

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

MONTEREY REGIONAL AIRPORT DISTRICT

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

PUBLIC MEETING DATED: NOVEMBER 26, 2018

**CHAIR:** CARL MILLER

**DIRECTORS:**

WILLIAM SABO

MARY ANN LEFFEL

MATTHEW NELSON

GARY CURSIO

**Location:** Monterey Regional Airport, 200 Fred Kane Drive,  
Suite 200, Monterey, California 93940

**Court Reporter:** Lisa A. York Meeske Certified Shorthand  
Reporter, License Number 10617.



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

Monterey, California

--oOo--

(Time noted: 1:11 p.m.)

CHAIR MILLER: I apologize for the delay. We'll be starting here in just a moment when staff arrives.

Before we get started, if any of you have cell phones that are on, if you could, please, put those to vibrate or turn them off, we'd appreciate it.

Welcome everybody to the special meeting of the Monterey Peninsula Airport District.

Today's date is November 26. The time is 1:11 p.m.

And thank you for showing up today and helping us out on this process.

Can we have a rollcall, please.

MS. AUKER: Director Cursio?

DIRECTOR CURSIO: Here.

MS. AUKER: Director Nelson?

DIRECTOR NELSON: Here.

MS. AUKER: Director Leffel?

DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Yes.

MS. AUKER: Director Sabo?

DIRECTOR SABO: Here.

MS. AUKER: Chair Miller?

CHAIR MILLER: Here.

1 Mr. Huber, can you, please, help us with the  
2 Pledge of Allegiance.

3 MR. HUBER: Absolutely.

4 CHAIR MILLER: Please, rise.

5 MR. HUBER: Please, rise for the pledge of  
6 allegiance. Salute. Pledge.

7 (Pledge of Allegiance sited.)

8 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

9 Communications and announcement, Mr. LaPier. Do  
10 we have any?

11 MR. LaPIER: None from staff, sir.

12 CHAIR MILLER: Does any member of the Board wish  
13 to make an announcement?

14 Okay. Hearing none, we'll go to public comment.

15 Any person may address the Monterey Peninsula  
16 Airport Board at this time. Presentations should not  
17 exceed three minutes and should be directed at an item not  
18 on today's agenda and should be within the jurisdictions  
19 of the Monterey Peninsula Airport District Board.

20 We do have some -- some items here for public  
21 comment, but I'm assuming this is related to -- to the  
22 public hearing {sic} that we're going to be having on the  
23 environmental report.

24 Does any member of the public wish to address  
25 something not on today's agenda?

1           Please, come to the front and state your name.

2           MS. ELIZABETH STACEY:  Want me to use the  
3 microphone?

4           CHAIR MILLER:  Please.

5           MS. ELIZABETH STACEY:  Good afternoon.  My  
6 name's Elizabeth Stacey (phonetic).  I am a resident of  
7 Del Rey Oaks.

8           I'm just curious why we weren't notified about  
9 this meeting until late in the afternoon the day before  
10 Thanksgiving.  I think, if we received more notice, there  
11 would have been more people here from Del Rey Oaks, as  
12 well as other people who commented on the EIR.

13           CHAIR MILLER:  Okay.  We normally don't respond  
14 to questions from the community.

15           Yes?  Richard, please, state your name.

16           MR. RICHARD RUCCELLO:  Richard Rucello,  
17 president of Casanova Oak Knoll Neighborhood Association.

18           This is not on the agenda.  I brought to you a  
19 copy of the picture of a tanker truck on one of our  
20 cul-de-sacs in our neighborhood that are -- it's directly  
21 opposite to the entry to the north side.  I'd like to have  
22 a meeting with Michael and whatever board members who  
23 would like to.

24           We need to establish some type of protocol for  
25 deliveries.  We do not know what's in this tanker truck.

1 We don't know if it's gasoline or milk or whatever. The  
2 driver couldn't speak English, couldn't read English, and  
3 went right by four road-closed signs.

4 On that day, we had six to eight different  
5 semi-trucks pull into that closed street and get stuck.  
6 What worries us is the hazardous material and this truck  
7 backing down the hill into traffic on their own with no  
8 guidance. It's a dangerous situation, and we need to get  
9 some kind of rules for the tenants on deliveries. We have  
10 no idea what this guy was doing here.

11 I did send this picture to Michael back in  
12 September and members of the staff. I haven't received a  
13 reply yet. But I'd like to sit down and talk to you about  
14 this problem on this street.

15 We just spent \$250,000 closing that street off  
16 following all state laws, and the problem continues.

17 Thank you.

18 CHAIR MILLER: Again, we don't normally comment  
19 on this, but I'm sure staff will get in touch with you.  
20 We don't know if that was even related to the airport,  
21 that particular truck.

22 MR. RICHARD RUCCELLO: Don't know.

23 CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Normally, they don't go  
24 that route.

25 Okay. Any member of the public wish to address

1 something that's not on the board today -- that's not on  
2 the agenda?

3 Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to be closing  
4 public comment.

5 We'll move on to the regular agenda, Item  
6 Number 1, E-1, Resolution 1730, a resolution of the  
7 Monterey Peninsula Airport District to approve and certify  
8 the Final Environmental Impact Report, the Mitigation  
9 Monitoring and Reporting Program, and related California  
10 Environmental Quality Act findings for Monterey Regional  
11 Airport Master Plan.

12 Mr. LaPier, can you help us walk us through  
13 this.

14 MR. LaPIER: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.

15 With us today is the entire planning team that  
16 has been working for the last two-plus years on the  
17 environmental impact analysis as it relates to the master  
18 plan and the alternatives, Jimmy -- Jim Harris, from  
19 Coffman Associates, is the here to lead his team, and the  
20 rest of the team is there to provide that support. They  
21 do have a presentation for you, but most of this is  
22 questions and answers. So, please, feel free to ask those  
23 questions as you see fit.

24 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Mr. Harris.

25 MR. HUBER: Mr. Chair, if I might? Let me --

1 let me jump in. I'll start off, and I'll kick it over to  
2 Jim.

3 As you're all aware, we are here for a  
4 consideration of the Final Environmental Impact Report on  
5 the proposed master plan. This matter has been properly  
6 advertised and noticed pursuant to the government code.

7 As advertised in the agenda, and, as you see up  
8 on the board, staff recommends the adoption of  
9 Resolution 1730 to approve and certify the Final  
10 Environmental Impact Report, the Mitigation Monitoring and  
11 Reporting Program, and related California Environmental  
12 Quality Act findings and Statement of Overriding  
13 Consideration for the Monterey Regional Airport Master  
14 Plan; and, number two, the adoption of Resolution 1731 to  
15 approve Alternative Number 1 as the Monterey Regional  
16 Airport Master Plan.

17 The Airport Master Plan will provide a  
18 development framework to implement improvements that will  
19 enable the airport to accommodate future demand for air  
20 travel in the region, to enhance airport safety, to  
21 incorporate airport sustainability goals, and to increase  
22 airport staff -- I'm sorry -- airport self-sustainability.

23 This has been studied at great length, and --  
24 and we do want to get into some of the larger details of  
25 the framework or of the plan. And so, for that, I will

1 turn it over to -- to Jim.

2 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

3 MR. JIM HARRIS: Thank you, Scott. All right.

4 Well, thank you for having us here today,  
5 Chair Miller, Members of the Board of Directors.

6 It's good to be here again, and we'll spend some  
7 time going through, obviously, some of the topics that  
8 Scott just discussed.

9 But what I wanted to do -- and apologize for a  
10 little bit of the tag team. We have a lot of subject  
11 matter experts here to speak to the topics.

12 But I want to talk just briefly just to kind of  
13 give you a quick bringing things up to speed relative to  
14 the history of the report master planning process just to  
15 kind of establish where we're at and the framework for how  
16 we got to this particular point.

17 Again, the history of master plan process has  
18 been one, obviously, many of you are very familiar with.  
19 There have been a number of briefings. But there -- early  
20 on, as the master plan was being started, a planning  
21 advisory committee was established. That committee  
22 comprised something in the order of around 25 individuals  
23 that sat in review of the work, and there were seven  
24 different meetings held over the course of the development  
25 of the master plan.



1           Along with that, there was a very robust public  
2 outreach plan put together that allowed for the  
3 opportunity for public review and comment during that  
4 process. There were also seven different board briefings  
5 following every committee meeting. But then, of course,  
6 there were public workshops after every committee meeting  
7 as well, which allowed for the public review and comment  
8 process to take place.

9           At the end of that entire process, going through  
10 that, then we brought back the proposed Airport Master  
11 Plan project to the Board for review. And the Board then  
12 directed staff to move forward with the CEQA environmental  
13 process, and that took place in September of 2015. That  
14 really was what initiated the CEQA process; more  
15 importantly, the initial study that started that  
16 particular process.

17           And so that kind of gets you up to date of  
18 the -- of the public outreach and the preparation process  
19 that the master plan went through to set the stage for the  
20 Draft Airport Master Plan.

21           So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to  
22 Judi, who is Judi Krauss with Coffman Associates. She's  
23 going to then kind of segue into the CEQA process to kind  
24 of give you an overview of where -- where we're at with  
25 the CEQA process as of today.

1 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

2 And your name again for the record. I'm not  
3 sure you said --

4 MR. JIM HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, I  
5 apologize. My name's Jim Harris. I'm with Coffman  
6 Associates.

7 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Harris.

8 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Good afternoon. I'm Judi  
9 Krauss, associate with Coffman Associates. Thank you for  
10 having us.

11 So I just wanted to kind of summarize CEQA  
12 environmental process.

13 I'll start out by saying that the process has  
14 exceeded the CEQA requirements by quite a bit. There's  
15 some leeway in CEQA in how you approach a public outreach  
16 program, and the staff and the consultant team has  
17 consistently gone over and above what the minimum  
18 requirements are. Just as an example, the notice of  
19 preparation for this EIR was issued December 30th, 2015.  
20 The scoping period is a 75-day period that was provided as  
21 opposed to a required 45-day, a full month longer than was  
22 required by CEQA. During the Draft EIR public comment  
23 period, which began September 17th, it was 54 days, which,  
24 again, is more than the 45 days required normally.

25 During the public EIR, the Draft EIR public

1 comment period, we received 36 comment letters or e-mails  
2 that comprised Chapter 3 of the Final EIR along with  
3 written responses to the comments. Eight of those e-mails  
4 were from agencies, five from businesses or local  
5 organizations, and 23 residents or the general public. At  
6 the time that I put this together, one late e-mail had  
7 been received, and then, as you know, there were three  
8 more that came in this weekend; one requesting that this  
9 meeting be continued. A public meeting was held on the  
10 Draft EIR on October 9th. There were 29 people attending.  
11 And we provided an opportunity for oral comments for the  
12 record. There were four people who took advantage of  
13 that. Those are also part of the Final EIR, and the  
14 transcript is there as well.

15           So, just to kind of summarize, a notification  
16 outreach included display ads for the public meetings that  
17 were held in three newspapers, a direct mailing to over  
18 300 contiguous property owners, airport tenants, agencies,  
19 and interested parties. Posting on the District and EIR  
20 study websites and posting the notice is at two locations  
21 at the airport.

22           The administrative record for this project  
23 includes quite a bit of information, including the Draft  
24 Final Airport Master Plan and errata that are available  
25 for download on the study website, the Draft EIR, which,

1 as you know, is voluminous. The Final EIR proceedings of  
2 the public workshop that was held on October 9th is part  
3 of the public review period, and then the proceedings from  
4 this Board meeting, including any public comment and  
5 testimony that you hear today, the agenda packet, the  
6 draft findings and resolution, and any attachments and  
7 documents appropriate by reference. So all of that  
8 comprises the administrative record for this project.

9 So I just want to kind of go over again. It was  
10 in the resolution slide, but the proposed Airport Master  
11 Plan objectives are important to keep in front of us as we  
12 make decisions -- or as you make decisions about  
13 alternatives and how the project's going to look.

14 So, to kind of boil it down to these four main  
15 points. The master plan is to enhance airport safety, to  
16 increase compliance with the federal design standards to  
17 the maximum extent feasible is the number one goal of the  
18 master plan, and also to prepare the airport to move into  
19 the next 20 years to adequately meet demand that has been  
20 forecast and approved by FAA methodology.

21 Incorporate the airport sustainability goals.  
22 The airport master plan has a sustainability chapter to it  
23 that can be incorporated into new development and  
24 redevelopment as the airport moves forward. And then to  
25 increase airport self-sufficiency. The master plan

1 identifies areas that are not needed for aeronautical use  
2 that can be freed up for non-aeronautical use in the  
3 future and increase the airport's economic viability and  
4 self-sufficiency by producing additional revenue.

5           Just kind of a CEQA review. The CEQA Guidelines  
6 state that, if you have the no-project as the alternative,  
7 environmentally-superior alternative, that you need to  
8 identify a second environmentally-superior alternative.  
9 The criteria we used in that selection process included  
10 the ability of the alternative to achieve project  
11 objectives, the feasibility of implementing the  
12 alternative, and the alternative's ability to eliminate or  
13 reduce significant impacts.

14           So, given those criteria, Alternative 1 was  
15 selected as the environmentally-superior alternative. It  
16 does meet all of the project objectives. And, at the end  
17 of this presentation, when we go through the Statement of  
18 Overriding Considerations, we'll come back to this point  
19 of how Alternative 1 seems to be the optimal solution  
20 from -- from the study that we've done.

21           This -- but there are some impacts still with  
22 Alternative 1. So we did a lot of comparison in the EIR  
23 between the proposed project and Alternative 1 to really  
24 flesh out what that looks like. What are the reductions  
25 in impact is all quantified in the document. But, if you

1 have questions, specifically, about some of those numbers,  
2 I'll be glad to provide you in the question-and-answer  
3 time.

4           So this is just a summary of those -- those  
5 conclusions. Alternative 1 would reduce impact to the  
6 Highway 68 scenic corridor. That's, primarily, because  
7 the proposed project proposed a four-story parking garage,  
8 and Alternative 1 provides a surface lot instead. That's  
9 the closest part of the whole project to Highway 68 in as  
10 far as the short-term projects, and so that reduces  
11 impacts to the visual aspects of the project.

12           Reduced impacts to Yadon piperia, which is an  
13 endangered plant, that the airport has, primarily, along  
14 that frontage of Highway 68 and a few other places that,  
15 again, some of the design changes we made reduce the  
16 impacts to that plant. We realize that plant is really  
17 hard to mitigate. There's very limited populations. A  
18 lot of them are on the airport or in this real -- this --  
19 this close proximity to the airport. So it's hard to  
20 mitigate for. So we reduced the impacts to that and  
21 mature trees, including Monterey pine, which is another  
22 thing that's hard to mitigate on an airport, because FAA  
23 doesn't want you planting tall pine trees.

24           Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and fewer  
25 impacts to congested intersections. The Alternative 1

1 would, in the short term -- short-term project, according  
2 to the traffic analysis, would contribute four p.m.  
3 counter trips to two intersections along Highway 218, and  
4 that's it.

5           Improved off-airport emergency response times.  
6 This has to do with our building being on the north side  
7 and a new north-side access road.

8           And then fewer inconsistencies with existing  
9 City of Monterey policies. A lot of those have to do with  
10 the CONA neighborhood.

11           There's a slide after this that shows the  
12 graphics. So I'll kind of talk between them. But you can  
13 also look at the bottom of this board as I walk through  
14 these project components, and then I'll kind of try to  
15 just take it slow and go piece by piece so you can really  
16 see what we're talking about.

17           So Alternative 1, or the proposed project,  
18 looked at the project components in the master plan that  
19 would be built in the next ten years. A lot of them are  
20 related to a safety-enhancement component of shifting  
21 Taxiway A farther from your runway.

22           So this includes relocating the commercial  
23 terminal and apron, moving the ARFF building to the north  
24 side, as well as the general aviation hangars that are on  
25 the southeast ramp, and providing, I think, there's space

1 for up to seven new hangers mostly in pads over there.

2 The north side road connection to Del Rey  
3 Gardens Drive, land acquisition of the 5.5-acre parcel  
4 that's here next to parking in the northeast ramp -- I  
5 mean, southeast ramp -- sorry -- and a Highway 68 frontage  
6 cul-de-sac road.

7 I'm going to fast forward a minute so I can show  
8 you these thing.

9 So this is your terminal. There's no change to  
10 the terminal access with Alternative 1. It still comes  
11 out through Olmsted, but the existing terminal, which is  
12 over here, would be relocated here (indicating) so that  
13 there is room to shift Taxiway A further from the runway.  
14 To do that, the existing hangars that are in this area  
15 will be relocated to the north side. That's these first  
16 two rows. That's Phase 1. The second two rows are on  
17 Phase 2, which would be dealt later in -- past the  
18 ten-year timeframe.

19 But, on the south side, we would relocate the  
20 terminal building, bring this intersection of Garden Road  
21 and Olmsted and make it a roundabout to facilitate some of  
22 the traffic, and traffic would come in and loop around  
23 this surface parking lot like that (indicating).

24 So, when we talk about a terminal loop road,  
25 we're talking about this little road that goes around the



1 terminal parking lot (indicating). This -- all of this  
2 red is increased apron, which you can see is a lot more  
3 depth and room for returning/overnight parking. That's  
4 the short-term project.

5           And then, where the existing building is, where  
6 we are now, will be converted to service parking lot.  
7 There's a little bit -- Fred Kane Drive might have to be  
8 shifted a little bit. But, for the most part, this  
9 service parking here, here, and a ready return lot. The  
10 rest of this is in the programatic, so I'll talk about  
11 that in a minute.

12           On the north side, these hangars that are in the  
13 southeast part now would be relocated to the north by the  
14 Navy Flying Club ramp. The Navy Flying Club would be  
15 moved probably to one of these hangar, and the six  
16 port-a-port hangars would be just relocated to the edge of  
17 the apron as long as you want to keep them.

18           The ARFF building would also be relocated. This  
19 blue is a new service road to the primary runway. And  
20 then, as a big point in Alternative 1, is the timing of  
21 this proposed north side road. In Alternative 1, it's  
22 proposed to be constructed first so that all of this  
23 redevelopment can go -- would not go through the CONA  
24 neighborhood. It would go out to Del Rey Gardens Drive.

25           I think, like I said, it's four p.m. trips out

1 on the highway. So there's not a lot of traffic in this  
2 short term, and I think that's been a little bit confusing  
3 for the public, as they have read through the documents.  
4 The ten-year timeframe is just moving these hangars, 44  
5 hangars, which are not a big traffic generator, and  
6 they're not a peak, p.m. peak, traffic generator.

7           So the new traffic would be the ARFF building  
8 and these hangars, and it would come out to the east,  
9 Del Rey Gardens. Existing Airport Road would be closed  
10 right here. So all of this would continue to go west  
11 through Airport Road and CONA, but this stuff that's there  
12 now would go east (indicating).

13           So I hope that's clear.

14           The rest of this -- this -- all this orange is  
15 part of the programmatic side, and there is not a  
16 difference in the programmatic 20-year timeframe for those  
17 projects between the proposed project or Alternative 1.  
18 There are things listed in the master plan as future if  
19 demand occurs the way the projections go. You may want  
20 more hangars.

21           The perimeter fence is something that the  
22 Wildlife Hazard Management Plan recommends. An airport  
23 maintenance building and yard is something that would be  
24 nice to have if you have more hangars on the north side.  
25 And then there's some safety changes to your airfield,

1 like a Taxiway D extension and changes to the connector  
2 taxiways over there. But all of that is out in the 10- to  
3 20-year timeframe, and the EIR really just looked at it in  
4 a programatic level. And I'll go through what that means  
5 in a minute.

6 Property right acquisition for the RPZs on the  
7 east side.

8 And then the future non-aeronautical  
9 development. And I want to focus on this just for a  
10 minute, because I know it's also been misunderstood a bit.

11 The Airport Master Plan looked at what was  
12 aviation -- needed for aviation, and the rest of the --  
13 the airport was designated as non-aeronautical. It's just  
14 a land-use designation to differentiate between  
15 aeronautical and non-aeronautical. And then, if you look  
16 at the picture, we also included an open space up or along  
17 the property line.

18 But all of this orange on the north side and  
19 here on the south side is area that does not look like the  
20 airport would need or would be feasible really to have  
21 aeronautical, and, therefore, it is shown in the master  
22 plan as non-aeronautical (indicating). So, from a CEQA  
23 standpoint, how do you address that? So what the EIR does  
24 is it looked at, you know, what would be the most likely  
25 worst case, in terms of size of development that might be

1 in the future on those areas? And that's what we  
2 analyzed. So we did not -- we don't -- there's not a  
3 project on the board now for that area. It's just this is  
4 what it would look like if you were able to maximize your  
5 development to the fullest.

6 So I hope that makes sense.

7 On the south side, we -- this area is, actually,  
8 within the City of Monterey. There's City of Monterey  
9 zoning. So we looked at what could be built under the  
10 City of Monterey zoning, and that's what we've analyzed.

11 On the north side, because the airport controls  
12 that, there was a marketing study done at one point to  
13 kind of look at some build-out numbers, and that's what we  
14 looked at. But, again, it's a programmatic look for  
15 purposes of analysis of CEQA.

16 So what does that mean? Well, CEQA allows a  
17 program -- a program EIR when you have a series of actions  
18 that are characterized as one large project; for example,  
19 the Airport Master Plan. They're related geographically  
20 by the airport boundaries, and they're a logical part of  
21 contemplated actions, which fits your master plan pretty  
22 well, because you have your short-term projects, and then  
23 you have future long-term actions.

24 Subsequent activities must be examined in light  
25 of the program EIR to determine whether an additional

1 environmental document must be prepared. So what that  
2 means is that, if one of those long-term projects that we  
3 only looked at programatically, actually, you want to move  
4 forward with, you, as lead agency, would have to decide  
5 whether it was analyzed enough in this program EIR for you  
6 to move forward, or, is there additional -- additional  
7 analysis needed? And, in the program EIR, we identified  
8 some things we know you would need, which is traffic  
9 studies; primarily, traffic studies.

10 And then the Agency shall incorporate feasible  
11 mitigation measures and alternatives developed in the  
12 program EIR into subsequent actions in the program.  
13 That's for your Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting  
14 Program will be -- come into play as you're looking at  
15 future development.

16 So I hope I haven't made it more confusing for  
17 you, but you can ask questions.

18 Okay. So back to what Alternative 1 is. I told  
19 you it's environmentally superior. There's a very lengthy  
20 summary table of the mitigation measures. There's,  
21 actually, several. There's one in the Final EIR, a  
22 Mitigation Monitoring Program. It's also in the Draft EIR  
23 in the summary. So those are a good place to go and see  
24 what each impact is and what the mitigation is. But this  
25 is sort of just a high-level look at the impacts that

1 would be reduced to a level of less than significant by  
2 the mitigation program.

3 Potential operational impacts to Highway 68  
4 scenic resources. When I say, "operational impacts," I  
5 mean non-construction.

6 Project specific impacts to air quality.  
7 Impacts to most of the rare plants that are on the  
8 airport; the Yadon piperia being the exception.

9 Potential impacts to cultural and tribal  
10 cultural resources; geological and soil hazards; hazardous  
11 materials, both, the transport disposal or use at the  
12 airport; construction-related noise and traffic.

13 Short-term, long-term, and cumulative water use.  
14 And we can say that, because one of the mitigation  
15 measures for one of the -- for the future projects is you  
16 will have enough water, or you'll design your project and  
17 come into the amount of water you have. So that's an  
18 actual mitigation measure of the program.

19 Sewer infrastructure improvements, if necessary,  
20 and solid waste disposal.

21 Those are all things that either those  
22 regulatory requirements and/or mitigation measures in the  
23 EIR to address the impacts.

24 And now this is the summary of significant  
25 unavoidable impacts. There would be some with

1 Alternative 1, just like there would be with the proposed  
2 project.

3           And I forgot to mention this, but we did look at  
4 two other alternatives in the EIR; one was the No-Project  
5 Alternative, and one was Alternative 2, which was,  
6 basically, the proposed project without a north side  
7 access road. Both of those alternatives, for one thing,  
8 they don't meet the project objectives or the project  
9 objectives well. But they do not -- they create  
10 additional impacts to the City of Monterey, and,  
11 primarily, the CONA neighborhood. If the additional  
12 traffic has to continue to go out through Airport Road,  
13 then there would be additional impacts to that  
14 neighborhood and to the street system on the west side of  
15 the airport. It would also create additional emergency  
16 response times that you don't have to have.

17           So there were some things about taking your  
18 project and just taking out the north side road that made  
19 it less desirable. So we can talk about that more, if you  
20 want, during the question-and-answer time.

21           All right. Sorry. To segue back. I forgot to  
22 say that.

23           So the summary of significant unavoidable  
24 impacts of Alternative 1 are: Potential impacts to  
25 Highway 68 scenic resources during construction;

1 cumulative impacts to air quality and greenhouses gasses,  
2 and that's because any additional emissions create a  
3 cumulative impact. This air basin is not in -- not in  
4 compliance for ozone and particulate matter and greenhouse  
5 gasses overall, right now, to meet the State standards of  
6 reduction. If you contribute any additional greenhouse  
7 gasses, you're going to have a cumulative impact.

8           Loss of Monterey pine trees and Monterey pine  
9 forest. Again, this is because it's not really ideal to  
10 replant such a tall, fast-growing tree as Monterey pine on  
11 the airport.

12           Loss of Yadon piperia. The -- I don't have -- I  
13 didn't put the numbers in a slide, but, in the EIR, there  
14 is a discussion of how many plants we're talking about;  
15 how many trees we're saving between the proposed project  
16 and Alternative 1. So I can look that information up for  
17 you if you'd like.

18           Policy inconsistencies with the plans of the  
19 Cities of Del Rey Oaks and Monterey and the County's  
20 Airport Comprehensive Land Use Plan. All of these policy  
21 inconsistencies, to some extent, exist now, with the  
22 exception of the Del Rey Oaks', you know, policy about the  
23 north side road. But Alternative 1 would have some  
24 inconsistencies.

25           Exterior noise level increases within the 65



1 CNEL at four nearby residences. I wanted to talk about  
2 this just for a second. Because this is a CNEL that's  
3 related to what we think airport operations could be in  
4 2033, and it shifts the contour just a little bit in the  
5 CONA neighborhood. That's where the -- you have done  
6 sound attenuation. So that's why we say this is an  
7 exterior noise-level increase only. The four homes that  
8 would be affected have all received insulation. So it's  
9 just an exterior noise impact, not an interior noise  
10 impact.

11 And then the additional peak-hour trips through  
12 congested intersections and roadways. I think the  
13 proposed project there were five intersections in the  
14 short term that would be affected. Alternative 1 would  
15 only affect two, and it's four p.m. peak-hour trips for  
16 each one. But the threshold is one.

17 Okay. I feel like I'm kind of racing through  
18 and looking at your faces and realize I'm talking too  
19 long.

20 The Statement of Overriding Considerations in  
21 your packet I just want to cover a little bit of the CEQA  
22 Guidelines' section. I won't read it to you. But the  
23 purpose of a Statement of Overriding Considerations is  
24 when CEQA allows the decisionmaking agency to balance the  
25 economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits

1 of a project against its unavoidable environmental risks.  
2 In that case, the agency can make a finding that those  
3 risks are acceptable. There's two caveats. There has to  
4 be substantial evidence in the record, and the agency has  
5 to make a formal statement.

6           So, for this project, for your consideration,  
7 these -- these are the overriding considerations that we  
8 would like you to consider. Based on the analysis, we  
9 believe that the Alternative 1 is the optimal balance  
10 between meeting project objectives and reducing  
11 significant unavoidable impacts. You're not going to  
12 make -- meet either of them completely. So, either you're  
13 going to sacrifice some of the safety considerations  
14 you're trying to accomplish here at the airport, or you're  
15 going to have some impact.

16           So we feel like Alternative 1 is -- does the  
17 best job of balancing those two. It provides the airport  
18 safety enhancements per FAA design standards that appear  
19 feasible at the airport. It prepares the airport to meet  
20 operational forecasts through 2033.

21           And I -- I just want to mention that's not just  
22 like we need more hangars. It's the kind of hangars, the  
23 kind of terminal. It's upgrading your terminal to meet  
24 sustainability standards of today and what does a  
25 passenger expect to be able to fly into a destination

1 place like Monterey. They have certain expectations, and  
2 this gives the airport an opportunity to create something  
3 that meets more of those expectations.

4           Incorporation of the airport sustainability  
5 goals and objectives; revenue producing opportunities to  
6 enhance the airport's economic viability and  
7 self-sufficiency; and then there's some regional economic  
8 growth impacts in the construction sector. The airport  
9 provides regional direct, indirect, and induced economic  
10 impacts to the area. That would continue as the airport  
11 moves forward successfully into the future.

12           So I think, with that, I'll turn it back over to  
13 Scott to wrap up, and then we can go from there for your  
14 next part.

15           Thank you so much.

16           CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

17           MR. HUBER: I want to thank Coffman Associates  
18 for the presentation.

19           Again, we'll have an opportunity to get into  
20 some questions here, but I want to remind the Board that  
21 the two recommendations -- or the two recommendations that  
22 we have regarding these resolutions -- and I won't read  
23 them in their entirety again -- in their entirety again.

24           But, again, the -- the staff and the consultants  
25 are recommending approval and certification of the Final

1 Environmental Impact Report, as outlined in  
2 Resolution 1730, as well as approving Alternative Number 1  
3 as the Monterey Regional Airport Master Plan in  
4 Resolution 1731.

5 Mr. Chair, it would be appropriate, I think, at  
6 this time, to -- to open it up for staff to ask any  
7 questions they may have of -- I'm sorry -- for the Board  
8 to ask any questions they may have of staff and of Coffman  
9 Associates.

10 Should you have any questions, we want to get  
11 those out and answer them, then we can move into the  
12 public comment after that.

13 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Let's -- let's start down  
14 on this end.

15 Director Nelson, any questions?

16 DIRECTOR NELSON: Thank you, Chair.

17 A couple questions here with the first  
18 responders. Would this type of master plan help  
19 facilitate with response time for mutual aid? Let's say,  
20 forest fire or house fires or structure fires.

21 MR. JIM HARRIS: Director Nelson, yeah, the  
22 improvement to the location of the ARFF facility, we do  
23 believe the response time -- and correct -- correct me if  
24 I'm wrong, Judi. But the response times are enhanced by  
25 the location of the ARFF facility being relocated, because

1 it, not only, has, as you -- as you know, not only ARFF  
2 and aircraft firefighting response capabilities, but  
3 structure response capabilities. So it does meet the  
4 needs and is more beneficial in the north side location.

5 DIRECTOR NELSON: I see.

6 I just think, in light of the Paradise fire and  
7 the Pebble Beach fire, as a resident here for almost  
8 40 years on the coast, thinking back to the Pebble Beach  
9 fire that burnt 65 homes in 1987, I think, responding to  
10 those events there in the forest took some time to get to  
11 those windy roads. That's a comment from me.

12 MR. JIM HARRIS: If I could? I'm sorry.

13 DIRECTOR NELSON: Sure. Absolutely.

14 MR. JIM HARRIS: Just to add to that. I think  
15 the ramp space -- the extended ramp space is going to be  
16 beneficial, because that's one area that we had  
17 significant shortage was for the -- parking the aircraft.  
18 And so, if you have other response aircraft that need to  
19 be serviced, the ramp area will also provide that  
20 additional space.

21 DIRECTOR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

22 And I was called on the phone by a couple  
23 constituents regarding a restaurant that might be built on  
24 the north side. I just want to dispel that rumor that  
25 there's no discussion of talks about a north side location

1 of a restaurant.

2 MR. JIM HARRIS: There is no mention of a  
3 restaurant in the document on the north side.

4 DIRECTOR NELSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 And then, Jim, the open-space buffer, what is  
6 the approximate width of the buffer there? Are we talking  
7 enough in terms of measurable distances? Like  
8 feet? yards? I don't mean to stump you.

9 MR. JIM HARRIS: We'd have to probably get back  
10 to you. I believe it was on the order of about a hundred  
11 feet, but we would have to confirm that exactly.

12 DIRECTOR NELSON: Okay. And buffers are  
13 designed, primarily, for noise and dust attenuation. What  
14 are they, specifically, for?

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: That's a really good question.

16 The green area that you show -- and I apologize.  
17 I don't know, offhand, how many feet it is -- it's  
18 primary -- its primary purpose was just to provide, like  
19 you said, for dust, for visual, for noise. Just all  
20 around to help land-use compatibility from things that  
21 might be built on the north side of the airport. But I  
22 will point out that there is -- part of the biological  
23 mitigation program the airport needs to replace some of  
24 the plants and some of the habitat conservation areas that  
25 were established for the RSA project. And so they have

1 been added to that green line, and I think it's  
2 Figure 4.4-E maybe in the Draft EIR. The buffer would,  
3 actually, be quite a bit bigger. Yeah. It goes kind of  
4 along here and along here (indicating). And those --  
5 those areas would be reserved as habitat conservation  
6 areas to replace some of the plants that are being  
7 disturbed and would be kept, you know, in perpetuity.

8           So the purpose of that buffer is a little  
9 different. It's for habitat conservation, but it  
10 accomplishes providing quite a bit more area between the  
11 residences and anything that would be developed on the  
12 north side.

13           DIRECTOR NELSON: Okay.

14           MR. HUBER: And, if I might, just so the audio  
15 record is clear, Judi, you were referring to what is  
16 currently on the proposed project, referring to the orange  
17 area -- looks orange from here -- on the north side where  
18 you were saying that the buffer would be quite larger.

19           MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Right.

20           MR. HUBER: It's adjacent to the green stripe on  
21 the border. I just want to make it clear so that, if  
22 someone's listening to the recording, when you said "here"  
23 and "here," that they -- that they will know where we're  
24 talking about.

25           MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Right. And it's

1 Exhibit 4.4-D, like David or dog, or whatever you say at  
2 airports. I can never remember D.

3 DIRECTOR NELSON: Delta.

4 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Delta. Delta. That's it. It  
5 looks like this (indicating).

6 CHAIR MILLER: And how many acres is that again?

7 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: I have to read. I think there  
8 is a chart.

9 How about I field another question, and then  
10 I'll look that up.

11 DIRECTOR NELSON: Okay. And then -- and then  
12 my -- my closing, I guess, comment is: If we can pull up  
13 the slide for the airport diagram, the overview, please.

14 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: This one?

15 DIRECTOR NELSON: Yes. One thing to keep in  
16 mind is -- do you have a laser pointer --

17 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

18 DIRECTOR NELSON: -- that could point to the  
19 proposed Runway 6 and Runway 24. If you look at it's --  
20 kind of hard to see.

21 MS. KRAUSS: Okay.

22 DIRECTOR NELSON: There you go. Runway 6 and  
23 24.

24 So, just for the record, that used to be an  
25 active runway back in the '70s and '80s, and the folks in



1 Del Rey Oaks were concerned about the noise and activity.  
2 And the airport listened, and we decided to close that  
3 runway. And so it's now a nonactive runway that's used  
4 for non-aeronautical use. And so -- and another issue too  
5 is, when we had the CONA entrance down in the north side  
6 of the airport, there were some strips that made noises  
7 that, when cars would go over, they'd make noises.

8           The point is: You know, I look for a  
9 collaborative approach with our folks here in Monterey  
10 County.

11           And, secondly, if there are issues, we listen.  
12 I don't want to be set up or keyed up as, you know, we're  
13 the enemy. We're not the bad guys here. We're looking  
14 for a way to collaborate here in this area that we all  
15 love very much.

16           MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Right.

17           According to this diagram, the additional  
18 conservation area would be a little over 20 acres.

19           DIRECTOR NELSON: Thank you.

20           Okay. That's all I have for now, Chair.

21           CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

22           Director Sabo.

23           DIRECTOR SABO: Thank you, Judi.

24           And a question. If you could go back to the  
25 part where you talked about access to -- from the airport

1 through the gate to Airport Road. You mentioned something  
2 about closures on Airport Road.

3 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

4 DIRECTOR SABO: Could you kind of review that  
5 whole section again, because it went by real fast.

6 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes, I can.

7 So one of the comments that we got during a  
8 scoping meeting was concern about, if there was a proposed  
9 north side road, that people would cut all the way across  
10 and go out. And it would create more impacts to the Cona  
11 neighborhood. So we added this as a project feature.  
12 It's in, both, the proposed project and Alternative 1.

13 Alt -- the ideas that existing Airport Road  
14 would be closed as a cul-de-sac right here by the gate,  
15 D-22, I think, and there's a little X that just indicates  
16 the pavement would be removed. So it would, literally,  
17 cul-de-sac Airport Road here, and the new north side road  
18 would cul-de-sac here. You can probably keep some  
19 emergency, you know, access or gate. But it would be  
20 closed to any public through-traffic at all, including  
21 even gate holders. It would not be available to -- so,  
22 from this area, you would have to go through the new road  
23 instead of -- you'd get this far, and you wouldn't be able  
24 to go through to CONA (indicating).

25 Does that answer your question?



1 MS. KRAUSS: Good question. Yeah, I can.

2 That's a good question.

3 It would not have fewer environmental impacts in  
4 Alternative 1; however, no -- doing nothing does not meet  
5 the objectives of the project, which are to fix some of  
6 your safety-enhancement issues, plan for the next  
7 20 years, incorporate sustainability, and have  
8 revenue-producing opportunities. So it would not meet,  
9 really, any of those.

10 So -- but, in terms of reducing impacts, it  
11 would. It would reduce, you know, traffic and some things  
12 like that; however, it is not completely free of  
13 environmental impacts, because what it would do is  
14 continue the inconsistencies with City of Monterey  
15 policies for the CONA neighborhood.

16 So there would still -- there would be impacts  
17 of the No-Project Alternative. There would also be  
18 increased noise, because the airport is going to grow  
19 whether you adopt this master plan or not. It's still  
20 projected to increase operations.

21 So, those -- those four houses that I mentioned  
22 that have -- would be included in the 65 CNEP, that would  
23 occur whether the No-Project Alternative was chosen or  
24 not.

25 So some of those things that are really related

1 more to just whether the airport reaches a core cap in  
2 growth or not would happen whether you adopt the master  
3 plan or not.

4 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Thank you.

5 No other questions.

6 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

7 Director Leffel.

8 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Judi, thank you.

9 Just to be clear, this is a request from FAA  
10 that we fix the problem that we have that this building is  
11 too close to the center line of that --

12 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

13 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- piece of concrete out  
14 there; correct?

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

16 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: That's what started all this.  
17 No one just woke up and decided we wanted to have a new  
18 terminal and --

19 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Exactly, yeah.

20 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I think it has to be really  
21 clear: We have a safety issue with the size of planes  
22 that our community is asking for to fly in and out of  
23 here --

24 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Correct.

25 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- and where our terminal

1 sits.

2 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. And the depth of your  
3 apron is too small --

4 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Is too small.

5 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: -- to accommodate it.

6 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: One of the things that has  
7 come up, and I think it has to be said, is a community  
8 request -- and I -- not a lot. I get it from people who  
9 are sometimes a little younger than me, but many who are  
10 as old or older -- that we do not have a very elderly use  
11 of an airport. So the fact that you have to leave the  
12 building, and you have to walk out on the tarmac and walk  
13 up either a pretty steep slope or stairs is not really  
14 conducive to encouraging a lot of our residents to fly.

15 So one of the things that I think keeps coming  
16 up is: When are you going to get something, a terminal,  
17 that has a jetway or has something that's connected to the  
18 building where we don't have to go out in inclement  
19 weather or we don't have to go at increased risk to  
20 ourselves up and down slopes?

21 MS. KRAUSS: Right.

22 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I think that's -- it's a --  
23 it's a piece of why we're doing this, and I -- I think the  
24 public has to be aware of it.

25 There are 44 hangars over here?

1 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

2 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And I sometimes, when I leave  
3 here, if I've got e-mails or something to return, I'll  
4 pull out into the lot and then sit out there and sit for a  
5 while where I get a good signal.

6 I think it's important -- I sometimes sit there,  
7 and, I don't watch -- I don't see a single person going in  
8 and out of those gates to those hangars for a good hour.  
9 There's nobody. So I think the amount of traffic that  
10 those hangars generate is extremely minimal. I've got a  
11 couple friends who have them there, and I think they maybe  
12 fly a couple times a month. So I think that, too, is  
13 important.

14 If the intent is to put hangars on the north  
15 side, that is not a lot of traffic that is being created  
16 there.

17 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: You're right. That's not.

18 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I think also the fact that  
19 those roads would not connect is extremely important. So  
20 there's not -- and I think I heard you say, even if you  
21 have a badge, you can't go through a gate --

22 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Right.

23 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- and cut across there.  
24 You're going to come back out whichever way you came --

25 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.





1 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. For the short term,  
2 biological impacts, I think, you can get quite a ways on  
3 the north side. I don't know that you can get there  
4 completely, but we don't have the final numbers really for  
5 what -- you know, it depends kind of what you decide here,  
6 among other things.

7 But some of the long-term impacts are for  
8 this -- this area, and so, until that's built, you  
9 wouldn't need to worry so much about --

10 CHAIR MILLER: I'm sorry. Can you put that up  
11 again. I didn't see where you were pointing.

12 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Down here (indicating). That  
13 road --

14 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. On the north side?

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. This is one of the  
16 features --

17 MR. HUBER: It's on the south side.

18 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: South side.

19 CHAIR MILLER: South side. Excuse me.

20 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: I forgot to mention this.

21 But this is one of the reasons that the bio  
22 impacts are less for Alternative 1 is that the proposed  
23 project showed this frontage road looping all the way  
24 around and coming back in. But that -- there's a lot of  
25 rare plants along there, including Yadon's.

1                   So Alternative 1 would cul-de-sac and minimize  
2 the environmental impacts.

3                   DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And that also then -- I think  
4 that would close off one of the entrances onto  
5 Highway 68 --

6                   MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

7                   DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- where there are a lot of  
8 rear-end accidents --

9                   MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah.

10                  DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- as they approach  
11 Olmsted Road, and then you come out of Fenton Keller and  
12 then --

13                  MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Exactly.

14                  DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- what is it? Talbots the  
15 next one. There are two or three driveways there. And  
16 the frontage road would be -- it would allow us to close  
17 that down. So --

18                  MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

19                  DIRECTOR LEFFEL: -- Caltrans -- it's my  
20 understanding -- likes it a lot.

21                  MS. JUDI KRAUSS: They do and so does TAMC.  
22 They've been supportive. And they were both included on  
23 the PAC and had input into some of these design features.  
24 Some of this is kind of a result of their input.

25                  DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So -- and I think, if I heard

1 correctly, the peak-hour trips through congested  
2 intersections and roadways that we would not have to  
3 discuss it if there was one, but that, instead, there are  
4 two intersections that are impacted.

5 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah.

6 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So that it -- which two are  
7 those intersections?

8 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: So there's a couple things.  
9 It's -- it's not how many intersections. It's per  
10 intersection is -- is how they look at the impact. And,  
11 if there's a peak trip that goes through an impact -- an  
12 intersection that's already at Level Service D or lower,  
13 it's considered significant.

14 What I said about the two intersections is that,  
15 with Alternative 1, in the short term, okay, not the  
16 programatic, because we don't really know what the traffic  
17 would be. But, in the short term, it would be four peak  
18 trips here, Del Monte -- wait. Where's Del Monte?  
19 Fremont and 20 -- Fremont and 218 and Del Monte.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. Del Monte.

21 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. Yeah. So both of those  
22 are further away. The traffic study went quite a ways up  
23 and down the highways, because everything, you know,  
24 spills down block one.

25 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And then, if I have read and

1 listened correctly, we're talking about doing this in  
2 phases. This goes to what year?

3 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Ten years out from whenever  
4 you start, which would maybe be next year.

5 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And that first -- first phase  
6 would include the fire station, moving 44 hangars.

7 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And building the north side  
8 road.

9 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And building the north side  
10 road.

11 And that be would the end of the first phase?

12 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Phase 1, yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the terminal.

14 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I was going to say --

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Well, I guess I -- the  
16 short-term projects are in four phases in terms of  
17 funding. So -- is that what you're talking about?

18 Okay. You're just talking about Phase 1 is the  
19 short term. Okay. Sorry. I misunderstood.

20 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: In ten years, what is going to  
21 happen?

22 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Okay. Got you.

23 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: What is going to happen? I'm  
24 asking.

25 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Okay. So in -- sorry. I

1 misunderstood. We broke it down a little differently in  
2 the EIR.

3 So, in ten years, the hangars that are here on  
4 the north side -- or south side would be moved. The ARFF  
5 building would be moved.

6 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: You cannot build a new  
7 terminal without moving the hangars.

8 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah, that be would the first  
9 step.

10 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Either the hangars go away,  
11 and we tell all the small pilots that are in there, Go  
12 away. We don't want your business, because we're going to  
13 build a terminal, or we move it to the other side where we  
14 can still accommodate our community.

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. So you would move the  
16 hangars and build a road, move the ARFF, and then you  
17 would move your terminals and deepen the apron. And then  
18 you would shift it. All of that is in the ten years.

19 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Okay. I think that's, for me,  
20 all of the questions that I had. Thank you.

21 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

22 And, again, thank you for your presentation on  
23 this.

24 I have just a few questions.

25 This has been going on a long time. How long

1 has this process been that you've looked into this?  
2 Certainly, you didn't do this within 48 hours. You didn't  
3 generate --

4 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Well -- we tried, though.

5 So the initial study was done in the fall of  
6 2015, and then we began the environmental -- the impact  
7 report, the Environmental Impact Report, at the beginning  
8 of 2016. And now we're here.

9 So, in 2017, there was a lot of exploration of  
10 which alternatives would work and how we could change  
11 things to minimize impacts. And it's just -- it's kind of  
12 an interate process sometimes. So you try this. Oh, that  
13 creates this -- and so it took a while to come to the  
14 alternatives that you see before you.

15 And then we were able to wrap up the analysis  
16 once we have that set.

17 CHAIR MILLER: And you had a number of  
18 workshops, including community groups, that got together  
19 on a regular basis and participated. And -- and you've  
20 not only used them for comment, but you also -- they got a  
21 chance to see where this project was moving and had an --  
22 had an active role in it; correct?

23 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: We had two public workshops as  
24 the EIR -- but go ahead, Jim.

25 MR. JIM HARRIS: Yeah. I think -- Chair Miller,

1 I think the key to it, of course, was all the preplanning  
2 that went on during the master plan. There were seven  
3 public workshops that took place as well as the additional  
4 board meetings, which were open to the public for  
5 briefings as well.

6 As it got into the environmental process, of  
7 course, that whole process led us up to the proposed  
8 project.

9 And then, as it went into the scoping for the  
10 preparation -- or the initial study and then into the  
11 scoping for the preparation of the EIR, there was the  
12 public scoping meeting, which then led to the more  
13 analysis, which Judi talked about, and leading us up to  
14 Alternative 1.

15 And, of course, there was another public  
16 workshop that we just talked about that was for the public  
17 to gain more comment.

18 And I think we came back a couple interim steps  
19 and briefed the Board at public meetings as well just to  
20 let you know the status of where things were moving.  
21 So....

22 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And those are on our website.

23 MR. JIM HARRIS: Yes.

24 And the website was used as very valuable tool  
25 for public-outreach. So we had quite a bit of activity on

1 the website for the public taking a look at the progress  
2 and the study in the different stages as it moved through  
3 the process.

4 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

5 I did get some comments from members of the  
6 community concerning the traffic count, and I think  
7 there's a lot of misunderstanding about those. That  
8 number was quite high. I forget what it was. Was it  
9 7,000 cars a day or something?

10 And I know you've -- you've sort of talked about  
11 that, but that's worst case scenario. And, in fact, I  
12 don't even think it's fair to call it worst case scenario,  
13 because it's -- the likelihood of ever reaching that  
14 200,000 cars, what would that be? 7,000 cars a day?

15 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. So the traffic study  
16 looked at what would happen if this ten-year -- what you  
17 call Phase 1 was built, and the main ramification for  
18 traffic is moving a few trips from the south side of the  
19 airport to the north. Because, like you said,  
20 Commissioner Leffel, it's not a lot of trips. And that  
21 was -- the number of trips was determined by actual  
22 traffic counts in and out of the hangars. They counted  
23 them to see how many.

24 But the long term, where we're looking at, what  
25 kind of traffic can happen --





1 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And so -- yeah. You're right.  
2 It's -- it's a big number, but it's a theoretical number  
3 for purposes of the analysis.

4 CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

5 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And it would require the  
6 regional traffic -- you know, regional improvements that  
7 are way beyond the ability of anyone in your jurisdiction.

8 CHAIR MILLER: We couldn't even afford to do the  
9 improvements that would be required in order to  
10 accommodate that level of traffic is what you're saying.

11 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah.

12 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. That's all the questions I  
13 have. Thank you very much.

14 MR. HUBER: Mr. Chair, if -- if the board  
15 members have no further questions, then, at this time, it  
16 would be appropriate for the Board to open the public  
17 hearing {sic} and invite comments from any and all members  
18 of the public who wish to make comments regarding this  
19 matter.

20 Comments from the public are limited to three  
21 minutes per speaker, and speakers may not give their time  
22 to another speaker. As I have sometimes called myself the  
23 de facto parliamentarian, I'll go ahead and keep the  
24 time --

25 CHAIR MILLER: Oh, good.

1 MR. HUBER: -- on my -- on a stopwatch app on my  
2 iPhone.

3 I would suggest that you begin with those who  
4 have submitted speaker slips. When those are exhausted,  
5 then I would open up to anyone who either did not want to  
6 or who did not get an opportunity to fill out a speaker  
7 card.

8 Following the public comment, once there are no  
9 more public comments, it would be appropriate to close the  
10 public hearing {sic} and to limit comments to those  
11 between staff consultants and the Board.

12 CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

13 MR. HUBER: So, at this time, you should open  
14 the public hearing {sic}.

15 CHAIR MILLER: And I would -- at this time, I  
16 will open -- open the public hearing {sic}?

17 MR. HUBER: Yes.

18 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. We are opening the public  
19 hearing {sic}.

20 It's 2:12 p.m.

21 On two of the statements, it just says you wish  
22 to make a public comment.

23 Richard, I assume you already made your public  
24 comment for this?

25 MR. RICHARD RUCCELLO: No. I have one.

1 CHAIR MILLER: You have one?

2 MR. RICHARD RUCCELLO: Yeah.

3 CHAIR MILLER: And, Matthew Wright, did you want  
4 to make a public comment related to this project?

5 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: I did. But it's more in  
6 general regarding both resolutions. It's not,  
7 specifically, tied to environmental or the master plan.  
8 So --

9 CHAIR MILLER: Well, it's your option. You can  
10 speak now or at a later time.

11 MR. HUBER: Well, no. Anybody that wants to  
12 speak regarding this matter should do so now.

13 CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

14 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Regarding the environment  
15 aspect --

16 MR. HUBER: Regarding this project, generally,  
17 or the resolution.

18 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Will there be a public  
19 comment period provided for the Airport Master Plan?

20 MR. HUBER: This is it right now.

21 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Okay.

22 CHAIR MILLER: Do you wish to make a public  
23 comment?

24 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: I do.

25 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Please.

1 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Right now?

2 CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

3 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Thank you.

4 Chair Miller, Vice Chair Sabo, Members of the  
5 Board, Executive Director LaPier, my name is Matthew  
6 Wright. I'm the general manager and vice president of the  
7 Monterey Fuel Company.

8 I am here to support -- to voice our support for  
9 the Proposed Resolution 1730 and 1731 and ask that the  
10 Board take action to approve both the Final Environmental  
11 Impact Report and the Airport Master Plan.

12 As you know -- or I think you know, Monterey  
13 Fuel Company is the largest tenant at the Monterey  
14 Airport, and, perhaps, the one most likely to be impacted,  
15 either positively or negatively, by these documents.

16 I've also have the unique pleasure -- a little  
17 sarcasm in there -- of having gone through a similar  
18 process as a similarly-situated stakeholder at Scottsdale  
19 Airport within the past ten years. So I have some  
20 experience with the process, and I understand the  
21 importance of getting it right for the airport, the  
22 airport stakeholders, and the community, as a whole.

23 So, as -- and I think, Director Leffel, you  
24 touched on this a little bit. But, as a document that I  
25 believe -- or both these documents, I believe, are

1 required by the FAA to be considered for most airport  
2 project funding. We understand the overall importance for  
3 the airport and the client public that the airport had an  
4 updated master plan and that the potential harm and  
5 potential safety issues for failing the plan for the  
6 future in a community that's, primarily -- or heavily  
7 reliant on air travel and tourism for its economic  
8 vitality only speaks to the importance of these documents  
9 that are before you today.

10 So Monterey Fuel Company supports Alternative 1  
11 of the -- presented in the environmental report as,  
12 generally, the best option.

13 We are also the opinion that the master plan  
14 does a good job of defining the current state of the  
15 airport and identifies areas that are in need of  
16 development and improvement.

17 While there's no one-size-fits-all solution, we  
18 believe the proposed documents represent a fair and  
19 necessary vision for the future of the airport, and the  
20 Monterey Fuel Company is supportive of -- in support of  
21 the Board's approval of both resolutions.

22 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

23 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: Thank you.

24 CHAIR MILLER: Was that your fuel truck, by the  
25 way, that was --

1 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: For the record, that was  
2 not our fuel truck.

3 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

4 MR. MATTHEW WRIGHT: I was speaking to -- to the  
5 gentleman, and, just so everybody else knows in here: All  
6 fuel deliveries are made to the south side. All the fuel  
7 storage is on the south side of the airport.

8 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

9 I have one more slip from Louise Grateris  
10 (phonetic). Help me with your last name.

11 MS. LOUISE GETSELL: Getsell (phonetic).

12 CHAIR MILLER: Getsell. Thank you.

13 MS. LOUISE GETSELL: Good afternoon. I'm Louise  
14 Getsell. I'm a resident of The Oaks in Del Rey Oaks. I'm  
15 also on the board of directors for the homeowners'  
16 association; although, these comments are my own personal  
17 opinion.

18 I think that there's a lot of hard work, good  
19 work, gone into the plan, the draft master plan, and the  
20 EIR.

21 I do object to the north side road coming in  
22 through Del Rey Gardens Drive, and this is also a comment  
23 from Mr. RJ Roland, Roland and Associates, who's one of  
24 our neighbors. Our major concern is that road and the  
25 impact it would have on the quality of life of the

1 resident of The Oaks and Mr. Roland's business, quality of  
2 life, as far as noise, exhaust, and things like that.  
3 Yes, right now, you're talking maybe a hundred trips a  
4 day, but also the environmental impact of merely  
5 constructing the road, the potential for runoff, the  
6 impact on the flora and fauna that -- that we have. The  
7 coyotes and our raccoons and our skunks and our foxes and  
8 our bobcats and our hawks and all the other things would  
9 be adversely impacted by the construction of the road from  
10 Del Rey Gardens Drive.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you very much.

13 Mr. Richard Rucello.

14 MR. RICHARD RUCCELLO: Chairman, Members of the  
15 Board.

16 Richard Rucello speaking as president of the  
17 Casanova Oak Knoll Neighborhood Association.

18 We had representation at your meetings on the  
19 master plan throughout. I live at 2 Airport Way. I'm on  
20 the board of directors. So we're very informed on this,  
21 and this was an excellent presentation.

22 I want you to know that our neighborhood  
23 association is totally behind you on Alternative 1.

24 But I want to expand on your emergency response  
25 difference to the City of Del Rey Oaks. To put it in



1 terms of work: I have life experience. Eight minutes is  
2 a lifetime. Being a member of the Community Emergency  
3 Response Teams from our formation, brain death you stop  
4 breathing starts at four to six minutes. Eight minutes is  
5 just out of it. You need to be defibbed. You need  
6 medical attention. Having that three minutes away, I can  
7 tell you, in my neighborhood, we've had three house fires,  
8 and two of them were reported. Within three minutes of  
9 the report, we had engines there, up to eight engines in  
10 one house fire. That house fire was reported within --  
11 and an officer on scene in 30 seconds. In all three  
12 cases, all three houses were totaled. That's how fast it  
13 goes.

14 So, having an agreement with an adjoining  
15 jurisdiction to have fire available and to have paramedics  
16 on board those fire engines is a life-or-death situation.  
17 I think that's a wonderful addition also to our  
18 neighborhood.

19 And, like you said, if that cul-de-sac has a  
20 card gate, and the fire engines could also go that  
21 direction, we would not stop public safety from going  
22 through, whether it's police or fire. We're just trying  
23 to stop the new development traffic from going through the  
24 residential area.

25 And, to be clear, they don't also use Airport

1 Road. At a peak hour, they come down, and they're facing  
2 gridlock on Fremont from Cass Verde to Canyon Del Rey on a  
3 good day. So, if they make a choice go to Airport Road,  
4 then you've got Airport, Ramona, and Casanova to get  
5 through before you get to Canyon Del Rey. Well, they go  
6 down Ramona or they go down Casanova, one of the  
7 highest-density streets in the city of Monterey.

8 So, when the traffic comes out of the airport,  
9 they make value decisions on time. And, if you can  
10 eliminate three stop signs that are gridlocked, you could  
11 be saving 15 minutes, and that's what you're doing today.

12 So thank you.

13 We -- we support you on Alternative 1. I hope  
14 the residents of the other city will look at how that  
15 affects the lives of their city too.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

18 Any other member of the public wishing to  
19 address the Board at this time?

20 Well, I saw him first, and then I'll go to you  
21 second. So, if you could come up and state your name for  
22 the record, and you have three minutes.

23 MR. BOB SMITH: Thank you.

24 Hi. Thanks for giving an opportunity.

25 I moved here in 2017. I'm a residence of The

1 Oaks and Del Rey Oaks. I do want to ask --

2 CHAIR MILLER: Your name, sir?

3 MR. BOB SMITH: Oh, I'm sorry. Bob Smith.

4 Sorry about that.

5 I wanted to ask Judi, one of the consultants, if  
6 they did a study on the impact of putting that north road  
7 through over to 218. I didn't hear anything about the  
8 environmental or the impact on the residents.

9 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Sure.

10 MR. BOB SMITH: Okay.

11 CHAIR MILLER: Sure.

12 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Can I do that or?

13 CHAIR MILLER: Yeah, go ahead.

14 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: They're saying no.

15 CHAIR MILLER: Oh. They're saying no. Okay.

16 MR. HUBER: We -- we may -- we may be able to  
17 answer that question subsequently, but -- but, at this  
18 point in time, this is for the public --

19 MR. BOB SMITH: Just comment only?

20 MR. HUBER: Well, yeah, to make your comments  
21 known, and, if you --

22 MR. BOB SMITH: Okay.

23 MR. HUBER: Again, we'll take that comment as:  
24 Would you, please, let us know what the -- what the study  
25 was.

1 MR. BOB SMITH: Okay.

2 CHAIR MILLER: And you can follow up with if he  
3 leaves his name and address with you?

4 MR. HUBER: Certainly.

5 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And that might be best, or  
6 we may address this at some future point here too.

7 The gentleman in the back.

8 MR. WAYNE MARIEN: Thank you.

9 My name is -- my name is Wayne Marien. I live  
10 in Del Rey Oaks just on this side of the airport property.  
11 Our property backs up to the airport property. So you see  
12 the no-trespassing sign on the fence on the six-foot high  
13 fence. And we've lived there since, well, five years. So  
14 the end of 2013/fall of 2013, we moved in.

15 So we're well aware of the noise that's created  
16 at the airport and the pollution problems, particularly,  
17 pollution problems. We've got a lot of dust, a lot of --  
18 lot of air pollution that comes down upon us from the  
19 airport.

20 And I'd just like to make a few comments or a  
21 couple of comments.

22 I didn't see in the EIR any mention of the  
23 effect on property values. I may be wrong, but I did not  
24 see anything. And I'd like to read a couple of facts that  
25 I've dug up on the internet.

1           On one study, it's been shown that there's been  
2 a ten-percent-or-more decline in property values on -- on  
3 residences that are located near airports.

4           On another study, there's a -- for every --  
5 let's see. How does this read? Okay. This is the John  
6 Wayne Airport. And this is a study done at Los Angeles  
7 International, John Wayne Airport, and Ontario Airport,  
8 which, you know, they're bigger airports, but still.

9 27 -- due to airport proximity, a 27.4 percent reduction  
10 in property values.

11           Now, also included with -- now, if this is true,  
12 if there is going to be a decrease in property values,  
13 that's also a decrease in taxes brought into the County,  
14 property taxes. So that's just one concern that I have.

15           Another concern I have is the noise that's  
16 created by the airport. I know the airport -- at least, I  
17 believe, that the airport is supposed to abide by a  
18 7:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. quiet time. We're woken up just  
19 about every day at 5:30 a.m./6:00 a.m. by the noise, jets  
20 warming up.

21           Also, traffic does not come down -- when it's  
22 landing, does not come down in this kind of a pattern. It  
23 comes over my house sometimes, small airplanes and  
24 helicopters, and quite low at times. If I had a  
25 slingshot, I could shoot at it. That low.





1 talked about before, and that is this north side access  
2 road. There is a lot of misperception about this. There  
3 is a lot of misperception on the part of citizens of  
4 Del Rey Oaks that we have made a backdoor deal with the  
5 Airport on this that we have all decided. I've tried to  
6 emphasize to people and let 'em know that, Hey, look, the  
7 airport, this is their master plan. We -- we were asked  
8 for input. We provided input. And I just want to  
9 emphasize, again, that we have to figure out a solution  
10 that will be acceptable to the people of The Oaks, to the  
11 people like Jay Rolands, who has his business there, and  
12 the gentleman who just talked about noise pollution on his  
13 side of the boundary over here.

14           So I think one of the really important things  
15 you need to address is get people to understand exactly  
16 what the plans are for that area that you have up here in  
17 orange, how far that is between there and where the  
18 hangars are going to be located, and then what kind of --  
19 I don't think people understand the potential for  
20 buffering the way -- sound buffering, what can you do  
21 about air. Dust was mentioned here. These things can be  
22 mitigated, and they need to be addressed in a logical way  
23 so people can understand them. And then maybe they'll be  
24 more receptive to this idea of the north side access road.

25           So I think a lot of discussions to make the plan



1 work, preferred Alternative 1, has got to focus on what  
2 are reasonable things what -- that people can do to  
3 mitigate these issues that are very well voiced by Louise  
4 Getsell and other people up here.

5 Thank you.

6 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

7 Any -- any other member of the public wish to  
8 address the Board at this time?

9 If you want to talk, you better do it soon  
10 before I close public comment. I see a couple people  
11 shifting.

12 Okay. I'm going to be closing public comment  
13 if -- okay. We'll close public comment at this time.

14 Is it appropriate to ask the consultants at this  
15 time, or should we just move on?

16 MR. HUBER: Well, again, you've got -- this is  
17 the time for Board comments and discussions. So, if the  
18 Board has any comments they'd like to make or -- or any  
19 additional, you know, clarifications, it's up to the  
20 Board.

21 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. That sounds good.

22 We'll start here on this end, Director Leffel.

23 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So I am -- I guess, for me,  
24 it's really important that we also talk about the  
25 sustainability piece, and that goes with that buffer.



1           DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So, if you were talking about  
2 it, if my house was near the fence, how much space do I  
3 have between the fence, I guess, and where there might be  
4 an activity? You can -- you can look, and I'll....

5           MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Okay.

6           DIRECTOR LEFFEL: And, also, we put a pretty  
7 large solar farm over there, which, actually -- if you  
8 just want to talk about buffer, it, actually, is another  
9 buffer, because there's nothing that goes on over there  
10 that would create any type of noise or activity.

11           Something I just have to say I think this is --  
12 the first ten years we're talking about first round of  
13 money is what? About \$30 million give or take?

14           I think, if you look at the investment that the  
15 federal administration is looking to make in this  
16 community, it's substantial for a community of our size.  
17 It's pretty mind-boggling.

18           When we read all of the airport news throughout  
19 the US and see how many airports our size are losing  
20 airlines, they're losing flights, and they're losing  
21 activity. We have been on the receiving end for quite a  
22 while now, and a lot of it has to do with you, the  
23 community. And I think that that's really important.

24           We are -- we are able to sustain the activity in  
25 this area with the addition of the Denver flights twice a

1 day and with Dallas once a day, beginning February and  
2 then April. That's really important. The community said  
3 this is where we want to fly to. We want more flights to  
4 the east. We've got grandchildren there. We've got  
5 business there. We need to be able to move east. And we  
6 were able to listen to you and to go out to the airlines  
7 and ask for it, and they have -- they have -- they have  
8 responded.

9           So this airport is not going away. What it  
10 really needs to do, though, is to be safer and to be more  
11 accessible for our community. And I think both of those  
12 things are here.

13           We have worked very hard in the last 10,  
14 12 years to make this much more  
15 environmentally-sustainable airport with the solar farm,  
16 electrical charging stations, LED lights everywhere.

17           But the, I think, thing is: You can only do so  
18 much with an aging building like this, and we get a  
19 complaint card every month. And the thing that people --  
20 as soon as we get above -- you know how grouchy we all get  
21 when it gets above 75 degrees, because we're so used to  
22 our 64? That holding where TSA, when you go through  
23 security, it just gets hot and stuffy in there, and  
24 there's not a thing we can do about it. We've put fans  
25 in. We've done everything we can short of spending

1 massive amounts of money on an aging building that's too  
2 close to the runway.

3           So there are all these things that just make it  
4 better to be able to move forward. So I'm hoping that we  
5 can all agree that, for the good of the community, we  
6 can -- we can make this work.

7           And I live in Monterey. I have a lot of friends  
8 and a lot of business associates in Del Rey Oaks, and I  
9 feel the pain of both the communities that have access  
10 there. And I -- but I do think that we can work through  
11 this, and we can make it so it works for everybody.

12           CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

13           Mr. Harris, you put a -- you put a chart up  
14 there that shows the environmental buffer area?

15           MR. JIM HARRIS: Yes.

16           Chair Miller, that was in response to  
17 Director Leffel's question about some of the widths and  
18 such. You can kind of get a better depiction of kind of  
19 the areas. And I think some of them, when you have the  
20 berm over there, which, I think, is, on the average, about  
21 a hundred-feet wide. But, those conservation areas and  
22 buffer areas, some of those are going to vary to 300- to  
23 500-feet wide depending upon the specific areas. So  
24 anywhere as -- as low as a hundred, and, some, much, much  
25 more.

1 CHAIR MILLER: Where is the solar farm in  
2 reference to that?

3 MS. JIM KRAUSS: Solar farm's right here  
4 (indicating).

5 CHAIR MILLER: Which is also a pretty good size.  
6 So that takes that area out from any --

7 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes.

8 CHAIR MILLER: -- future development.  
9 And the blue area on the -- off to the right?

10 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: That is potential off-site  
11 mitigation area for biological if they need it.

12 CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

13 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: We just kind of identified  
14 some potential areas where the habitat was suitable.

15 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So -- excuse me.

16 CHAIR MILLER: Yes. Go ahead.

17 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So, for the -- for someone who  
18 is concerned about the wildlife, that, actually, becomes  
19 another great place for wildlife on the Del Rey Oaks' side  
20 of the airport.

21 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yes; although, the airport has  
22 to keep wildlife.

23 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I understand. Hawks are not  
24 our friend.

25 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: So -- yeah.



1 MR. JIM HARRIS: I was just asked to comment on  
2 one other thing about the buffer areas. That's an area  
3 that -- correct me if I'm wrong, Judi or Chris. But oaks  
4 would be planted in that area as well as --

5 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And chaparral.

6 MR. JIM HARRIS: Pardon me.

7 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: And chaparral.

8 MR. JIM HARRIS: And chaparral. So there will  
9 be trees planted there.

10 In addition, there was a real significant effort  
11 made to balance the earthwork that takes place for the  
12 terminal building on site so that they're not having to  
13 import or export material. So there is going to be some  
14 excess material and excavation that can be used or will be  
15 used over in that area to raise some of the areas as well  
16 that are kind of low lying will be brought up. So it was  
17 a real effort to find a placement for that material that  
18 would be beneficial.

19 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

20 Anything else, Director Leffel?

21 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: That's all. Thank you.

22 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

23 Director Cursio.

24 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Well, just a comment or two.

25 I am, for those of you that don't know, the



1 newest member of this airport board and recently just  
2 elected to another four-year term. But, being the newest  
3 member sometimes has its advantages, believe it or not,  
4 because I -- I sometimes have a tendency, having not been  
5 through the early part of this process, and now that I see  
6 what -- what is proposed, it's very -- it just seems  
7 crystal clear to me that Alternative 1 is, by far, the  
8 superior way to move forward with this airport. And a lot  
9 of it, as we've mentioned before, is safety-related.

10 But the other thing that's so important is that  
11 we need to be constantly improving the customer  
12 experience, the client experience. And every -- some of  
13 us learned at a recent conference that -- and we all know  
14 this, anyway. Every business has what's called its pain  
15 points. And, of course, airports have more pain points  
16 than any other business that there is; although, I did  
17 find one last week that is much worse, and that's the DMV.

18 That being said, to do the kind of things we  
19 need to continue to elevate the customer experience -- and  
20 Director Leffel mentioned some of the things pertaining to  
21 seniors, et cetera -- we -- we can't do those things with  
22 this facility. And, if we're going to keep moving forward  
23 into the future and improving the experience, this is the  
24 way we have to do it.

25 And, yes, there are issues that we need to

1 resolve with our neighbors, and we -- and we intend to do  
2 that.

3 But, currently, the -- by far, the best option  
4 is this staff recommendation of Alternative 1.

5 That's it.

6 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

7 Director Sabo.

8 DIRECTOR SABO: Thank you for your presentation  
9 again.

10 And, I guess, did you -- just to -- before I  
11 make some comments about the alternatives, would you run  
12 through the timeline for the -- for the steps involved in  
13 our 20-year plan here, the timeline. What are the  
14 significant -- we got short term, intermediate term, long  
15 term. Can you summarize what's in each one of those  
16 categories.

17 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Sure.

18 DIRECTOR SABO: Particularly, short term and  
19 intermediate term, what those times are too.

20 MS. JUDI KRAUSS: Yeah. So we didn't really use  
21 the intermediate term, because the Safety Enhancement  
22 Project, shifting the terminal and the hangars, is such a  
23 big project. So we just have short term and long term.

24 I think what might help is to go back to this  
25 list. So the short-term projects would be the Safety

1 Enhancement Project related to Taxiway A shift, which is  
2 relocating commercial terminal and apron, the ARFF  
3 building, the 44 general aviation hangars, the north side  
4 road. Those all would be first. And it will take, I  
5 think, eight or nine years to get all of that  
6 accomplished. Other things in the short term is  
7 acquisition of the 5.5-acre parcel along Highway 68 and  
8 the Highway 68 frontage cul-de-sac road, which the graphic  
9 isn't there, but that's this one (indicating).

10           So those are the things that we hope you can do  
11 in the first ten years and that the EIR analyzed in a  
12 project-specific level of detail.

13           The other things, we don't have a timeframe for  
14 these things. I think some of them the master plan put  
15 together a graphic that kind of shows, you know, ten years  
16 out. But it really will be up to the airport to  
17 prioritize these things when the time comes, and it will  
18 depend on what funding.

19           But here are the things on the list. Okay. So  
20 upgrading the perimeter fence. That's taking the  
21 perimeter fence that's along the highway and making it  
22 taller -- that's a recommendation in your Wildlife Hazard  
23 Management Plan -- and taking that improvement all around  
24 the airport to keep deer and things like that from  
25 accessing the airfield. So that's a project.



1 during the master planning process as well with the  
2 committee -- is: How do we get from point A to point B  
3 with as little disruption as possible? Because,  
4 obviously, there's a lot of improvements.

5           And I think Director Leffel kind of touched upon  
6 it in the fact that: You have to move one piece to then  
7 build it in another area or to build in that area.

8           So, within that ten-year timeframe, that's why  
9 it was combined, because it takes a while to kind of put  
10 all of the pieces together to get from point A to point B  
11 during that ten-year period. For example, moving the  
12 southeast general aviation activity that's there now, to  
13 clear that area and open it up for development for the  
14 terminal and the other areas, the intent is to accomplish  
15 that first; to move those hangars over and minimize the  
16 disruption to the existing tenants to the greatest extent  
17 possible to get them in a new home so that area is cleared  
18 to be developed.

19           Same thing is true with the -- the ARFF  
20 building. It needs to be moved to build the ramp. And,  
21 of course, obviously, the taxiway cannot be shifted until  
22 the -- the terminal building is -- is moved and relocated.

23           So it's -- it's a bit of a -- kind of a  
24 chessboard moving the pieces around to effectively do it.  
25 And I know staff is working very closely with the FAA

1 relative to grant programs and funding and timing and  
2 everything else.

3           So it's a -- it's been a very-detailed program  
4 with discussion and putting this plan together to minimize  
5 the disruption to the greatest extent possible,  
6 particularly, with the terminal building too. Because,  
7 again, we wanted to be able to not disrupt the activities  
8 that take place in a active, operating terminal building  
9 while you're building a new one.

10           So this particular plan will allow for that to  
11 occur.

12           So that kind of explains a little bit why  
13 Phase 1 and Phase 2 was combined in the short term and  
14 redistancing.

15           DIRECTOR SABO: Well, that's an apt description  
16 and addresses my concerns.

17           You know, my comments on what we're about here:  
18 I -- this is probably -- in 11 years on the Board here,  
19 this is one of the toughest choices that I've had to make,  
20 and I'm sure that extends to the other directors here.  
21 And it requires a lot of thinking and a lot of looking at  
22 this volume of information, even though we've been at it  
23 since 2015.

24           So, members of the public and others, don't  
25 think that any of us, and, specifically, right now me, are

1 taking any of this lightly, because we understand that  
2 there are differing views about Alternative 1 and  
3 Alternative 2, don't do a project. And I have put myself  
4 in each one of those categories at some point.

5 But one of the primary considerations that I  
6 have is the safety of aircrafts here, whether they be  
7 general aviation airplanes, corporate general jets, or  
8 airliners. And I -- as a pilot myself, having ridden up  
9 and down these taxiways, where you've got to wriggle  
10 around to get around these aircraft, I think it's  
11 important, a very important consideration, and has  
12 influenced my decisionmaking an awful lot.

13 The second thing that I've always been concerned  
14 about about this airport is sustainability from a  
15 financial standpoint. We need to be financially  
16 self-sufficient. We don't get tax revenue of any  
17 consequence here. So we have to be financially  
18 self-sustaining, and I hope our neighbors and all of those  
19 people who live in our District understand all that. This  
20 is -- we're not just another one of those money-sucking  
21 public entities. We -- we develop our own revenues, and  
22 we -- we pay our own way. So be participants in that,  
23 since you are members of the district.

24 The third thing that has been a consideration  
25 for me is the convenience of our -- of our passengers that

1 use this terminal. There's only so much inconvenience we  
2 put them through when they make choices to go to that  
3 other airport. And, over time, we've had to deal with  
4 that.

5           And you are participants in this too, because  
6 you're users of this airport, or you better be. We're  
7 taking names.

8           So those are the considerations I have, and so  
9 I -- I wanted to share that with you as, when it comes to  
10 my time to vote and the thoughts that I've given to it,  
11 none of it was done lightly, and none of it was with a  
12 bias towards one view or another.

13           But also I ask of you, as citizens, to be  
14 participants when it comes to thinking kindly about this  
15 airport. It is your community's asset, and you can't say  
16 it's somebody else's problem. It's your problem as well  
17 as -- we're just decisionmakers, and we get paid a lot of  
18 money for this. You know, I get paid a hundred dollars.  
19 But we have no vested interest. You are -- you have a  
20 vested interest in it, and it's just about protecting your  
21 front door, but also helping to support this community.

22           Thank you.

23           CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

24           Director Nelson.

25           DIRECTOR NELSON: Yes. Little -- little off



1 script here for myself.

2 But, you know, one thing I did, when I -- when I  
3 joined the Board here, eight years ago -- by the way, I'm  
4 the second-most junior board member here, and so I truly  
5 love serving on this board.

6 Just -- just for clarification here -- and,  
7 again, it's not a response to a challenge here. But  
8 Orange County Airport is ranked number 42 in the country,  
9 in terms of airports, in over 5 million employments a  
10 year in 2016. Monterey ranks at 186 just above San Luis  
11 Obispo. So I just wanted to make the clarification  
12 there. And, if we can get further clarification on dust  
13 from airports, which I have not heard of either, that  
14 might be useful for us to learn more about as well.

15 In -- in closing here, also, with the noise  
16 complaints to, I serve on the Air Service Development  
17 Committee, which also deals with noise complaints. My  
18 cell number and my personal e-mail address are on the  
19 website at Monterey. I'm here to help. I want to make  
20 sure that this is an airport where people feel like we're  
21 listening, because, certainly, if I lived in Del Rey Oaks,  
22 I'd want to be listened to as well. If I had someone  
23 doing a short approach like that, show boating, I wouldn't  
24 like it either.

25 The challenge is the -- this is really off

1 script, but the tower, they're federal employees; whereas,  
2 we are here. It's a District. Once an airport takes off,  
3 we lose little -- we have little control of that airplane  
4 once it takes off. Just for clarification, I'm a retired  
5 pilot from Southwestern Airlines, so I understand how that  
6 works there. Before an airplane lands, historically  
7 speaking, they have -- we, at the airport, have little  
8 control as to how they fly their approach. It's the  
9 pilot-command decision.

10 I, personally, invite you, for any noise  
11 complaint or air service development issue, please, come  
12 to our meetings. I attend them. So just to put that out  
13 there.

14 So, lastly, as a collaborative organization  
15 here, we partnered with Monterey Police -- or, rather,  
16 Monterey Fire years ago to do a cost-sharing measure,  
17 which has worked out fairly well, as well as our recent  
18 joint venture with Del Rey Oaks, the police. It's good  
19 government. It saves money. It saves the District money.  
20 It has saved Monterey money as well as Del Rey oaks too.

21 So I respectfully leave it at that.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIR MILLER: Thank you.

24 I really want to thank staff and our consultants  
25 for -- for doing this voluminous amount of work, and I

1 would like to say that I read every page here, but I stand  
2 on that. This is -- this is a lot of work, and it has  
3 happened over a long period of time.

4           You know, I also want to thank the public for  
5 coming. To be honest, we don't get this level of  
6 participation over here. But I really welcome you here,  
7 and I would hope that you would continue to attend these  
8 meetings, and, usually, because you have an issue or  
9 problem. And we welcome those. We want to talk to you.  
10 We want to be good neighbors.

11           In a moment here, we're going to have an  
12 opportunity to make a motion whether to accept this -- any  
13 of these proposals or not. I don't know how that's going  
14 to turn out. But, regardless of how that turns out, the  
15 work doesn't stop there. We're not going to start  
16 building a road tomorrow should that be voted on.

17           This is going to take a lot of work and a lot of  
18 time and a lot of cooperation in working with our  
19 neighbors to get anything moving forward. So this is the  
20 beginning, in many ways, certainly not the end, of moving  
21 forward here.

22           So, at this time, I think it would be  
23 appropriate to open it for any motions of the Board.

24           DIRECTOR LEFFEL: I would like to move that we  
25 adopt Resolution Number 1730, resolution of the Monterey

1 Peninsula Airport District, to approve and certify the  
2 Final EIR, Mitigation Monitoring Reporting Program, and  
3 related CEQA findings for the Monterey Regional Airport  
4 Master Plan.

5 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Second.

6 CHAIR MILLER: For clarification, that includes  
7 us adopting staff recommendation of Alternative 1 or  
8 Alternative A? I've heard it referred to both ways.

9 MR. HUBER: No. This is just 1730.

10 CHAIR MILLER: This is just 1730.

11 MR. HUBER: Alternative 1 is in 1731.

12 CHAIR MILLER: 1731.

13 MR. HUBER: So that's separate.

14 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And we're taking those at  
15 separate times?

16 MR. HUBER: Yes.

17 CHAIR MILLER: So this is strictly we're talking  
18 about our Environmental Impact Report and the work that's  
19 been done so far?

20 MR. HUBER: Yes.

21 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. I'm sorry.

22 We have a first. Do we have a second?

23 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Second.

24 CHAIR MILLER: First by Director Leffel and  
25 seconded by Director Cursio.

1 Can we have a rollcall vote, please.

2 MS. AUKER: Director Cursio?

3 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Yes.

4 MS. AUKER: Director Nelson?

5 DIRECTOR NELSON: Yes.

6 MS. AUKER: Director Leffel?

7 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Yes.

8 MS. AUKER: Director Sabo?

9 DIRECTOR SABO: Yes.

10 MS. AUKER: Chair Miller?

11 CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

12 Thank you.

13 Resolution Number 1731. Now, in our -- in your  
14 presentation, we have wrapped both of these together. I  
15 assume you -- you weren't planning for a separate  
16 presentation at this time?

17 MR. HUBER: That's correct.

18 CHAIR MILLER: So, basically -- thank you.

19 MR. HUBER: But, as I always say, it's at the  
20 pleasure of the Board.

21 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. And, strictly, maybe this  
22 can recap what resolution -- for benefit of other people  
23 that may not have read it.

24 MR. HUBER: Sure.

25 Resolution 1730, actually, adopts and approves

1 and certifies the Final Environmental Impact Report and --  
2 and the other things that are listed there, the Mitigation  
3 Monitoring and Reporting Program, the Statement of  
4 Overriding Considerations, et cetera.

5 Resolution 1731, actually, approves  
6 Alternative Number 1 of the Regional -- of the Monterey  
7 Regional Airport Master Plan. It is Alternative Number 1  
8 that provides the development framework that -- that  
9 provides the most favorable environmental option.

10 And I don't know if there's more to elaborate.  
11 I think that's pretty much it. It's very wordy in its --  
12 in its resolution, but that's really what it does.

13 CHAIR MILLER: Okay.

14 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So Director Miller -- or  
15 Chair Miller, I would move that we adopt Resolution  
16 Number 1731, a resolution of the Monterey Peninsula  
17 Airport District to improve the Monterey Regional Airport  
18 Master Plan.

19 CHAIR MILLER: We have a first.

20 Do we have a second?

21 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Second.

22 CHAIR MILLER: We have a first and second.

23 Can we have a rollcall.

24 DIRECTOR SABO: I have a question.

25 CHAIR MILLER: Okay. Director Sabo requests to

1 ask a question.

2 DIRECTOR SABO: I have a question on the second  
3 resolution.

4 In one place in the staff report, I think it  
5 refers to the project as adopting the Airport Master Plan  
6 for implementation, number two. And, in another place, we  
7 are adopting the Airport Master Plan as a development  
8 framework. And I'm not sure I understand the difference  
9 between those two.

10 To summarize, what happens when -- what is the  
11 consequence of us approving this Airport Master Plan in  
12 its current form as the CEQA was approved?

13 MS. BALLANCE: So this sets a framework for a  
14 20-year vision for the airport. Within that vision, you  
15 have the short-term projects and the long-term projects.

16 The short-term projects that you see here were  
17 studied to a project level of detail. So this provides  
18 the framework to move forward with those projects.

19 The programmatic long-term projects, you will  
20 have to look at those as you develop and define the  
21 projects for long term, and then you may have to do  
22 additional environmental review for the long-term  
23 projects, depending on how you frame those projects.

24 That's why there's separate project specific  
25 versus programmatic in nature. But it does set up a

1 framework for your 20-year vision of the airport.

2 DIRECTOR SABO: Okay. I'm not clear on what  
3 frameworks mean versus implementation, which is -- both  
4 terms have been used.

5 MS. BALLANCE: Yeah.

6 DIRECTOR SABO: What is -- what are we  
7 empowering the executive director to do with what we have  
8 if we approve this?

9 MS. BALLANCE: Right.

10 So you have -- this allows us to move forward  
11 with the short-term projects for implementation, because  
12 they have been studied to a project level of detail.

13 So you are approving the short-term project  
14 components for us to move forward and take those next  
15 steps.

16 Again, like Chair Miller said, there -- this  
17 starts the work that you need to do, because there are a  
18 lot -- if you look at the Mitigation Monitoring Program,  
19 there are a lot of next steps that you will need to move  
20 forward, including working with Del Rey Oaks and the City  
21 of Monterey, as far as implementing those short-term  
22 projects. You also have to move forward with the NEPA  
23 component that enables you to get the funding necessary to  
24 move forward with these projects.

25 So it sets in motion all of these next steps



1 that need to be provided before you, actually, will start  
2 seeing it shovels to ground out there.

3 DIRECTOR SABO: All right. Very good. That  
4 answers my question.

5 CHAIR MILLER: If there are no other questions,  
6 we'll have a rollcall vote now.

7 MS. AUKER: Director Cursio?

8 DIRECTOR CURSIO: Yes.

9 MS. AUKER: Director Nelson?

10 DIRECTOR NELSON: Yes.

11 MS. AUKER: Director Leffel?

12 DIRECTOR LEFFEL: Yes.

13 MS. AUKER: Director Sabo?

14 DIRECTOR SABO: Yes.

15 MS. AUKER: Chair Miller?

16 CHAIR MILLER: Yes.

17 Well, that, adjourns this meeting.

18 Again, sincerely, I want to thank every member  
19 of the community that came forward today to talk or just  
20 to listen.

21 This is the beginning of the process, and we'll  
22 be reaching out to you, I'm sure, in the future.

23 Thank you.

24 We are -- I'll entertain a motion for an  
25 adjournment.

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

DIRECTOR LEFFEL: So moved.

DIRECTOR NELSON: Second.

CHAIR MILLER: We have a first and second.

All those in favor of adjourning, say aye.

DIRECTOR NELSON: Aye.

DIRECTOR SABO: Aye.

DIRECTOR TREFFEL: Aye.

DIRECTOR CURSIO: Aye.

CHAIR MILLER: Aye.

We are adjourned at 3:01 p.m.

Thanks again, everybody.

(Time noted: 3:01 p.m.)

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

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

The foregoing proceedings were held before me,  
LISA A. YORK MEESKE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter for  
the State of California.

Said proceedings then and there at the time and  
place previously stated was held on said day.

The proceedings was taken by me in shorthand at  
the time and place therein named, and, thereafter, under  
my direction, transcribed into longhand.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
attorney for either or any of the parties to said  
deposition, nor in any way interested in the outcome of  
the proceedings and that I am not related to any party  
thereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand  
this \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER  
FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA