, end quote, and declares the proposed
improvements as quote, the environmentally superior
alternative, end quote.
Due to the profound positive economic impact
that the airport operations have on continuing viability of
this city, the Economic Development Commission
respectfully urges the City to act without further delay
or impediment to the process to approve the EIR and move
forward to improve and modernize the Long Beach airport.
Thank you very much for your attention.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
Next.
MS. SOPO: Hi. My name is Linda Sopo. I reside at
1301 Armoudale Avenue in Long Beach, and I'm here with
mixed emotions tonight because I've been coming to these
things for two and a half years, and much like Birgit
brought up a few minutes ago, one of the things that we
need you guys to do was look at the impact to our
children.
There was a study done about asthma and cancer
in Long Beach. It was printed in the New England Journal
of Medicine, it's been brought up at several meetings, and
I saw nothing about the children in here and the kids that
are living while their lungs are developing living in Los

Alto, in Bixby and Cal Heights. We know about a
70 year-old man that lives there, but in my judgment, that
is not quite. And what about the impacts on kids and
their lungs development?
The other part, I was pleased to hear that you
mentioned Minnie Gant having mitigation, but my question
was as I was going through this, I heard mitigation,
mitigation, mitigation, mitigation. Who's paying for the
mitigation?
And in hearing about -- I have to disagree with
Ms. Dynum. I think that there are areas that we've been
asking for in this that you guys have not addressed that
are real concerns, and people want to be able to go in
their backyards. They don't want to deal with additional
noise. And it would be awful if all those kids in Minnie
Gant would have to stay in the classroom. And then we
have to worry if those planes are actually going to make
it as they go overhead.
So it's really good to get practical here, but
realities ruin people's lives.
Finally, in terms of the economic impact, I
agree. I love our airport. I think it's great, and I
think it's a lot of good things. I love flying in, I love
flying out of it. I like our drop-off. I think the last
thing anybody in Long Beach really wants after this is
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I think that's wrong. Needs to change.

That being said — because right now we do have comments closing on the 22nd. What is that, two days before Christmas? I'm going to address the lead component. I see here in the overview of the guiding principles for the airport do not include the — it's kind of tucked in at the back paragraph.

And I think as the City of Long Beach as a member of the U.S. Rebuilding Council, that you need to put that component as a guiding principle.

And I think that if you wouldn't have done that, if the City had taken that into effect, the largest terminal, if it all is being equal, that is never the environmentally superior because it takes more energy to heat a building, it takes more energy to cool a building, it takes more resources to clean a building, and all those are what drive the lead component because we're trying to build buildings that are really friendly to the environment.

Small points here. Regarding the economic impact study, I think that that's a little misplaced here, the comments earlier. That was another study earlier that was brought up, I will address it.

That study was a — methodology was an older version. There was no public input in that study. The model used drought factors in from our Ventura County.

I think if we really wanted to have an economic impact at the Long Beach airport, we really need to look at a study that involves, you know, what the economic impact to Long Beach is, and that study needs to have public input, too.

The oversight committee were all pro-airport expansion people, and it was a closed kind of study group.

So I would say to the Economic Development Commission that "I think to that particular study may not be in the best interests of Long Beach residents."

And one more thing. The air quality monitoring, I understand CMS and Southern California Air Quality Management did indicate that we need to have air quality monitoring at the airport, but I think there was a large outcry that citizens around Long Beach wanted to have air quality monitoring.

The current monitoring is upwind of the airport, and I know when those jets are running up their engines getting ready to take off, all that jet emission is being put out into residential areas, and I think the residents deserve to know what is the air quality and not take models that are upwind of the actual airport property.

It seems so obvious that that didn't happen,

but I think as an environmental impact report, our citizens need to have that understanding of what the environmental impact is at the airport.

Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.

Next?

MR. VILLANI: Good evening. My name is Daniel Villani, V, as in Victor, V-I-L-L-A-N-I. I live at 305 Corona Avenue, C-o-r-n-o-a-v-e-nue, in Long Beach.

I love the airport. I have been flying — I don't think since 9/11 I have flown out of LAX more than one time. Business has taken me to the east coast a lot since then.

I have a couple of points. Gonna start the clock.

One, I strongly recommend that in the study documents, in the written comments, that the term "significant" is explained more in layman's terms because as an engineer, I know that something can be called significant if it's the great big dominant factor.

It can also be called significant — if you're looking at a whole bunch of noise and you see one little blip barely visible in the noise, you can call that significant, too.

And I don't know whether it's a blip that can...
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1. be detected or if it's very significant. Very layman's 
2. term, "significant effect." I suspect that it's down in 
3. the blip range myself, but that needs to be clarified in 
4. the report because "significant" can mean -- can have 
5. emotionally charged impact.
6. Second, I think everybody needs to remember --
7. and it's unfortunate, I think, that the environmental 
8. impact report mixed up optimal flights and the airport 
9. improvements because nothing in the improvements can 
10. increase the number of flights. We could put in a theme 
11. park at Long Beach Airport, and it would not improve --
12. increase the number of flights.
13. Nothing will increase the number of flights 
14. except the airlines flying quieter. Nothing. Unless we 
15. void the noise ordinance. And one of the most effective 
16. ways that we can void the noise ordinance is for the City 
17. of Long Beach to act in bad faith.
18. Acting in bad faith would include things like 
19. trying to make it such an unpleasant experience to fly out 
20. of Long Beach Airport that it drives customers to other 
21. airports, and if that is attempted, then the courts will 
22. be able to see right through a ploy like that 
23. stirred-up residents who cheer for the tear-it-down 
24. option, and that would result in voiding the noise 
25. ordinance.
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1. So we want to keep it comfortable. We want to 
2. act in good faith if you want to keep the noise ordinance 
3. in place.
4. My last point is that I want to remind people 
5. that there was a study released by the Long Beach 
6. Press-Telegram sometime within the last year. I kept my 
7. copy a while, but I've misplaced -- showing the 
8. various sources of air pollution in the area, and it had, 
9. no surprise, the port right up near the top, and somewhere 
10. down around number 15 or 20 as contributed to Long Beach 
11. air pollution was the airport, and it was down below home 
12. heating as a source of air pollution.
13. Now, we live in Southern California. We know 
14. how much we burn to heat our homes, and the airport is 
15. below that. We need to remember that.
16. I think that pretty much sums up my points.
17. Thank you very much.
18. MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
19. MR. SOPO: Joe Sopo, S-o-p-o, 3061 Aramuudale, Long 
20. Beach.
21. The City Council promised citizens of Long 
22. Beach a prospective human health risk assessment. They 
23. told the City staff to make sure that's provided in the 
24. EIR. And my question to them would be where was the air 
25. sampling gathered, how many places, how many mobile units?
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1. Also, my comment would be "significant" means 
2. something much different than I think maybe what you're 
3. putting on your report. "Significant" to me means 
4. significant and something to be looked at with 
5. significance.
6. In the report, it was mentioned that homes that 
7. are located in the 65 CNEI would be insulated, double 
8. paned windows. Am I correct on that, you'd mentioned 
9. that? And that schools that were in the 60 CNEI, they 
10. were to be insulated.
11. And one question I have, would Minnie Gant 
12. Elementary School -- that's in a 60 CNEI zone. Would that 
13. be built today with today's standards?
14. And I have children who have gone to Minnie 
15. Gant Elementary School, and I -- they stopped the class if 
16. the noise is too loud for several minutes. The pollution 
17. from the planes there is certainly more than a home 
18. heating unit at the time flying over the house.
19. And I do want to say that anybody who would 
20. rush to the microphone and endorse this draft EIR without 
21. taking the time to study it sufficiently and giving all 
22. sides time to sufficient -- to study sufficiently. I would 
23. wonder where they were coming from.
24. Thank you.
25. MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
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1. Next?
2. MR. HUSO: Jeff Huso, 5310 Las Lomas, Long Beach.
3. First of all, I was going to address what the 
4. previous gentleman said about the need to be concerned 
5. about keeping the ordinance in place. And City Attorney 
6. Mike Mais has already said several times at many different 
7. meetings that Long Beach is not required to accommodate 
8. the airlines, that we can have this proposal C, which is 
9. not expanding anything, and that's fine.
10. If you think about it logically, why would we 
11. be forced to pay money or they have to allow to 
12. accommodate some corporations or something? That's not 
13. what his opinion was, but people get uptight bringing that 
14. up again.
15. So here I am at meeting number 87, unpaid 
16. meeting number 87. I think this Environmental Impact 
17. Report is really a feasibility study rather than an 
18. environmental impact report.
19. I noticed one zero -- 1.0 is titled "Executive 
20. Summary," so I guess I'm the executive that it's directed 
21. to.
22. And then it goes on -- the EIR goes on to 
23. state, "Under optimal conditions." Anybody knows that 
24. that's a slanted word, "optimal." I would have used 
25. "maximum." That would have been neutral.
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EIR states under optimal conditions A, B or C, 31 that the result is going to be the same as far as the 3 number of flights that are going to be going out. 32 So A's got fourteen airplane parking spaces, 33 and C has got ten. They assume that having fourteen 34 spaces is going to result in no more flights than ten, but 35 that's their starting point they're basing this 36 environment impact report. 37

Since that's the primary concern of the 38 residents, having fourteen spaces instead of ten in a 39 bigger facility will tend to encourage airlines at some 40 point to get more flights in there. 41

They're starting with the assumption that ten 42 is going to go to fourteen and their facility is going to 43 be the same number of flights, resulting in the same 44 number of flights as ten, and then going on to tell us 45 that with the bigger facilities, if you have bigger 46 facilities, it's going to more easily accommodate less 47 traffic on the ground, which is probably true. 48

But they missed the whole point of the main 49 concern when they said that the A and C will result in the 50 same number of flights. There is presently no support for 51 that.

I thought the presentation tonight generally 52 gave the legalistic point of view, you know. For example,

there's 60 homes, only 60 homes. Well, there's a lot more 53 than 60 houses that are within -- that can hear and be 54 affected by these flights. 55

But legally speaking, it's from the point of 56 view of feasibility study, you might be able to get away 57 with it legally. But then again, who is behind this 58 report that wants to -- since when is it about what they 59 can do away with legally? 60

And there again, you have the Airport 61 Commission that was appointed by the City Council that 62 already has given instructions to the airport management 63 to maximize the number of flights. City Council has 64 appointed the Airport Commission. The Airport Commission 65 selected the contractor that wrote the Environmental 66 Impact Report.

Another thing that the speaker tonight 67

17 conventionally neglected to mention, that under 3,6, 18 residents getting noise abatement for their -- and 19 sound treatment for their homes would be required to 20 accept, in trade a noise easement over their properties. 21

And to the Alliance group, I would say since 22 you were the second one to speak, your representative, and 23 you said that the EIR addressed the residents ' concern, of 24 which only one has spoken yet. And I hadn't spoken yet. 25 How do you know whether the EIR addressed my concerns or 26 not? 27 I guess that's it. Thank you.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. And could you spell your 28 last name one more time for her?

MR. HUGO: It's H-u-g-o.

MS. EBERHARD: Next?

MR. FRELEAUX: Good evening. My name is Daniel 29 Freleaux, F-r-e-l-e-a-u-x. I live at 5451 Stearns Street 30 in Los Altos area. I've lived in that general part of 31 town for better than 50 years.

I'd like to invite anyone who has 32 a shop on Ocean Avenue, come on over to Los Altos Shopping 33 Center and set up shop and try and hold conversation on 34 your telephone throughout the day. You'd be interrupted a 35 number of times.

Also, I'd like to invite anyone that lives in 36 Belmont Shore to come on down and live on Stearnslee or 37 Montair or Heather and see what it is like. I don't think 38 you have any legitimacy at this meeting. Okay.

As far as insulating 11 houses in the 65 -- I'm 39 sorry. I forgot what all the letters were, but it doesn't 40 make any difference because the sound insulation is a 41 small matter.

You feel the vibration. Goes through your 42 building. I've been there. I went to Minnie Gant. I've 43 been on both sides of the landing and takeoff pattern.

Sometimes you seriously feel the vibration.

You don't -- I mean, hearing it is a secondary 44 matter. I have black spots that lands on my property from 45 the air -- I assume from the airplanes. I live far enough 46 away from the harbor that I doubt -- it may contribute, 47 but nonetheless.

I think that the idea that the airport is a 48 driving matter for Long Beach economy is absurd. It's 49 ludicrous. Long Beach has a vibrant population. It has a 50 university. It could have a lot more facilities for its 51 residents and perhaps not have to charge so much that 52 people really don't want to go downtown.

Anyways, I thank you for your time.

MS. EBERHARD: Thank you, sir.

Next?

MS. NADEAU: Hi, my name is Jane Nadeau. That's N, 18 as in Nancy, A, as in alpha, D, as in delta, O-u. I 19 live at 3921 Lemon in Bisby Knolls.

And as much as I have tried to get used to the 21 noise, that's not my main issue, although I really would 22 not like to have ten, twenty flights taking off 11:20, 23 1:30, and the lovely one this morning at 4:17 a.m.

My concern is the pollution, and I'm really 24 concerned that the EIR hasn't addressed it fully,
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1 especially since I've been told that it contains -- the
2 studies were used were from the seventies, and with the
3 paper saying on a daily basis that the AQMD and CEQA and
4 everybody -- not CEQA, but AQMD is saying that we have
5 some of the worst pollution in the area. And yes, I know
6 the port contributes significantly, and they're working on
7 it, allegedly.
8 My concern is with the airport, and I too have
9 to keep windows closed because of the dust, and you can
10 wipe down our furniture all the time. It doesn't matter.
11 It's the dirt next day.
12 And Hughes, Saint Barnabus and Longfellow
13 schools are in my neighborhood, and those kids are
14 impacted, and I'm really worried about that, and I think
15 you need more accurate data. You need to do a better
16 health risk assessment, especially when so many people are
17 being affected by asthma and cancer.
18 And the 405 contributes, too. So does the 710.
19 But why are we going to add one more time without doing
20 some proper studies?
21 Thanks.
22 MS. FISHER: Thank you.
23 Other speakers?
24 MS. LEISHMAN: My name is Julie Leishman,
25 L-e-i-sh-m-a-n. I live at 1818 Greenbrier Road in the
26 Los Altos area, and I work in Orange County, and I have a
27 lot of contact with people because I'm out in the field,
28 and I always ask everybody what they think of the Long
29 Beach Airport.
30 And I know everybody complains that everybody
31 -- all the people from Orange County come and use
32 the airport, but I would say 99 percent of the people that
33 I've talked to are very happy with the airport. They like
34 the convenience. They like to be able to come in and out,
35 to drop people off, and they're very happy with the Long
36 Beach Airport. That's one.
37 The thing that I'm concerned about is Los Altos
38 is a cancer cluster, and there's been a lot of cancer
39 incidents just on my street alone, and I don't see where
40 that's been addressed in this EIR.
41 So my question would be how was that addressed
42 or where was that addressed? Because it's a problem.
43 Thank you.
44 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you very much.
45 Other speakers?
46 MR. BROWN: My name is Thomas Brown, and I live at
47 7049 El Paseo, and I live in -- I work in Belmont Shores.
48 I'm a travel agent.
49 And I just want to say I've been following it
50 -- I haven't participated, but I've been following it, and
51 just looking at your study here, Exhibit 3, it's a
52 very well-designed airport. I mean, it looks good. Look at
53 that. But if you go to Exhibit 5, Exhibit 4, it's
54 completely surrounded by neighborhoods.
55 And so most places that you travel to, the
56 airport is located outside of the City, and so, I mean,
57 it's completely surrounded by neighborhoods.
58 And I heard a while back from somebody -- I'm
59 five years in the neighborhood -- that originally, the
60 airport was being talked about being built out in the port
61 somewhere, which that would make sense to me, but I guess
62 we're beyond that.
63 So I'm just in favor of Alternative C because
64 in 1941, the current airport was built and it was what,
65 35,000 feet? And they keep confusing the issue saying
66 that a new build is 56,000 feet, 56,000 feet with the
67 tents and all that, that's what, 80 percent larger than
68 the original building.
69 So to me that is -- that's what I'm in favor
70 for. Thanks.
71 MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
72 Next? I saw at least one more.
73 MR. FUASICK: Good evening. My name is Kimball
74 Fuasick, F-u-a-s-i-c-k. I live in the 3rd
75 District at 801 Less Avenue.

My home is located directly below the major
inbound flight path. I've lived in my current home for 19
years. I am concerned with things such as the appearance
of our airport, the CATs, the trailers and the lack of car
parking and security issues.
But by far, my biggest concern is the
inadequate number of aircraft parking positions. I do fly
out of Long Beach quite a bit, and on numerous occasions
I've flown into Long Beach, arrived on time and then sat
on the tarmac for up to 20 minutes, jet engines still
running, waiting for a parking position.
This makes absolutely no sense environmentally,
and I hope as a community, we can agree to proceed with
the improvements as soon as possible.
Thank you.
MS. EBERHARD: Thank you.
Sir?
MR. HANSON: My name is Roy Hanson, H-a-n-s-o-n. I
live at 104 Santa Ana Avenue, Long Beach.
I've been a resident of the county since 1941.
Most of the folks here probably haven't, and most of them
probably got here because of the construction of freeways
and the variety of things that have made this a community
that's livable, and every one of those improvements
negatively impacted the environment to some degree.
40 cont.
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1. MS. EBERHARD: Thank you. Anyone else? Okay, I see a hand.
2. I will tell you when we're done with anyone that wants to make presentation to the group, the court reporter will be available to take your comments individually if anyone wants to do that, assuming I think we're doing very well on time. So she'll be here for that.
3. Go ahead.
4. MS. BAUCH: I apologize I got here a little late tonight, and I didn't actually get to hear, but from what I can see on the report, I'm not really seeing a lot of things that we requested and that we were so concerned about that we expressed to all our councilman, that we talked about in meetings, and I would just like to reiterate that 16 for the record.
5. One of the things that comes to mind is the sense of an environmental impact report, because we live in the neighborhood, because everybody that lives in Long Beach or nearby is impacted by the airport, by the pollution that will be invected by an expanded airport.
6. I live in the neighborhood. It's fine with improvements and reasonable improvements. We understand that that's a necessity, but let's be reasonable.
7. And also, just saddens me that there wasn't a cumulative study done on traffic congestion, the freeway, 405, and the airport and everything that's going on that could actually affect the environment in the next few years with the expansion. So I just wanted to mention that.
8. And also, just to mention that I think that this is a little bit ridiculous to be pushing this item during the holidays, and if we could at all wait 'til January, that would be wonderful.
9. MS. EBERHARD: Could you just state your name and address for the record?
11. MS. EBERHARD: Okay. Anyone else? Our numbers are dwindling, but we have time. I'll give you another minute to think about it. Anyone? Any comments?
12. Well, thank you. And again, don't forget there's Saturday's meeting and Monday night. There's handouts. As you walk out, there are handouts out there. You can speak with the court reporter and make your comments for the record. And otherwise, thank you very much. We really appreciate you coming out tonight. Thank you and drive safely.
13. (Brief recess.)
14. MS. WELDON. My name is Judith Weldon, W-e-l-d-o-n.
Commenter 207 Judith Weldon

I live at 1901 Fairwood, Fa-n-w-o-o-d, in the Los Altos area. I arrived late at the meeting, but I didn't hear anybody say that they addressed the safety issue in the EIR.

Long Beach Airport is in the top 5 percent of major inclusions on the airport. I know they have a new instrument that they're putting into effect to prevent this.

But I also want to bring up the fact that the recent Jet Blue flight that came in about a month or so, again, that had to come in with a nose wheel was bent.

We had our band radio on, which we could hear the pilot talking to the communication tower. He was given the choice of what airport he wanted to fly into, whether it be Long Beach, Ontario, Palmdale or Los Angeles or LAX. He picked LAX.

He said he would not fly into Long Beach because it was surrounded by residential. He did not want to fly into Ontario or Palmdale because of the heat and the wind, which he thought would cause an additional turbulence to the landing. So he wanted to fly into LAX.

We also think the reason why he didn't want to fly into Long Beach was because that would tie up the one major runway at Long Beach airport, which would mean that all the rest of the Jet Blue flights would have to be detoured elsewhere. And I'm wondering if this shouldn't be taken into consideration or the people at least know about it.

(Whereupon the comments session was concluded at 8:07 p.m.)
Comment Card

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

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

As a user of the airport I always arrive key topic before key topic. As I leave I
what cross the street with on coming traffic
(finding up people) to get a taxi. I feel
this to may be a hazardous to cross.
Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name: Ed Barwick
Address: 5408 Long St., L.B., 90808
Email: EdBarwick@aol.com

Comments can also be submitted to: I would like a copy of the EIR on CD.

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

Please provide your comments below and complete the opposite side of this card. Thank you.
Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name

Address
861 College Place
Long Beach, Cal. 90815

Street
City
Zip Code

Email

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

I am very disappointed in meeting. I arrived on time at 6:30 pm but when I came at 6:30 pm (again) the meeting was well on its way, the ladies spoke too fast and not loud enough. I don’t care what you do to the airport as long as there are NO MORE FLIGHTS over my house.

How close is concluded. Just over 11 houses are under the landing pattern. What are left of Warner Ranch? Is there an emergency runway between my house & airport?
Comment 211

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

Name  MARK L. BIXBY
Address  501 MARGO AVE.  LB  90803
Email  Mark@bixbylund.com

Comments can also be submitted to:
Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA  90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.
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Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

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

I would like to ensure that the EIR states that any amount of airline parking pads less than the studied and recommended 14 would have:
(1) negative environmental impacts; (2) more jet idling and emissions AND negative operational impacts; (3) gate crowding, throughput and safety issues.
Comment Card

Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 20, December 3, December 5, 2005

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

1. Is determination of "environmentally compatible" based on solely energy efficiency (i.e. green equipment)?

2. Ex. bottom slide on page 7: Pl. clarify: "air quality impacts would remain significant" is this during construction or airport operations with proposed improvements.

3. Your proposed mitigation measures suggested by the city. Does the city have sufficient staff to do this.

4. Did you consider 500 passengers jet walking which the proposed project would accommodate, and an increased number of cars coming to the airport due to the larger planes?
Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name
A. Freleau

Address
5451 Stearns St  
L.B., CA  90815

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

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

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

1) You assume that travelers will park at the airport - in reality, most people choose to be dropped off/picked up to save parking fees - your analysis did not take that into account.

2) Nitrogen oxides are still significant per your study.

3) All pollutants were significant, you state now it's better with occasional use of electrical equipment. That does not solve the issue - occasional use.

4) No one states what the noise level was for previous year, also the 25 commuter flights have been filled.
Name: George Garcia
Address: 1081 Marcellus St., Long Beach, CA 90807

Comments can also be submitted to:
Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

1. Exhibits 4-7 are very confusing and not all together truthful. The noise level extends much further than the lines on Exhibits 4-7, depending on wind conditions, the planes land West to East and take off East to West. The jargon is confusing... 60 CNEL means what? 2. I'm disappointed that the report didn't look at the effects of air quality of residents. My breathing is much more impaired since living in Bixley Heights.
Comment 215

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

Name
Patricia Garcia

Address
3625 Cerritos Long Beach 90807

Email

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

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

1) This draft EIR fails to adequately address the pollution (air & noise) hazards. A more thorough health risk assessment should have been made.

2) It is not readily clear from the draft EIR how the additional freeway traffic resulting from increased airport activity will affect the environment.
Comment 216

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

Name: Tamara J. Hock
Address: 5403 E. Adderley Dr., Long Beach, 90805
Email: T408537@aol.com

Comments can also be submitted to:
Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

I understand the lack of Jetways but will there be anyway to better serve physically challenged travellers? Perhaps enclosed ramps?
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Comment Card

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

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

1. Since there won't be any jetways, will there be ramps to the planes for boarding?
2. Am very pro Long Beach Alliance and want to see real improvement of the airport.
Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

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

Please extend the review process to at least 90 days total (This is a very small amount of time to evaluate this complex confusing report). There are many undefined terms & unsupported conclusions. Many aspects don't add up - don't make sense. In the end the greatest concern should be for the quality of life of Long Beach residents. I'm in favor of improving what we currently have & not adding any more square footage.
THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
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Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name: Dan Thompson
Address: 7259 Roswell L.B. 90811
Email: D5DT62@cs.com

Comments can also be submitted to:
Angela Reynolds, Environmental Officer
City of Long Beach
Planning and Building
333 West Ocean Blvd.
Long Beach, CA 90802

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

1. Build it as soon as possible.
2. Let's get it done.
3. Use only L.B. business people to do it.
4. Put as much glass in the outer walls as possible.
5. 

1
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Long Beach Airport Terminal Area Improvement Project EIR
Public Meeting
November 29, December 3, December 5, 2005

Name  Bill & Judy Wilson
Address  1901 Fairwood Ave. Long Beach  90815
Street
City
Zip Code

Email

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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

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

1. Did the study take into consideration the impact of airline arrivals and departures scheduled, e.g. when (3) or (4) flights are scheduled to depart or arrive within a very short period of time, like 20 minutes? When you say the noise would be less then significant, what does significant mean?

2. 
Comment Card

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

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

"If you build it, they will come." This phrase summarizes the proposed expansion of Long Beach Airport. The proponents of this project have other concerns than the surrounding neighborhoods. Long Beach Airport is in the middle of houses and neighborhoods. Almost all other airports around the world are located outside the city for a reason. San Diego Airport is in the process of being moved away from its close proximity to the city. Why degrade the neighborhoods surrounding LAX Airport?"
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TRANSCRIPT OF PROJECT PRESENTATION AND FORUM FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS
RE: LONG BEACH TERMINAL AREA IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

COMMUNITY CENTER - LONG BEACH CITY HALL
333 WEST OCEAN BOULEVARD
LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA
NOVEMBER 9, 2006
9:28 A.M.

MARY B. FISHER, CDR 0143
05-265

1 PRESENTERS:
2 Christine Eberhard, Facilitator, CommuniQuest
3 Kathleen Brady, Bonterra Consulting
4 Jessica Feldman, Jones & Stokes
5 Cindy Krebs, Bonterra Consulting
6 Janet Harvey, Meyer, Mohadesse Associates, Inc.
7 Vince Mestre, Mestre Greve Associates
8 John Pehrson, CDM
9
10 PUBLIC COMMENTS (in order of appearance):
11 Terry Jensen
12 Doug Haubert
13 Mark Bixby
14 Malcolm Green
15 James Bell
16 Phyllis Orman
17 Thomas Brown
18 Jane Nadeau
19 Kevin McAdooen
20
21
22
23
24
25
1 LONG BEACH, CALIFORNIA, SATURDAY, DECEMBER 2, 2005;
2 9:28 A.M.
3
4 MS. EBERHARD: Okay, we have the official go, so
5 we'll get started.
6 Thank you very much for coming out this
7 morning, and for those of you that have been waiting.
8 patiently, a special thank you.
9 My name is Chris Eberhard with a firm called
10 CommuniQuest. I'm a subconsultant to Bonterra on this
11 project, and you’ll hear from Kathleen in a little bit.
12 Again, thank you, especially on a Saturday
13 morning, for taking time out of your busy week and this
14 weekend morning. This is the second of what’s going to be
15 three public meetings. The next one is Monday,
16 December 5th at the Petroleum Club, which I believe is
17 3656 Linden. Most of you are probably familiar with where
18 it is.
19 There are handouts that it looks like most of
20 you have. If you didn’t, they’re out front, correct?
21 There should be three different ones, one for the power
22 point presentation that you’re going to see here in a few
23 minutes, and one is the project description, and then the
24 third one is an abbreviated executive summary.
25 The draft EIR is available for review on the
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The timing for the meeting will be four hours. Or three hours. I’m sorry. And the presentation is going to take about an hour. And then any of you that are interested in making comments, we can do it at that time. As you know, there’s restrooms out over to the right, and feel free to kind of get up and move around if you need to, but I would caution you that we do have a court reporter here today.

Mary was with us the other evening and is here again today, and if you have side conversations, it would be helpful if you went out in the hall so that there isn’t disruption because she has to hear carefully.

With that, I will begin the presentation. I’ll introduce Kathleen Brady, the project manager from Bonterra, and she’ll get us started.

MS. BRADY: Thank you, Chris.

One thing I’d like to comment on is for the people on the side, sometimes it’s harder to see the power point slides because there’s some distortion. So if you’ll leave it at that.

As Chris indicated, I’m Kathleen Brady, and I’m with Bonterra Consulting, and our firm has prepared the Environmental Impact Report consistent with the Environmental Quality Act. Also with me are some of the experts who prepared the technical studies on which the findings of the EIR are based.

Jesse Feldman is the architectural historian with Jones & Stokes. They prepared the cultural analysis. Cindy Krubs is also with Bonterra Consulting and prepared the hazardous materials and public services analysis and will also be discussing aesthetics today. Vince Mestre, with Mestre, Greve & Associates, conducted the noise analysis. Janet Harvey with Meyer. Mohaddess Associates, prepared the traffic analysis, and John Pechton, with CDMM, was responsible for the air quality and human health risk assessment.

The EIR was prepared with the basic premise that the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance would not be modified. The key objective is to provide airport facilities to accommodate the maximum -- excuse me -- the highest number of flights at the airport, which per the ordinance is 41 commercial flights and 25 commuter flights and have it in full compliance with all applicable fire, building and safety codes, as well as other applicable standards. Associated with that objective is the commitment to compliance with the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance and maintaining the current character of the airport terminal building as a Long Beach cultural heritage landmark.

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

This exhibit, by the way, is in the handout of the summary document, because I know it’s pretty hard to see. But to give you some bearings, here’s Lakewood Boulevard, here’s the terminal building area, the existing parking structure, and the improvements would be in this area through here. The area that’s shown with the hash marks is the area that’s currently leased to Million Air and would be used for some of the parking, aircraft parking improvements.

The proposed parking structure is here, and associated with that -- and I’ll be discussing this more -- is the extension. Currently, the Douglas Drive Loop ramp comes through here. Because of the parking structure, it would extend out to Lakewood and have a right-out only. I’m never going to get this straight. I’m just going to pass it to you.

As previously indicated, a basic premise of the project was maintaining the tenets of the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, and the ordinance allows a minimum of 41 commercial carrier flights and 25 commuter flights. These facilities proposed as part of the project have been sized to accommodate the passenger levels associated with the minimum number of flights. The Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance also allows the number of flights to increase over the minimum 41 flights provided the noise budget outlined in the ordinance is not exceeded.

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

Under optimal conditions, which have never been achieved at the airport, the estimated number of increased flights would range between seven and eleven flights. Though the proposed project, which is the terminal area improvements, would not either directly or indirectly allow the increased number of flights, at the direction of the City Council, the EIR evaluated the impacts associated with the maximum number of flights that could be expected.
In the EIR analysis, this was identified as the
optimized flight scenario because in order to be achieved,
the flight level, the airlines would have to optimize
their operations, and the optimized flight scenario
assumed 52 daily commercial flights and 25 daily flights.
The proposed improvements are in 13 primary
areas, which are listed up here, and I will get into these
in just a few moments. The City Council established the
size of these improvements in February 2003.

Also as part of our evaluation, a basic concept
plan was provided to the consultant team so that we would
have some of our basic parameters for evaluation in the
EIR, and it is premature to develop a final design of the
airport until the improvements are approved by the City
Council and an alternative selection is selected.

But during the final design, as well as the
concept plan, the design -- excuse me -- the precise size
and configuration would be ensured through compliance with
the applicable fire codes and safety and security
requirements, that the overall size of the airport
improvements would not exceed the square footage
allocations and would be consistent with the parameters
ultimately adopted by the City Council.

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

These include the 1990 MOU, which was adopted
by the Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council
pertaining to modifications of the terminal building.

This MOU, Memorandum of Understanding, includes the
Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation of
historic buildings.

There's also the development and use standards
for the Long Beach Airport terminal plan development
ordinance, which is the zoning code, and also a 2005
memorandum which provided guidance on any new construction
at the airport.

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

As I said, the improvements are in 13 basic
areas, and this shows the terminal area. It does not show
the parking structure. But to give you a feel here, here
is the existing terminal building, and here is the Donald
Douglas Loop Road in front of the terminal.

The gray color are areas that are proposed to
be enclosed as part of buildings. Kind of light green
area would be open kiosks where they'd be covered, but --
they would be open sides but have a cover. And then the
darker green are proposed as garden areas.

The first area identified was the holdrooms,
which is proposed back here. And this exhibit also, by
the way, is in the summary document handout if you want to
follow along with that.

Currently, the airport holdrooms are comprised
of all the 1984 permanent holdrooms and the temporary
modular buildings. As part of the proposed project, the
13,150 square feet of temporary holdroom currently being
provided through the use of modular buildings would be
replaced with 21,101 square feet of permanent floor space.
This is a net increase of 8,921 square feet.

The second area was concessions, which the
concept plan shows as being in this location, and these
would serve the new holdrooms area. Currently, there are
5,460 square feet of concession at the airport, and the
proposed project would add an additional 9,541 square
feet.

The passenger security screening would be done
in this location. You basically come in and go through
the terminal building, which is actually how the original
design of the terminal was, that it was open in the back
to the airfield area. And the security, passenger
security screening, would be in that location.

This would be designed to meet the requirements
of the Transportation Security Administration, also known
as TSA. And currently, there are 3,900 square feet of
passenger screening, and with the proposed project, there
would be an additional 7,000 square feet devoted to this
use.

With the baggage security screening in this
design, which is -- currently, the airport does not
provide a structure for conducting baggage screening, and
since 2003, this has been done under a canopy, and TSA has
indicated that this open-air situation is not sufficient
because of the sensitivity of the equipment being used.

And the proposed project would provide for a 7,000 square
foot structure for security screening of baggage.

The baggage would then go to an adjacent
open-air area called the baggage makeup area, which would
just be covered.

The baggage claim devices would be over in this
area. And currently, the airport has 226 linear feet of
passenger-side baggage claim devices, and with the
proposed project, the area would provide a total of 510
linear square feet. And this is an area that would be
| 1. open air similar to how it is now, whether it be covered |
|---|---|
| 2. with a roof or a canopy. |
| 3. The sixth area is the baggage service office |
| 4. and multipurpose rooms. These are shown down here in the |
| 5. corner, this little area through here. |
| 6. And the airport does not have a baggage service |
| 7. office or any sufficient meeting room space, and the |
| 8. proposed project would allocate 900 square feet for a |
| 9. baggage service office and 300 square feet for a |
| 10. multipurpose room. |
| 11. This area would provide for holding of |
| 12. unclaimed bags, bags that were misdirected or for |
| 13. reporting lost luggage. The multipurpose room would |
| 14. provide an on-site meeting space for shift briefings, |
| 15. training and other meetings for airport and tenant staff |
| 16. whose job duties do not allow them to leave the terminal |
| 17. area. |
| 18. Restrooms would be provided over in here, and |
| 19. there would be a 2,000 square foot increase in restrooms |
| 20. in the non-security area for a total of 13,730 square feet |
| 21. of restrooms. |
| 22. The eighth area of improvements is office |
| 23. space, which would be designed to meet the TSA, the |
| 24. airlines and airport administration needs. TSA would have |
| 25. an area through here. As I said, final design, the |

| 1. precise locations and such may change some, but this is |
| 2. the basic concept. |
| 3. The airline offices -- I'm not sure if I |
| 4. mentioned that. The TSA would have 5,191 square feet of |
| 5. permanent space. Currently, they're in a modular |
| 6. building, temporary modular building. |
| 7. The airline offices are currently housed in |
| 8. approximately 2,000 square feet, and an additional 3,754 |
| 9. square feet would be allocated for this use. That's over |
| 10. in here. The airport offices and conference areas would |
| 11. increase from 6,970 square feet to 11,970 square feet, |
| 12. maybe off in there. |
| 13. The ticketing facilities at the airport would |
| 14. also be expanded. The ticketing facilities can be broken |
| 15. into four categories, ticketing counter area, ticketing |
| 16. counter queuing area, airline ticket office, and |
| 17. circulation for the ticketing. |
| 18. And the combined space for ticketing |
| 19. operations, all four categories, at the airport would |
| 20. increase from 6,423 square feet from the current 8,410 up |
| 21. to 14,000 square feet, and this would be in this location |
| 22. here. |
| 23. The airline gates. Currently, the airport has |
| 24. eight aircraft gates for boarding and loading and |
| 25. unloading of aircraft, and with the proposed project, this |

| 1. would increase to 11 gates. The term "gates" at Long |
| 2. Beach Airport is used to identify the doors and the |
| 3. holdrooms that are used for passenger boarding. You can |
| 4. see the little lines through here. So these would be the |
| 5. gates. |
| 6. There would be no possibility for jetways at |
| 7. the airport. Jetways are where you provide direct access |
| 8. from the airport terminal to the aircraft itself, and in |
| 9. order for jetways to be constructed, there needs to be a |
| 10. second story, and the proposed improvements are one story |
| 11. and could not be retrofitted to accommodate a second story |
| 12. because of their design. |
| 13. The aircraft parking positions. Currently, the |
| 14. airport has ten aircraft parking positions, and this would |
| 15. be increased to as many as 14, and they're shown in this |
| 16. location. |
| 17. And as I indicated earlier when I pointed out |
| 18. on that other exhibit the thatched markins where there's |
| 19. land that's currently leased to Million Air for general |
| 20. aviation tie-down and delay parking, that general aviation |
| 21. aircraft would be displaced, and they would be relocated |
| 22. to a new tie-down area on Parcel O, which would be located |
| 23. south of runway 12-30, the long runway down by Clark and |
| 24. Willow Street. And this use down on Parcel O is |
| 25. consistent with the March 2003 Long Beach airport |

| 1. development area's map |
| 2. There's also the potential that aircraft |
| 3. hangars for small general aviation aircraft could be |
| 4. provided on Parcel O. |
| 5. Vehicular parking is the twelfth area of |
| 6. improvements. As I said, it does not show on this |
| 7. exhibit, but I did point it out on the other aerial |
| 8. photograph. |
| 9. Currently, vehicular parking at the airport is |
| 10. available through surface lots in the parking structure |
| 11. and from off site parking lots leased from the airport |
| 12. from Boeing, which is known as lot D. |
| 13. There are currently 2,852 permanent parking |
| 14. spaces at the airport and approximately 2100 leased |
| 15. spaces, and the leased spaces are on a month to month |
| 16. basis, and the proposed project would construct a new |
| 17. parking structure, which would combine the existing |
| 18. parking structure and the surface parking to provide a |
| 19. total of 6,286 spaces on site. This would eliminate the |
| 20. need for the off-site parking, and the project would have |
| 21. a net increase of 1,351 parking spaces from what's |
| 22. currently available at the airport. |
| 23. As I mentioned earlier, because of the |
| 24. parking structure's location, it would require the |
| 25. relocation of the east side of Donald Douglas Loop Drive. |
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Also associated with the modifications to the 
structure, which would include a new facade to match the 
parking structure and complement the architecture of the 
terminal building. And this would provide a unified 
appearance and enhancement of the aesthetics at the 
airport with — and the identification of the airport 
terminal building as a cultural heritage landmark.

And the final area of improvements is, as I 
mentioned, the loop road for Donald Douglas, extending 
that out, as well as other modifications for signage and 
lighting for vehicular and pedestrian traffic through the 
parking structures and lots.

As far as how it would look, the City has 
adopted the guiding principles, which I mentioned earlier, 
for ensuring that the modifications would reflect the 
historic airport terminal or enhance that, and the City 
highly values the terminal building and wants to ensure 
its historic integrity.

To accomplish this, the design ensured that the 
improvements would not look like add-ons to the terminal 
building or a wall of structures as you approach, and the 
modifications to the interior of the building were to be 
in keeping with the original design.

This visual here is also in the package, and it 
shows the terminal, the existing terminal building here 
and what it would look like from above on the airdome 
view. So the holdroom, then the side structures, the 
terminal building.

As far as the alternatives that were looked at 
in the EIR, there were three primary alternatives that 
were evaluated. Alternative A was based on the 
improvements proposed in the 2003 NOP with minor 
modifications, and Alternative A assumed the airport 
terminal area would be a maximum of 97,545 square feet 
compared to the 102,000 — slightly over 102,000 with the 
proposed project.

The nature of the improvements would generally 
be the same as the proposed project with minor reduction 
in square footage in all areas except for the baggage 
security screening would be the same as the proposed 
project. There was no additional space assumed for 
ticketing facilities, and the amount of airport office 
space is actually increased compared to the proposed 
project.

The 2003 NOP assumed 16 aircraft parking 
spaces. However, the City Council determined in February 
of 2005 that no more than 14 aircraft parking spaces would 
be evaluated in the EIR. So that is a slight modification 
to what was circulated in 2005.

Alternative B would further reduce the size of 
the airport terminal improvements and would provide a 
maximum of 79,723 square feet. As with the other 
alternative, the nature of the improvements would be 
generally the same. It would not result in any reduction 
in the square footage for the baggage screening, there 
would be no additional space assumed for ticketing, and 
there was no additional space assumed for airport office 
space.

And Alternative C is the no-project 
alternative, and this is required by CEQA, and it assumes 
that no new facilities would be provided at the airport.
And the vehicular parking or spaces that are currently 
leased were assumed not to be available because of the 
short-term nature of the leases, and based on recent 
discussions with Boeing, they have indicated that the 
leases would not be available on a long-term basis.

So as a result, the no-project alternative 
would have a net loss of 2100 parking spaces compared to 
current conditions.

As far as the phasing of the project, the 
proposed project would be based on availability of funding 
and service priorities, but the design is expected to 
begin following the project approval by the City Council 
and, pending funding, it is anticipated that be 
constructed to — in phases to minimize impacts to the 
operations at the airport and as outlined here.

And if this — all these slides are in the 
handouts, so you can read it easier, that the phasing 
would be expected to be the same for all the alternatives, 
with the first level of improvements would be the 
construction of Parcel O, then the parking structure 
improvements, and then the terminal improvements 
initiating approximately March of 2007 and expected to 
take 24 months to complete.

The EIR did identify impacts for the — 
associated with the project. They were aesthetics, 
construction air quality, cultural resources and hazards.
And with the mitigation program, which is in the handout 
of the summary document, all but construction air quality 
impacts would be reduced to less than significant. These 
impacts will be discussed in more detail in a little bit.
And as I indicated earlier, the EIR also 
addressed the optimized flight scenario, the 52 
commercial flights and 25 commuter flights. With the 
optimized flight scenario, there were also impacts for air 
quality, land use and transportation and circulation, and 
after implementation, mitigation measures, only air 
quality impacts would remain significant, unavoidable 
impacts.
There are also benefits associated with the proposed project. The project would provide for enhanced
TSA and airport security by providing better facilities. It would improve existing and future traffic conditions by
providing enhanced parking on site. The project also has a component in it to provide the infrastructure necessary to support electric
ground support equipment, at GSE, which is a heavy pollutant, polluting component of the project. So it would improve air quality.

And though not associated with the project, the EIR, the EIR did not identify a noise impact because we're
keeping to the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, but the EIR does recommend development of a land use
compatibility program with the optimized flights to benefit homes in the 65 CNEL contour and schools within
the 60 contour, and this would be a voluntary noise attenuation program.

CEQA also does require the identification of an environmentally superior alternative. This is done by
comparing the impacts associated with the various alternatives that are evaluated, as well as the ability of
the alternatives to meet the project objectives.

And while the no-project alternative would avoid construction-related impacts, it would have more
substantial long term traffic impacts, associated air quality impacts because there would not be sufficient
parking, which would result in additional trips associated with meeters and at greeters, which Janet will discuss in
more detail later.

And also, the no-project would not include the mitigation measures that arc associated with the human
health risk assessment, would be providing the infrastructure for the GSE.

So given that there was also not very substantial -- the impacts associated with the various
alternatives were not substantially different because they are providing very similar type of improvements, the
footprint would not be that substantially different because there's not a large range in the type of
improvements and the sizing, that each alternative would provide additional capacity to help serve the number of
passengers, and they would all still meet the minimum number of flights provided for in the Airport Noise
Compatibility program.

The project alternative was viewed as the environmentally superior alternative because it would better be able to meet needs of the project objectives by providing the required facilities to serve the flights and their associated passengers.

HNTB had conducted a study in 2004 during the scoping process to make recommended sizes of the facilities to best meet the needs, and all of the HNTB recommendations exceed even the square footage of the proposed project.

And so it was felt that since the proposed project would be able to meet all the objectives and would better be able to meet the needs, that it was identified as the environmentally superior alternative.

As far as if the project would -- what we're looking at right now is the certification of the EIR by the Planning Commission, and that is only a determination of if the EIR addresses the impacts associated with the proposed project. It does not approve the project itself.

That's a separate action taken by the City Council, and in addition to that, the actual design would have to be reviewed by the Cultural Heritage Commission, and a certificate of appropriateness would have to be issued prior to any sort of construction.

With that, I'll turn it over to Breccia, who will talk about the historical nature.

MS. FELDMAN: Thank you, Kathleen.

First, I'd like to present a little bit of background information on the airport terminal building historical significance before discussing impacts from the proposed improvements.

As many of you may already know, the airport terminal building, built in 1941, was designated in 1990 as a City of Long Beach Cultural Heritage Landmark. A few reasons for the designation were it was or is the first municipal airport in the Southern California region; it exemplifies the historical and economic heritage of the community; it is considered a masterpiece of an early American style, modern style, Streamline Moderne, and is unique to the City; the use of the ceramic mosaic tile throughout the building was considered innovative at the time, and the use of representational images reflected the artistic trends of the era; it is the quintessential theme building of the airport and its signature element; and it is the most prominent visual feature of the airport, which represents an established and familiar visual feature of the neighborhood.

In order to determine if proposed improvements would constitute changes in the significance of the historical resource, it's necessary to identify character-defining features of the building.

Character-defining features are those architecturally significant interior and exterior elements that best convey the original use of the building. Some of the character-defining features of the airport terminal
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1 building, which were identified from site visits,
2 historical research and photoraphs, include but are not
3 limited to the architectural style and the related
4 elements, such as the rounded windows and vents, the
5 geometric panels in the rear elevation, the curved walls,
6 smooth surfaces, the building's footprint, which is shaped
7 as a segment of an arc, the stepped-back stories, second
8 and third stories. The original windows and doors were
9 carefully designed in relationship to the building and
10 surrounding mosaic tiles.

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

17 However, several components of the proposed
18 improvements would significantly alter or change some
19 character-defining features, which under CEQA is
20 considered a significant impact.

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

26 removal or obscuring of original details.
27 However, we feel the proposed mitigation
28 measures and changes in design would reduce these impacts
29 to a level less than significant.

30 And now I'm going to turn it over to Cindy, who
31 will discuss the aesthetics, hazards, hazardous waste and
32 public services section.

33 MS. KREBS: Thank you.
34 First I want to speak about aesthetics, which
35 is the CEQA EIR word for how things look.
36 The City zoning ordinance and the May 1990 MOU
37 both set forth guidelines for improvements to the airport
38 terminal building. Those guidelines talk about building
39 siting and stipulate that space should be incorporated
40 between buildings to avoid a wall-like appearance.
41 They also discuss building heights, and the
42 focus is that there is compliance with FAA height
43 restrictions and also that the new buildings would
44 integrate well with the existing buildings.
45 Parking structures are also covered, and the
46 design theme for that would include rooftop landscape
47 planters and also an observance of height restrictions.
48 And then as far as overall design is concerned,
49 the guidelines say that the unique architectural features
50 should be preserved and be consistent with, as well as in

51 harmony with, the existing terminal building.
52 During construction, the proposed project would
53 temporarily alter views of the project site. The types of
54 things that would occur during construction, there would
55 be staging of construction equipment. Materials would be
56 brought on site and stored, such as soil that may be
57 stored in stockpiles, surfaces would be graded, and trucks
58 traffic would occur. Those impacts would only be
59 temporary and would only occur during construction.

60 Also during construction, there could be
61 potential light and glare impacts. Those would be
62 associated with security lighting, as well as light
63 emanating from the proposed improvements.

64 The mitigation program that's proposed would
65 reduce those impacts to a level considered less than
66 significant by recommending and implementing the following
67 types of features: Low intensity lighting, orientation or
68 shielding away from streets and residences. That is the
69 light would be shielded so that it doesn't create glare
70 towards streets or residences. And then the glass that
71 would be used in the building would be less than 20%
72 percent reflective.

73 The proposed project would be compatible with
74 the existing terminal building in size, massing, scale and
75 style. With respect to the size and massing, when you

76 look at the way that the existing buildings are laid out
77 on the terminal or at the airport with all the holdrooms
78 and everything that's kind of ancillary to the terminal
79 building itself, there is quite a spread and quite a
80 footprint that already exists there.

81 The proposed design of the new building
82 wouldn't expand much beyond where all the temporary
83 buildings and everything are on site right now.

84 With respect to scale, the new buildings would
85 be lower in elevation than the existing terminal building
86 so that views from the back, such as the restaurant and
87 deck, all of that would still be available.

88 And with respect to style, the new construction
89 would incorporate some stylistic elements of the
90 Streamline Moderne architectural theme. It would
91 incorporate curved roofs. The west wall of the holdrooms
92 would be mostly windows. The arc shape, which is a
93 characteristic feature of the terminal building, as
94 Jessica mentioned, would be copied in the roof shape of
95 the small attached building, and the elevation of the new
96 roof would be higher as it moves from there toward the
97 front of the building. All of those will be Streamline
98 Moderne, stepped elevation.

99 In the picture that's here and in your packet
100 shows an aerial view from the land side of the airport.
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1. Did want to mention this view isn't available to hardly
2. anybody because of the flat topography of the area around
3. the airport and all the existing buildings. There would
4. be just a few people who would have any view that would be
5. anything -- that would show anything as extensive as this.
6. With respect to hazardous waste, the analysis
7. approach that we used followed CEQA guidelines, and CEQA
8. guidelines say that the EIR should concern itself with
9. impacts that could result from implementation of the
10. proposed project.
11. Therefore, the analysis that we conducted
12. focused on the areas where the project would have impacts,
13. the terminal areas, the parking areas, and lot O. We did
14. not look at the entire airport, the airfield going all the
15. way up to the 405. We focused on areas where there would
16. be impacts.
17. However, having said that, we did gather data
18. from a wide variety of sources and for areas that extend
19. beyond the proposed project limit. We looked at existing
20. and historic records regarding the use of hazardous and
21. hazardous waste materials at the airport. Those are
22. documented in the June 2005 EIR report.
23. We also looked at state and federal databases
24. regarding known discharges, investigation and remediation
25. activities at the airport, and we gathered information

from airport staff, FBO -- those are fixed-base operators
-- representatives, the Long Beach Fire Department, the
Los Angeles County Sheriff's Air Bureau, and all of them
provided information about their current and past
hazardous material use and containment practices at the
airport.

Among the types of information they provided us
were past spill and cleanup efforts. We also know and
have documented where there are underground and
above-ground storage tanks.

We also looked at a 1998 asbestos survey and
found that there is asbestos, as you would expect in a
building that was constructed in 1941.

We also in some of these areas used common
sense. We also know because of the age of the building,
there's likely lead-based paint. We also know because of
the location of the airport, that immediately adjacent to
the 405 freeway, that there's probably aerially deposited
lead.

The current and hazardous waste programs and
practices at the airport are all very, very good. We
learned that all the emissions that have occurred have
been addressed appropriately and that all cases have been
closed.

The airport and the City share an ongoing

commitment to the proper handling of hazardous materials
at the airport, and they have documentation of those in a
couple of key documents. One, the Long Beach Airport
Certification Manual, and another, the Long Beach Airport
Rules and Regulations.

Not only does airport staff have to follow
those, but everybody else who uses the airport has to
follow those practices.

The airport also has a storm water pollution
prevention plan. The City's industrial national pollutant
discharge elimination system, NPDES, permit comes into
place, and the City, through their guidelines, through
their programs, ensures that the BMP, best management
practices, are being followed.

All of these programs have been approved by the
FAA, the Federal Aviation Administration, and they
document procedures for addressing fuel handling,
inpection, fuel training, corrective action and
hazardous material cleanup.

In addition, they comply with all local and
State construction building requirements and regulations,
including the Uniform Building Code.

As I mentioned briefly, we know from the 1998
asbestos survey that the terminal building does contain
asbestos, and we assume that it may also contain

lead-based paint. That would be investigated before
construction begins.

We also believe that Parcel O could, although
testing hasn't happened -- and it would precede any
activity -- but could contain aerially deposited lead and
perhaps even trace amounts of DDT. When there was an
airfield project at the airport a couple of years ago,
trace amounts of DDT, well below significant thresholds,
were found because the grassy areas used to be treated
with a fertilizer that contained DDT.

During construction, these hazardous materials
could be released into the atmosphere in the vicinity of
the airport, but through a combination of existing rules
and procedures, as well as the mitigation program that's
recommended, those would be contained, and there would be
assurance that hazardous materials impacts would be
reduced to a level less than significant.

All of the contractors who would be working on
this project would be required to obtain all required
permits, and those permits would ensure that they properly
handle and remove all materials that are considered
hazardous, that appropriate testing takes place and that
regional regulations from the South Coast Air Quality
Management District, the State Water Resources Control
Board and all other applicable procedures and regulations
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are followed.

My final topic is public services. The EIR discusses fire and police protection services, as well as TSA and airport security activities at the airport. It also makes note of the fact that TSA is requesting improvements to enhance the safety at the airport, safety and security.

Kathleen talked about the fact that one of the things that they continue to concern them is that they made a request for improvements to do with the handling of baggage security screening.

The equipment they use is very sensitive and the wind that occurs in the open area situation that they have right now can compromise their ability to perform that task as well as they'd like to.

The proposed project would provide more secure baggage and passenger security screening areas. It would also reduce possible safety hazards that could result from overcrowding.

If any of you have ever been at the airport, used the airport during a peak time, it's not uncommon for crowds to occur outside the terminal, and then as you move into the ticketing area, into the gate and holdrooms, because of the space there is so small, it becomes pretty tight in there right now.

Significant impacts could occur without the proposed project under the optimized flight scenario.

Again, the optimized flight scenario is what's allowed by the Airport Noise Compatibility Ordinance, the 41 plus 25 flights plus 11. Under these conditions, we think that security and circulation, safety, could be more significant concerns at the airport. More passengers, more baggage, just could lead to more crowded conditions.

The staffing levels at the airport for airport security, as well as police and fire protection, would be adjusted as necessary to meet changing demands. Those are all City staff positions, and the City budget provides the flexibility to increase numbers as necessary to meet demands at the airport.

With that, I am going to ask Vince to speak with you about noise.

MR. MESTRE: Thank you.

This is a very brief summary of the noise analysis that is contained in the EIR. EIR section 3.6 is the noise analysis, and it contains much more information than I can squeeze into this presentation.

The very detailed technical studies are contained in appendix F of the EIR. The noise analysis can be summarized in two figures. The first is Exhibit 3.6 dash 9 from the EIR. It shows the existing noise contours for calendar year 2004.

There are 15 homes within the 65 CNEL noise contour, which is the noise level standard used by the State of California and the City of Long Beach. There are no schools within the existing 60 CNEL contours.

On this map, the outer contour is the 60, the yellow is the 65, and the 15 homes are located right here.

The 70 CNEL contour is essentially on airport property, and it's the purplish color that's on this slide.

These slides are in your packet. They are in a different color. I've used a brighter color here so you could see them in the brighter room.

This is a close-up showing the homes within the 65 CNEL contour north and south of the airport. Most of the homes are located right here north of the airport for existing conditions, and there are a couple of homes down here that just are touching the 65 CNEL contour south of the airport.

We looked at future conditions with this project and identified that this project will not affect future conditions. The Long Beach Airport noise ordinance establishes a noise budget for airlines and cargo operators. That budget permits at least 41 air carrier departures a day -- that includes cargo departures -- and 25 commuter aircraft departures per day.

In 2004, 41 air carrier departures were allocated, and on weekdays, that level was reached. The 25 commuter flights are not being used.

The noise budget permits more flights if the airlines operate below the noise budget. How many more flights that could be realized if the airlines and cargo operators use the quietest aircraft available to them and they reduce the number of nighttime violations is an issue that is addressed in the EIR.

That analysis showed that under ideal but realistic assumptions, as many as 11 additional commercial flights could be accommodated. Of course, these additional flights would have to be of the quietest aircraft types and not during the night hours.

That slide should have been up during that whole speech. Sorry about that.

These are the noise contours for the potential optimized flight conditions in the future. The potential future case that was analyzed in the EIR is the case where the 11 additional flights are realized and the 25 commuter flights occur. These noise contours are shown as Exhibit 4.2, 3.6 dash 14 in the EIR.

Most importantly, achieving the budget potential of 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter flights is not dependent on this project. Can
three additional flights occur without this project? And
the answer is yes.

For the case of the future potential contours
with 11 additional commercial flights and 25 commuter
flights, there are 11 homes in the 65 CNEL contour. There
are two schools that fall within the 60 CNEL contour.
This is the Minnie Gant Elementary School and a special
education building at the School Safety and Emergency
Preparedness offices.

Here's a close-up of the potential optimized
flight contours. North of the airport, the contours
actually get slightly smaller and there are no homes. The
11 homes that are impacted are all south of the airport as
the contour grows a little bit to the south of the
optimized future flight condition.

This is the location of the 60 CNEL contour
shown here in green, and it falls on the Minnie Gant
Elementary School. This is the 60 CNEL contour and
special education building that's located in the school
emergency preparedness offices, and this is the Leo
Coyotes Diagonal. This is the 65 CNEL contour. This is
the 60 just touching the special ed building.

Even though the potential future noise contours
can be achieved with or without this project, the
mitigation measure has been identified. That's mitigation
measure 3.6 dash 2.

Within 24 months of certification of the EIR,
the airport shall develop a sound insulation program for
homes within the 65 CNEL contour and schools within the 60
CNEL contour. Sound insulation treatment will generally
include sound-rated windows and doors and other
modifications to ensure that the interior noise
environment meets State and local noise limits.

Construction noise analyses are also included
in the EIR. Any night construction on Parcel O will
require noise monitoring, and if the City noise limits are
exceeded, construction will have to stop until the
construction mitigation plan is implemented.

Janet Harvey will now discuss traffic impacts.

MS. HARVEY: Thank you.

For the traffic study, the terminal improvement
project in and of itself, a larger building would not
cause an increase in traffic. Additional trips would
result from the optimized flight scenario due to the
additional passengers. Therefore, the traffic study
performed an analysis of the optimized flight scenario.

The study intersections that we looked at are
on this map here, and you can see they go from Carson on
the north, Willow to the west -- I guess Willow to the
south, Cherry to the west, and Clark on the east side.

Assumptions that were made for the traffic
study again were the optimized flights were in place,
which is your 52 commercial and 25 commuter flights. We
considered the new exit that would go onto southbound
Lakewood Boulevard in the with-project conditions, and the
parking demand was based on 2.75 spaces per 1,000 annual
departing passengers, and this was based on an earlier
study that was completed for the City.

The number of vehicle trips that would occur
under the optimized flight conditions was based on
existing passenger data, and we also compared this data to
the John Wayne and Ontario airport studies that were
recently completed, and the number of vehicle trips is
very comparable, you know, per passenger to these other
airports.

The traffic study looked at two different time
periods. The first one was existing, like today's
conditions, with the project and without optimized flights.
This basically means we wake up tomorrow, the additional
flights and the new building is there. And then we also
looked at 2020 conditions with the optimized flights, and
when compared with project and the no-project, 2020
conditions also assumed that Douglas Park is in place and
open and mitigations for Douglas Park are in place.

For the existing with the project with
optimized flights, we also assume that the off-site
parking at lot D, parking in the Boeing lot, is still
available for use since it's supposed to be like what
would happen tomorrow.

But the study found two impacted intersections,
and these would be at Lakewood and Spring and Lakewood at
Willow, and mitigation measures were recommended as the
passenger numbers increase and, therefore, the traffic
would increase.

We also looked at the 2020 conditions with
optimized flights, and we assumed that no off-site parking
was available on the Boeing lot. And when the City
originally looked at parking for this project, they based
it on the Noise Compatibility Ordinance number of flights
of 41 plus 25 commercial and commuter flights.

But since we're analyzing the optimized flight
scenario, which is the 52 commercial flights, there would
be a parking deficiency, but the proposed project supplies
more parking with the new parking structure.

So just to kind of summarize it, in the
no-project conditions, there's less parking, and when you
have less parking, there's more drop-off trips, and that's
like when someone takes you to the airport, drops you off,
comes back to the airport to pick you up when you arrive
back.
So there's two trips. The number of trips doubles on a drop-off trip instead of you just going and parking and leaving. In the with-project conditions, there's more parking, and therefore, there's less drop-off trips.

So the 2020 traffic study results show that the proposed project with its additional parking generates fewer trips than the no project because more people will be able to drive and park at the airport and less people will have to be dropped off, remembering that drop-off trips generate twice as many trips, in and out both ways, than a single person, a person just driving to the airport and parking.

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

And now we're going to have John talk about air quality analysis and then health risk assessment.

MR. PEHRSON: Good morning, and we're almost done. Air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment began with the development of the protocol. This protocol was submitted and reviewed through the California Air Resources Board and the South Coast Air Quality Management District. The protocol describes the models and methods that are used in the analysis and defines the CEQA significance thresholds that the project impacts are compared to, and it defines the human health risk assessment exposure parameters used in the calculations.

Both the ARB and South Coast AQMD provided comments on our protocol. Their comments were incorporated. We resubmitted a revised protocol for their review. The AQMD had some final comments, and those comments were incorporated in the final protocol.

The protocol can be found as an attachment to Appendix C of the draft EIR. Appendix C provides the details of the air quality impact analysis and human health risk assessment conducted on the project. These results are summarized in section three of the main document.

These are the criteria pollutants that are analyzed in the air quality impact analysis: Carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, ozone precursors, or NOx, and volatile organic compounds, and particulate matter was analyzed as both PM10 and PM2.5. Sulfur dioxide was included, as was lead, which is not shown on this slide, but was a panel item as both a criteria pollutant and a toxic air contaminant, which is shown on the right side of this screen about halfway down.

The other pollutants analyzed in the health risk assessment are diesel particulate matter and the toxic VOC and semi-VOC organic compounds listed on the left side of the screen. PM2.5 included seven of the most toxic compounds commonly found from exhaust emissions. In addition, the human health risk exposure parameters looked at several receptors and exposure duration. Adult residents were assumed to live in the area for 70 years and be exposed to impacts for 350 days per year, and these receptors were assumed to be located at both residence and at school sites.

Workers were assumed to be exposed for 40 years, 245 days per year, and were located at commercial and industrial sites both on and off the airport. These two receptors are required for South Coast AQMD health risk assessment calculations.

In addition, we looked at a number of other receptors for CEQA exposure. These included a child resident and a school child, as well as workers located at schools. Potential cancer risk and non-cancer risk, such as impacts to respiratory and nervous systems, were analyzed. However, none of the project impacts or optimized flight impacts for any of the receptors analyzed exceeded the significance thresholds defined in the protocol.

We did have several impacts for ambient air quality. The Clean Air Act addresses air quality by using two approaches to define ambient air quality standards for pollutant concentrations in community locations, and it also allows for the development of emission limits for specific source types.

The CEQA significance thresholds have been developed in both concentrations and emissions. For this analysis, construction-related emissions from the proposed project would result in short term exceedances of the threshold of significance for NOx and VOC.

A number of mitigation measures were developed for construction and included emulsified diesel fuel and/or particulate traps that would reduce construction impacts. With the inclusion of the mitigation measures, however, NOx and VOC emissions still remained above the significance threshold.

Although not part of the project, impacts were associated with the optimized flight scenario. Significant impacts were found for both emissions and concentrations under this scenario. Increased flight activity under the optimized flight scenario would result in an exceedance of the PM10 concentrations due primarily to diesel-powered ground support equipment and fugitive road dust or re-entrained road dust.