

Airport Commission

Special Meeting

August 1, 2016

Minutes

Jeff Palmer: This meeting is called to order. Roll Call, Tom Milburn, absent; Ed Mandibles, present; Jeff Palmer, here; Steve Crocker, absent; Bob Wyckoff, present; David Hughes, present; Steve Dietrich, present.

First we have Public Comment. I see no one coming forward to make comments. We have no oral or written communications.

Richard Fernbaugh: There is one written communication that I just handed out. It is a letter from Law Offices of Baback Naficy, it's on the subject on your agenda.

Jeff Palmer: So, we just got this what are we supposed to do with it now. We just got this.

Richard Fernbaugh: The document will be included in the minutes of this meeting. This document is also available on the back table for the public.

Jeff Palmer: Ok, so we do have one written communication. There's no Administrator's Report. We're bringing up old business of the Motorsports Park EIR. The Airport Commission to discuss and comment on the Draft EIR.

Richard Fernbaugh: We have Lucille Breese who will introduce what we are going to talk about today.

Lucille Breese: Good evening Commissioners, members of the public. Thank you for attending this meeting this evening, or this afternoon happy to have it this afternoon. Just a reminder that the Draft EIR is out on the Motorsports project and the topic of your discussion this evening is to formulate a discussion recommendation as far as responses to the EIR only, it is not to discuss the project. It is not to make any kind of recommendation regarding approval or denial of the project, but simply to comment on the technical aspects of the EIR. Those comments will then be recorded by Mr. Fernbaugh, and will be sent to the consultant and at the end of the comment period which ends on August the 15th all comments will be responded to. Those comments will then be formulated as the final EIR. That is the document that will then go forward to the Council for certification so just want to make sure that we're clear on the purpose this afternoon which is only to provide comments to the EIR.

Ed Mandibles: I was kind of led to believe that tonight we were going to formulate a collective response as a Commission for or against the Motorsports Park. Is that not correct?

Lucille Breese: No, what you're doing is your commenting on the EIR. You're pointing out any shortcomings that would you feel are part of the technical document. So, it is not for or against the document, it is simply that you are stating if you see something that you believe is not adequately addressed and you believe needs to be further addressed.

David Hughes: So at a later date we can formulate some idea of what we think of the Motorsports Park? Tonight we're just discussing the EIR and what's in the EIR.

Lucille Breese: Only the EIR and not the merits of the project.

David Hughes: As a Commission, when would we do that?

Lucille Breese: That will come forward to you once we have completed the environmental process, once we are ready to move the project forward for approval. That will be following the NEPA review and the preparation of the ALP. Then it will come to the Airport Commission to look at the merits of the project and look at conditions of approval that would be recommended. You would then make a recommendation that would go forward to the Planning Commission who will look at the land use and then Planning Commission will take your recommendation and with their recommendation send it forward to the City Council.

David Hughes: That would be somewhere like October/November.

Lucille Breese: It will be further on than that probably. The NEPA document and the ALP are scheduled for review they are currently being processed and that NEPA document needs to be accepted and reviewed by the FAA as does the ALP so we do have some work yet to do on those documents. The project can't be brought forward to the City until we get to that point.

David Hughes: Ok

Lucille Breese: Thank you

Jeff Palmer: Ok, so I suppose what we need to do is start with someone and if you have comments about anything on the EIR.

David Hughes: My comment is on the mitigation of the trees, the vegetation that they're going to take down. Where are they going to plant the trees after the trees are gone out of the lower bench? Does anybody know anything about that? There are acres and acres of trees down there so they need a place to put them. So if we can put that maybe in the EIR ask them exactly where the re-planting of the trees is going to be because if they can't do that they can't really go ahead with the project as far as I know.

Just in furtherance of that question I was wondering, it appeared that in the wording it is also said that this would take acreage the Airport needed to use for tree mitigation for a future expansion. Is that correct?

Richard Fernbaugh: That area has to be identified by the Motorsports proposal, and our roughly seven acres would be identified as part of their mitigation area.

Ed Mandibles: I guess my question was more if the Motorsports project proceeds than the Airport will lose an area it's currently identified for use of planting trees and mitigation for Airport activities.

Richard Fernbaugh: It would not be able to go in the spot or spots where it is currently proposed to go. That area would then be identified by the Motorsports project to include the acreage that we're required to mitigate.

David Hughes: So if we extend the runway even further, we have less land to mitigate for the trees. Is that correct?

Richard Fernbaugh: Yes

David Hughes: I think if I'm correct, I think what your saying is we have that land identified right now but if we turn it over to the Motorsports park it's gone. Is it?

Richard Fernbaugh: Yes, that specific area is gone.

David Hughes: And if that area is gone, we can't extend the runway any further.

Richard Fernbaugh: Not without finding additional area.

Bob Wykoff: My two problems have to do with the mitigation. You take 7 acres and you have to mitigate with 72.4 acres, who's going to buy it? I also have a problem that this is an Airport and the FAA has been a primary source of funding for airport improvements for the last twenty years. In fact they were the last ones to pave George Miller Dr. and I would be very disappointed to see the FAA's response to a non-aviation use of airport property that may impact a business that is aviation supported or supports aviation. Personally I don't have a problem with a Motorsports Park but not in this location.

Jeff Palmer: Ok, Ed did you have something?

Ed Mandibles: Yes, on the EIR specifically, towards the front of the EIR there is a set of project objectives. The project objectives are supposed to be statements of what the project is going to do and the guidelines for this are they have to provide an honest objective of the intent of the project. That's the CEQA guideline state that information, has to be factual, adequate, and complete. Just in the project objectives there's nine project objectives and those statements, none of them are correct. And I'll get a little bit further here. Specifically, the first one is provide for ongoing recreational uses for skydiving and improve existing skydiving landing areas. Absolutely the opposite, so that statement is not true. It's just simply not true. The project severely limits the existing landing area. It greatly increases the likelihood of severe injuries to skydivers or motorsports participants.

The second one was it's supposed to minimize environmental impacts on natural resources, the airport, and neighboring residents. It doesn't. The project will not minimize any of those impacts. Whether it

be noise, animals, trees, none of that. The devastating environmental impacts to 40 acres of habitat can't be minimized. The impacts of the Airport will be substantial. Traffic on George Miller Dr. will prevent access to the Airport at times by airport users and emergency vehicles. Dirt and dust will inundate parked aircraft taxiways, runways, and hangars and cause severe safety hazards to aircraft and people on the ground. Neighboring residents, we don't need to go over that again. Neighboring residents, the noise issue, and an issue I have with that as a supporter of the Airport is when the neighbors start complaining, it will be the Airport generating the noise it won't be specific to the Motorsports or the airplane and that's what is really bad on this one.

The next one is "provide compatible recreation opportunities adjacent to the Lompoc Airport." First of all, the use is not compatible with the Lompoc Airport and its associated safety zones. And secondly, it's on the Airport property used for aviation purpose, not adjacent to the Lompoc Airport property. It's on the Airport property. So that statement is a wrong statement.

The next one is "preserve and/or minimize impacts to existing airport tenants, operations, and users." This project would not preserve any of that. It is going to be a devastating effect to all of those on the airport. This is probably the worst thing that could happen to an airport or any airport for that matter. The biggie, "improve runway safety zones." I have no idea where that statement came from but all it does is make it orders of magnitudes worse. Let me explain what a safety zone is. The EIR looks at FAA safety zones which are mostly in the air. It has to do with aircraft flying in the air so there are no poles, lights, structures that would interfere with the flight of those aircraft. There is also a set of safety zones which focus on things on the ground so the things on the ground don't get mixed up with airplanes operating on the ground. And specifically, in the EIR specifically, I think it's a misspelling because it says "improve runaway safety zones ". It's not runaway, it is runway so you might want to correct that. The project would not improve any runway safety zone but make it much worse by allowing a large concentration on people into a safety zone, on the ground safety zone. They are called safety zones for a reason. Cal-Trans Airport Land Use Plan handbook states that for Lompoc Airport Zone 5 which is called a sideline zone extends Northward from the center line of the runway 750 feet to the north. You draw that on the proposed plan of the Motorsports Park and it encompasses almost 100% of the entire park except for a little thin piece between the actual riverbed and one of the little oval tracks. Its right through the middle of that oval track. That's 750 feet. That basically is the entire project is violating that safety zone. The requirements for safety zone 5 are: prohibit stadiums and group recreational uses, among other things, like hospitals and old folks' homes and stuff like that. This project completely violates that. That is the major portion I have.

David Hughes: So what you're saying is like if a jet is coming in to land what is the approach speed of a jet? A hundred miles an hour?

Ed Mandibles: Yes

David Hughes: A hundred miles an hour and it blows out the right tire it's going to veer to the right and go straight into the Motorsports Park.

August 1, 2016
Special Meeting of the Airport Commission

Ed Mandibles: That is precisely why you have that safety zone, for take-off accidents particularly twins losing an engine, and will go right in the middle right exactly where the grandstands are with what's supposed to be thousands of people there. Right there off the runway, right next to the airport property. Those zones were there for a purpose and this would put thousands of people in jeopardy of serious injury or death.

Jeff Palmer: Does anyone else have something? Do you have anything else to say or is there something else you noticed?

David Hughes: I can't say much about the skydiving school because I'm you know the owner so I can't say much about that. It's all about the EIR.

Ed Mandibles: Ok, I'm trying to think if there is, there are some words in the EIR that have to do with businesses on the airport. One statement that this makes is that it is going to improve businesses at the airport. That is a wrong statement. In your case you represent not only your business, we have two other businesses that are solely dependent on yours being here. All three businesses would probably go away if this Motorsports Park were to be built. That's the big issue. Those three businesses contribute thousands and thousands of dollars to this community. Not only in through the airport, but hotels/motels, food. Skydive Santa Barbara is probably the sole reason we have a Jet A tank and we're able to service corporate jets, the jets that come in for the wineries we're able to service those. If we didn't have that I don't know if that tank could survive.

Steve Dietrich: As a general comment, when I started going through the sections you've got to read it once and then you come back, it seemed to me that they played pretty fast and loose with a lot of the assumptions, and with a cumulative impact that it pushed down some of the critical elements of it. I think in one of the areas was a noise, I believe there is only one airplane noise sample taken and I assume it was the skydive airplane just on the noise level and the emission length that was up and down in 15 minutes or something like that. To me, we've done a lot of EIR's in the past. You just need a larger sample. I thought the traffic study, and if you look at the location for it's at a stop signal going uphill on Highway 1 where the two lanes going straight ahead are going to merge so everybody's standing on it and it's taken at 9:00 on a Monday morning. It's a very very short segment of time to interpolate from those has some serious issues as to credibility. I think the background noise, especially in the evenings is considerably lower than what they projected and I think the use of the FAA noise overlay is, number one it's inappropriate but it's almost humorous because I've probably flown more night IFR approaches into the airport than most anybody probably a few more but I, this was my commute for 25 years. With the higher minimums, you're simply not making night circling approaches over the area where the sound footprint is imposed, and because of our low overcast and the high minimums that they have now I think it's a thousand on the RNAV approach and on the GPS approach and 1300 on the VOR approach you're going to have to do something to get down to the altitudes out there they're basically as high as VFR minimums. So, probably once a year you hear an airplane circling under the clouds at night. The takeoff minimums are such that on IFR departures they're going to go out quite a ways and then make the turn back to Gaviota if they're going to Gaviota, and they'll be above the typical pattern altitude. So,

I think, there are areas and I'd hate to see the City get into a mud fight over this thing and I think there's going to need to be an effort if this thing is going to proceed further with really going back and looking at these things, and the noise, and also there's the concern of the they pick the number of riders that are going to be on the track it's a pretty low number of riders on the eighth mile track. My experience from having ridden dirt bikes back with the dinosaurs is that you're usually out there with a bunch of folks and so you have more and more things going. The traffic, one of the concerns they've dismissed any concerns over the in and out from George Miller. I think the geometry of that intersection is going to be very tough where a lot of these vehicles are going to have trailers, they're not going to be familiar with that. There's a visibility issue, there's a just space turning and then you have the fairly sharp wiggle squiggle to get past coming in there and I don't think you can move the turn in further north because of the geometry of the bridge and what's going on up there. I don't know if Cal Trans has weighed in on this, or if they've made any expression or if the ball is in our court.

David Hughes: I think Steve, on H Street for George Miller Dr. I think they'll have to have to put some traffic lights in for the traffic coming in there because if they don't do that it's going to be, it's too dangerous anyway the intersection right now so they have a whole bunch of people coming in and out they need to put some traffic lights or something in there for sure right?

Steve Dietrich: It's a problem, of both the just the speeds and also the visibility is so restricted coming out of there. One of the other points it made the comment that the, I'm jumping back to the natural habitat. That there was a very broad area for the natural life to get, go up and down, move up and down the river but we have a natural trough point with the bridge right there. I'm concerned if we drive more of the wildlife to the north then you'll have more people impacting animals coming across Highway 1 around the end of the bike path from the school.

David Hughes: If we have the Motorsports there it will stop the coyotes from coming on the runway.

Steve Dietrich: That's an excellent point. I think that doesn't relay my primary concerns with this and I would subscribe to a lot of Ed's comments.

David Hughes: This doesn't affect the minimums for the IFR approaches does it?

Ed Mandibles: No. At least there is no appearance that it would but I think the concern of running IFR in there and the grandstand full of people right off the runway there. The zone 5 limits and measurements at any airport are based upon accident history. That's why they're the size and shape that they are. It has to do with our size of airport, our length of runway, and the type of aircraft they are able to land here, and the accident history is not just at this airport, but quite a few other airports. That is what defines that zone 5. The number of accidents that have occurred on sideline and mostly due to blown tires, inability of some student pilots to handle the airplanes, and we've had an airplane into the bushes right there at the top of the bench before. About midway- three quarters down the runway there was an airplane that hit those bushes. Luckily it was a small light airplane, it wasn't a big airplane but that does happen. Reading the accident history from the FAA or actually the land-use plan which devised those sideline zones, they did an entire accident history plot of where those accidents are and a lot of

them are on the sidelines and there's some straight out our over run area where the road that is supposed to come in on V Street, big accident area there although I think we've only had one or two aircraft that ever went off the end of the runway there but the traffic that's going to be on that road is in jeopardy when we're having aircraft operations. And, on the weekend is when it's going to be the worst and that's when we have the most traffic is on the weekend.

Steve Dietrich: One small addendum to that is I assume we're also going to lose the clear space off to the left side of the runway eventually which with the Ag fields out there which are near and dear to me because I almost ended up landing out there one morning.

Ed Mandibles: Well, we had an aircraft that did land out there not too many years ago, the Marshalls landed in that field, right in the middle of that field but luckily they went left and not right. Had they gone right, it would have been right in the middle of the Sports Park.

Steve Dietrich: I'll apologize for telling the story but it was the next morning that my engine quit and I turned to the field and there was the Marshall's airplane crash.

Ed Mandibles: It was something in the water I think, having two airplanes do that.

David Hughes: We've had a plane land in the riverbed.

Ed Mandibles: Yes, one in the riverbed, one just recently right across the street from H Street. That's as far as he could go he had no choice. That's usually the case. There have been ten accidents at this airport from about 1987 to present. There's ten accidents that happened at or near the airport. One was a helicopter which lost directional control. Bad thing to happen because he has no clue of where he is going when he hits the ground but that happened to be up on the hills here rather than right at the airport. But he was operating to and from the airport to get fuel and flame retardant, and like I say the Marshall's ended up in the fields just to the left of the runway. There was a Bonanza that had a gear problem that made it off luckily to the left side of the runway, it didn't go too far, had to be rescued. There's of course one on final so they do happen although I will say our airport as compared to a lot of other airports has a pretty good safety record. Most airports have a lot more accidents than we have so.

Bob Wykoff: I'd like to point out that the Bonanza that went off the left side of the runway was mine. My wife was flying it. It was also a matter of a mechanical failure, the left gear up lock froze, didn't let that wheel come down. At some point on landing we were both passengers. We were lucky that we didn't go the other way.

David Hughes: Is there, I may have missed this but is there anything in the EIR that if an aircraft crashes into the Motorsports Park, you know, what's going to happen? Any procedures at all?

Ed Mandibles: I'm sure the Motorsports Park people would probably sue the airport, that's probably what would happen. No, the problem with this is the potential is huge for the concentration of people. That's why we have air protection zones and we have ground protection zones because we don't want to hurt anybody.

Jeff Palmer: Anyone else have a comment?

Ed Mandibles: I have just a question. I believe in the back towards the back of the EIR it discusses the role of the County in this. As I understand it, the County doesn't feel that it needs to approve the EIR and I guess my question is will the County be commenting on the EIR?

Richard Fernbaugh: We'll have to wait and see what the responses are that the consultant receives. I would guess they probably would as the ALUC.

Jeff Palmer: Ok, any further comments? I personally don't have any. Ok, so we can move on to public comment. Would anyone like to come up and speak?

Donald Edward: My name is Donald Edward. I am an engineer, 44 years experience. The EIR I would say is gamed. That's the term that I would use. If you start out basically with a basis of estimate for everything that is wrong then you can draw any kind of conclusion you want and that's why I think, like Steve said everything is insignificant because like they start out with the wrong noise levels. The levels that should be consistently worried about is the level at their fence. According to the General Plan, the noise policy 1.1 states "The City requires that the users check the noise levels at their property line". And the property line to me is the fence around the drag strip. It's not in the middle of Lompoc. That's one thing. You go to the next thing, the noise levels that they use for the drag strip are off at least by 30 dba and I've run the equations and you run them and they run the noise levels right up. Right up in the neighborhoods, right in the shopping area, anywhere you want to check is grossly wrong. Meridian did a great job if I'd of hired them with the idea of writing a report to come out the way I wanted, everything insignificant, I would have given them a bonus because they did a real gaming job. I've seen a lot of gaming jobs in engineering but this is a classic. And, one of the things also about the traffic. The traffic, we're saying is going to be 1160 more vehicles. If you start projecting that out at about 8 per block, it would take 145 blocks to accumulate all that traffic backing up. So, you start backing that traffic up, on H Street, on V Street, on O Street, and just think what that's like. But, Meridian determined, it's insignificant. Now, you can go on through, I'm still working on the pages in that EIR but I've never seen a more ill conceived document in my life, and like Ed said, we're contributing to using the airport property for not consistent uses for the property. It's made to be an airport, it's not made to be a Motorsports Park. If you think you had dirt and pollution, just stand by. Now, Lompoc isn't smart enough to realize that having a drag strip in the middle of town, rather than about ten miles out in the boonies is a good idea. Anybody that would even sign up to doing that has their head in the wrong place and it's obviously not in the interest of Lompoc. I don't know if that's my three minutes or not but

Jeff Palmer: Yes, about three minutes

Donald Edward: Ok

Ed Mandibles: Thank you.

Eileen Wyckoff: Hello, my name is Eileen Wyckoff. My husband, our son, and I have been in the business of protecting Lompoc Airport for a lot of years, and I'm not going to stop now. At first we had

August 1, 2016
Special Meeting of the Airport Commission

no real comment, we kind of thought that the locals were going to run their motor bikes in the river like they used to and want to do again. But right now I have confessed that I have not read the EIR so don't criticize me on that but I would like to know when the Commission gets to vote on this? When will the Commission be allowed to have their voice in this? Thank you.

Martin Haven: My name is Martin Haven. I live five or six doors down from Steve I guess, and so I am impacted by this. More importantly, I wanted to keep this relative to aircraft performance and I did work for Boeing Aircraft for fifty years, and my specific job assignment was aircraft performance including theory, methods, how far, how wide. In particular, I wrote noise programs. One of my unpleasant tasks as an aircraft performance engineer was accident investigation and I don't know how many airports we went over, there were catastrophes around the world, Chicago. Airports that hadn't had a serious accident in twenty years, they do happen. It happens a lot and I would think that you would have accident investigation as part of the EIR since this is part of the environmental impact report. I haven't read through much I've skimmed the EIR a little bit but I would think the odds of a really serious traffic/aircraft accident should be in the EIR. What is the impact of an aircraft accident because they do happen, that was my job for fifty years trust me they happen. One of the things, it's not my expertise on but I'm wondering how this visually would influence a pilot landing or taking off and getting ready to come down to this airport and seeing the lights of the stadium on. I haven't heard anyone mention this, what are the odds of confusion? I've even heard of airplane pilots landing on the wrong airport. How about the wrong runway or the wrong situation? We've got all these lights and motorsports are they going to interfere with the pilot's vision trying to land a plane at night? I didn't hear that discussed. Should that be part of the EIR? I'm talking this case about light pollution, I'm not sure how noise pollution affects an airplane, but light pollution it could very well confuse a pilot and I think that is a serious problem. I don't know about the runway lights at night but how do those stand out versus the lights of the Motorsports Park? These are just some of the concerns that an aircraft performance engineer from Boeing would have. Kind of unfamiliar with this situation but it just crossed my mind what would a pilot think trying to land, trying to take-off, what's the odds of an accident and how does the EIR specifically address light pollution? One last thing I noticed. One of the things I was concerned about was the traffic on Harris Grade going up the hill past Highway 1 intersection. There's new housing developments going on there and I've always wondered how this, if this EIR includes the increased traffic due to those two housing developments? I do know that they have just two lanes going up and I'll bet you that EIR had nothing to do with Motorsports and all of these EIR's are kind of independent of one another. I'm wondering how that really works out when you put the EIR proposed for all those what is it 6, 7, 800 housing units going in up there, if that had anything to do with Motorsports or are all these things just totally independent of one another, and then the traffic independent of one another again? Each one does it separately what's the big picture look like? That would be my comments about the EIR and aviation in specific. I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong that the EIR is required to incorporate the effects of known pending projects.

Levi Miller: Good evening, I'm Levi Miller. I've been at the airport since 1962 and I'm also a commercial pilot and an air race pilot, fortunately I've retired from that silly mess. But one thing, I've been working

with the County Fish and Game and the water conservancy up at Lake Cachuma. I measure the berm at the end, down at the lagoon. I monitor the lagoon, give a report twice a week. I had the unfortunate task to move airplanes off of Lompoc Airport because of a flood. We had water on the runway, we had water in a couple of the hangars, and the Fish and Game people and Corp of Engineers are not going to be happy with a racetrack down on the lower bench to where we get water. The oil and debris from the vehicles are going to get in the river. When the river floods, and right now we've got a 4 foot berm down at the end, with a moderate heavy rain we will get flooding up in the valley. If you've not been through that, it's not a pretty sight. My office was with NASA, Kennedy Space Center for a while, and my office had 38 inches of water in it. Right there on the South Base. I think we are going in the wrong direction. The Sports Park would be a nice thing to have, but not around the river and around the Airport. I also had the misfortune to help remove some debris from aircraft that had crashed off the runway. One of them was over in the lettuce field, the other one was off the end of the runway killed two guys, and there was one that went off into the lower bench. Thank you.

Ann Ruhge: Ann Ruhge long, well not very long time. After being here for 22 years we're still considered as new comers to Lompoc. That's a joke. Now is the time to submit the arguments that you gentlemen have put forth are valid, they are reasonable, they are well thought out. But now is the time for you as a Commission to submit your objections to the EIR as a body. That's my understanding from Ms. Breese. The rest of you have valid points too and now is the time. We have two weeks to send our objections to this EIR into the City, the City Planning Department. So you need to get organized, I'm great community organizer. To have a document that you can all sign, or those of you that agree with it as the Commission and to submit it to the Planning Department with your names on it as a body of the City body representing your concerns about just this one area having this Motorsports Park on airport property and I think all your objections are valid and I wish you good luck I wish us all good luck that we can stop this ill conceived project.

Joyce Howerton: Good afternoon, Joyce Howerton Lompoc Valley Community Coalition. I think you received a letter from our attorney. You know, I just wanted to say that the Airport Commission, you're in a very strong position because you actually know what you're talking about. You have worked with airplanes and airports for a very long time. Some of you have been on the Commission for a very long time. Many of you are pilots. You know what goes on at an airport. You know how one should be operated. I think it's time that we have people who actually know what they're talking about make comments, and make comments to the EIR. We have got to get some factual information on the record because we have been filled with maybes, kind of, I think so, it might work, don't worry, trust me, I know what I'm talking about. Well in my opinion, the Commission knows what it's talking about and I look forward to your comments to the EIR. Thank you.

Janet Blevins: Good afternoon my name is Janet Blevins. I'm a newcomer also Ann I've lived here only 30 years. One of the things I don't believe was mentioned in the EIR in terms of the noise issue is the compressors that run on motor homes. If they're sitting over there in the park and they've brought they're motor homes or their trailers or whatever it's going to be 90 degrees. They're going to be running their compressors all night long. I live 3/10 of a mile from this proposed fiasco and the noise is

August 1, 2016

Special Meeting of the Airport Commission

10

going to be absolutely unbelievably horrible. I can hear every motorcycle and every hot rod that is currently street racing illegally from my bedroom window and I've learned to use ear plugs and shut the window and listen to music or do whatever else is necessary but the EIR states that the noise that's going to be created is similar to that of a vacuum cleaner. Well have you seen the way animals and human beings respond to vacuum cleaners? They don't gather round, they leave the house. Santa Barbara County has never met the state required limit for particulate matter pollution in the air, and we're going to be adding more with this project. The Class 1 un-mitigateable impact to air pollution in 2016 is inexcusable. The holding ponds that are suggested will cause toxins to leech into the soil and then possibly into the water table. There's just so many, many, many problems. And of course, including all of the risks involved with the airport and its purpose. Thank you.

Terry Hammonds: Good afternoon Commission. I concentrated my efforts on this from the aviation safety analysis that was provided. In that report, the lights are going to be a problem. We've already identified them as having height obstructions and if they're not going to be an obstruction to the airport and the operation of the airport, they're damn sure going to be an obstruction and nuisance to those people that live north of the airport because they're going to be up in the air shining light all over the place and there's going to be many lights out there. You can't put a bunch of people in the dark out in an area without lighting. So, that's going to be a problem to you, it's going to be a problem to us that live north. The V Street, are they going to dig it down so that these large vehicles can get through or are they going to put a barrier across the road so that they can't get those large vehicles there? V Street is their primary entrance to this site, there's going to be a problem with that. Anybody coming into this City from the north end is going to have to go through several intersections and that traffic is already in a very congested way now and it's going to be more congested as this park comes on if it is allowed to be built. The thing that irks me most, well one of the most irksome things about all this is the operation of a business at that airport, very profitable business being forced to have to make a decision about what they're going to do. Every one of you up there is going to either help him decide what he's going to do to stay, or help him decide to go away. I for one, vote for him to stay. He needs to be here, he started a business here, it is a business that is good for our city, and we need to protect it. We don't need to protect some ill conceived idea of putting a drag strip and off highway riding area right next to a very populated area. Please consider that this is not a good idea.

Thank you.

Ron Mose: I'll make this short and sweet. It doesn't belong next to an airport. Thank you.

Jeff Palmer: Are there any more public comments? I see no one moving. So, we'll close the public comments. Do we have any Commissioner requests for the next meeting? No. Ok.

Next scheduled meeting for the Airport Commission will be at the airport at the Administration building on September 1st, 7:00pm.

At this point we can adjourn the meeting.

Ed Mandibles: I have a question for Mr. Fernbaugh. We have to have comments into Lucille by the 15th is that correct?

Richard Fernbaugh: Correct

Ed Mandibles: So this Commission needs to formulate comments, somehow as a Commission to that and I think we need to work on, that, we might want to work on that right now to make that submission before the 15th. Now our other submission which is collectively our position on the project can come later as you suggested earlier but I think what we need to do is get some bullets down we've heard a lot of them here already to go forward with those comments as a Commission. Not an individual, also as an individual but that is your own and you should be putting those in. Do you think that's appropriate?

Richard Fernbaugh: I believe we're recording all the comments tonight so we would put those into a written report or report back to the Commission and then we can take a look at that. Hopefully, prior to the comment period ending and submit that.

Ed Mandibles: What kind of guarantees do we have that we would have those before the comment period, something that we can review as a Commission and say yeah this is good or no, you need to reword that?

Mike Luther: Mike Luther, City Engineer. You can't actually meet as a Commission again unless you have another public meeting. So if you want to set another public meeting to formulate otherwise we're going to take a record and that's going to be the official reply. You guys could set up a sub-committee to act on behalf of the entire board and appoint somebody but you can't meet as a group in private and discuss.

Ed Mandibles: I understand, ok.

Steve Dietrich: I think it would be important for us to see the summary of the comments here, and then have a chance to edit those somehow even if we had to have a special meeting.

Ed Mandibles: Yes, I go with that.

Steve Dietrich: I think this is one of the, in my short term it's the biggest issue.

Ed Mandibles: Yes it is. What's the plan?

Richard Fernbaugh: Like Mike said you could form a sub-committee and meet and review all these and submit that. If you prefer to have a special meeting like today it only requires a 24 hour notice so we could do this again and have another public meeting to submit the comments.

Ed Mandibles: Ok, so the original plan with taking and transcribing the comments, somebody could do that and we could get those comments transcribed and then have to formulate something. Or, would the transcribed comments be adequate? The Commission would have to look at it and approve it and we could hold a special meeting to do that.

Lucille Breese: Planning Manager. If you would like to submit the transcription of the meeting after your review then that would be adequate if the Commission reviewed it and then signed it as your joint comments. That would be fine for us to accept. If you wanted to make changes and you held another meeting you could do that as well so it's up to whatever the Commission would like to see.

Ed Mandibles: Ok so when those get transcribed and given to Richard he can mail it to all of us to review and then we have a meeting to vote on what we have? And I'm sure that we might have a red line or two, I doubt because it's exactly what's said.

Lucille Breese: They can be provided to you for your review.

Ed Mandibles: Ok and then that would become record in that EIR correct?

Lucille Breese: It will be part of the final EIR with the consultants' responses to whatever issues you've raised.

Ed Mandibles: Ok that sounds good to me.

Steve Dietrich: Could I make a friendly amendment to that and just ask that it be distributed in Word format to us and that way it makes it a lot easier to work on our comments.

Richard Fernbaugh: Yes

Ed Mandibles: Does that require a motion or is this going to happen?

Richard Fernbaugh: I can submit them to the Commission in email in Word and you can submit them back to me and that's sufficient rather than having another special meeting.

Ed Mandibles: As long as that doesn't violate Brown Act that would be fine.

Richard Fernbaugh: As long as it's individual.

Ed Mandibles: That's acceptable to me. Bob? Ok, very good I think we'll do that. If there's a major conflict with that then we could call a special meeting. I can't see that there really would, what's been recorded here I don't have a problem with any of that.

David Hughes: I take it that the members of this organization can submit individual comments on their own behalf? I may have something to say that I would present as an individual, not as a Commission member.

Richard Fernbaugh: Yes, you can submit those individually.

Jeff Palmer: Ok, are we able to adjourn the meeting? Anyone else have something to say?

Ed Mandibles: Second.

Jeff Palmer: Those in favor

August 1, 2016

Special Meeting of the Airport Commission

13

All Commissioners voted yes.

Jeff Palmer: Ok, meetings adjourned. Gavel

Jeff Palmer, Chairperson