



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

Name Sandra Gibbons

Address 1041 E. Tehachapi Dr. LB 90807
Street City Zip Code

Email sdgibbons@aol.com

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card



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

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

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

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

Name

Andrew Kresal

Address

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

Email

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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



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

Improve the area ^{terminal} but do not enlarge

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

Andrew Kresal

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

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

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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



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

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

1

2

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

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

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

* between 60+65 CNEL
Contours

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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



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

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

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

1

2

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

Name Dodie Soto

Address 4784 Virginia Ave. L.B. 90805

Street City Zip Code

Email _____

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card



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

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

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

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

Name Joseph Valles

Address 4330 Myrtle Ave
Street City Zip Code

Email Long Beach, CA 90807

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

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card

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



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

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

thanks,
Joe Valles

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

Name _____
Address _____
Street City Zip Code
Email _____

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card



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

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

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

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

1 Long Beach Airport Study Session

2 City Council Chambers December 15, 2005

3
4 Attendees:

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

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

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

2 Okay, thank you very much.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

13

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

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

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

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

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

3
4 Matthew Jenkins: Angela, thank you very much. I know there are a lot of questions
5 you want to ask and you might come forward to the podium, to the mic and voice them.

6
7 Angela Reynolds: I actually have two little housekeeping things as well, Matt. Just
8 for everyone's information this session is being recorded audio and visually and I
9 have copies of the 1990 MOU that was mentioned in the presentation between the
10 Cultural Heritage Commission and the City Council if any one wants to read them.

11
12 Matthew Jenkins: Questions? Yes, you have a question? Go to the mic there will you?

13
14 Leslie Gentile: Hi, I appreciate the site plan for the airport and the sensitivity
15 around the existing building I was concerned about the site plan that indicated the
16 new parking structure and the amount of additional parking that is going to be
17 provided. I'm not understanding what the current need for parking is versus the size
18 of that suggested parking structure. So that's one question, and then also the impact
19 I see from the aesthetics of that parking structure dominating the approach to this
20 historic building I think needs to be studied as closely as the addition to any
21 expansion to the airport.

1

2

22
23 Jessica Feldman: Can I respond to that?

24
25 Matthew Jenkins: go ahead, you want to answer that?

26
27 Jessica Feldman: As far as the size of it that was the size that was determined as
28 meeting the needs of the minimum number of flights, it also reflects the fact that
currently there's 2835 parking spaces on site and in addition there is 2100 parking

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

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

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

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

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

3

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

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

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

4

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

8
9 Leslie Gentile: Thank You.

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

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

} 5

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

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

} 6

2

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

5

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

} 7

8

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

12

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

} 8

23

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

25

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

} 9

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

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

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

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

17
18 Matthew Jenkins: Thank you, next.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28

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

14

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

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

15

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

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

16

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

16
cont

14
15 Matt Jenkins: Very well, next.

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

17

18

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

18
cont

8
9 Angela Reynolds: Well, those are very good questions the noise expert is not here but
10 we will definitely respond to you in the response to comment.

11
12 Gary Frahm: I will have about 300 questions for him to respond to, don't worry.

13
14 Angela Reynolds: Okay well write them all down and send them to me.

15
16 Gary Frahm: Thank you.

17
18 Matt Jenkins: Thank you very much, next.

19
20 Laura Sellmer: My name is Laura Sellmer, my address is 5474 Daggett, Long Beach
21 90815. I am concern about the noise analysis and the footprint and the lines we saw
22 on our presentation and what the community understands about our noise ordinance.
23 Very few people understand that when the wheels are on the ground of a jet and it is
24 running up its engine to take off, that noise is not counted in the budget but our
25 neighborhoods are hearing that clear out to Lowes clear out to Bristol Farms. For
26 this EIR study of course EIR is looking at the airport. I think the noise ought to
27 set aside the noise ordinance and measure actual noise, when the jets come in and they
28 land and are on the ground and they turn on the reverse thrusters that noise is not
calculated. Yet the impact to the community is felt tremendously. So I think the

19

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

19
cont

20

21

22

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24

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

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

25

23
24 Angela Reynolds: Yes they will Mike.

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

26

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

26
cont

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

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

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

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

27

28

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

2

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

29

7

8 Angela Reynolds: Is that your last question?

9

10 Mike Cole: Yes.

11

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

18

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

22

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

30

27

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

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

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

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

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

18
19 Joe Sopo: Yeah, that works. Thank you Mr. Mais. One other last little question that
20 I have was that the noise of the 60 CNEL and it went through Mini Gant and I know Mini
21 Gant, it went through Mini Gant school and half of Mini Gant school is in the 60 CNEL
22 and the other half is in the 55 CNEL, just a shake of the head do I have that right?

34

23
24 Kathleen Brady: It would be of less than sixty.

25
26 Joe Sopo: It would be of less than sixty? That sort of reminds me of the times before
27 smoking was prohibitable on airplanes and I asked for a ticket in non-smoking section
28 and they gave me a ticket in the non-smoking section but it was right next to the
smoking section. I never smoked so much smoke in all my life.

35

Commenter 282 Stanley Poe, 283 Brian Ulaszewski

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

2

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

36

14

15 Matt Jenkins: Thank you.

16

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

37

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

37
cont

7

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

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

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

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card



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

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

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

1

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN
LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**



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

Name ERMA KEMP

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

Email _____

Comments can also be submitted to:

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

All comments must be received by December 22, 2005.

Comment Card



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

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

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

1
