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I. Introduction

The City of Santa Monica has embarked on a rigorous three-phase public process regarding the future of the Santa Monica Municipal Airport campus. In 2015, all land and building leases throughout the airport campus as well as the current operating agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will expire. The 2015 timeframe presents the City with a unique opportunity to boldly re-envision the goals, operations and facilities of the 227-acre airport campus.

As a basis for planning the future of the Santa Monica Municipal Airport (SMO), the City has launched a participatory visioning process to identify community concerns, priorities and preferences. Phase I resulted in findings regarding best practices at general aviation facilities in relation to local communities by RAND. In addition, HR&A conducted an economic analysis of the airport’s operations and activities on both the local and regional economies. This Phase concluded in fall 2011.

Phase II was designed as an extensive, transparent and open public dialogue process in which all interested members of the public could share their concerns and ideas for the future of SMO. During Phase II, the City hosted a series of 32 facilitated community discussion groups between January and March 2012. MIG, a strategic planning and management firm with over 30 years of expertise in designing and implementing community outreach processes, was retained by the City to facilitate the community discussion groups and produce the Phase II summary report.

The purpose of the community discussion groups was to engage participants in interactive discussions about the impacts of SMO on surrounding communities and potential opportunities for change. This Phase began with an Open House event which allowed all interested participants an opportunity to tour the site, its facilities and operations.

All community comments and ideas were documented and analyzed in an effort to classify major themes. The source documents for this report include the wallgraphics (a unique, visual representation of the discussion points raised during the community discussion groups, detailed minutes taken by City staff, and participant comment cards from each community discussion group. The body of this report outlines the thematic outcomes and preferences identified by participants regarding the future of the airport campus.

Grounded by the studies from Phase I and the essential community input from Phase II, the City can now undertake Phase III actions and formulate a strategic analysis of key themes. The results of this in-depth analysis will lead to the development of prioritized recommendations that will be presented to the City Council in May 2012.
II. Community Discussion Group Overview

A total of 32 community discussion groups (CDG) were conducted between January and March 2012. The breadth and frequency of CDGs were designed to engage a wide variety of participants with diverse viewpoints. The CDGs were facilitated by a professional organizer of public meetings and community processes from the consulting firm MIG.

The community discussion groups were held at various locations across the City. Each CDG was comprised of approximately 8 to 12 participants and lasted for approximately two hours. The CDGs were open to all interested individuals regardless of area of residence. The relatively small number of participants per CDG gave members of the public ample opportunity to voice their concerns, frustrations and hopes for SMO. This approach emphasized inclusiveness, civil discourse and a high level of community interaction.

Participant Profile

During Phase II, 312 participants attended the community discussion groups and 309 participants identified their city of residence. The majority of participants consisted of residents from Santa Monica and West Los Angeles. Many Santa Monica participants were residents of Sunset Park, Ocean Park and other neighborhoods surrounding the airport. The City of Los Angeles participants were residents of various communities including Venice, Mar Vista, Pacific Palisades and Marina Del Rey. A few residents from other cities such as Gardena, Malibu and Thousand Oaks also attended the community discussion groups. (See Figure 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 for more details)

Figure 1.1: CDG Area of Residence Distribution

![CDG Area of Residence Distribution](image)

Area of Residence of Participants

- Santa Monica: 66%
- Los Angeles: 31%
- Other: 3%
Figure 1.2: Map of Participants’ Area of Residence

Source: Information regarding participants’ cities of residence was collected at each CDG through the participant comment cards.

Figure 1.3: Breakdown of Participants’ Area of Residence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Los Angeles</th>
<th>City of Santa Monica</th>
<th>Other Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The breakdown of participants’ area of residence does not equal the total number of CDG participants because not all participants included their city of residence on the participant comment cards.
The gender breakdown for CDG participants consisted of males representing fifty-five percent (55%) and females representing (45%). (See Figure 1.4) CDG participants varied in age with the majority of participants between 45-64 years of age (56%). Twenty-seven percent (26%) of participants represented the 65 and older age range, followed by the 35-44 year age group (14%). Only four percent (4%) of participants were representative of the 18-34 year age range. (See Figure 1.5)

**Figure 1.4: CDG Gender Distribution**
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The most frequently mentioned affiliations were Friends of Sunset Park (FOSP) and the Friends of Santa Monica Airport (FOSMO) organizations. Several participants listed affiliations with neighborhood associations such as the Ocean Park Association, Mar Vista Neighborhood Council and Venice Neighborhood Council. Also, a few CDG participants identified the Concerned Residents against Airport Pollution (CRAAP) group as their primary affiliation.

Report Organization

The report is organized to allow the reader to consider each section as a stand-alone summary for each particular topic. Consequently, some repetition of ideas and concerns expressed by CDG participants was necessary.
III. Spectrum of Positions

During the community discussion groups, participants were asked to share their opinions and ideas for improving the current conditions at the airport campus. Participants were encouraged to consider both aviation-related and non-aviation-related uses at the airport. The following section highlights participant comments based on their preference for either maintaining the airport with recommended improvements or closing the airport completely. The spectrum of positions is not listed in order of priority.

The authors of this report have attempted to accurately reflect the opinions and beliefs of community discussion group participants. The body of this report is a reflection of CDG participants’ experiences and perceptions regarding SMO operations. In many cases, CDG participants expressed many of the same concerns as other participants, but took different positions with respect to the future of SMO.

Five profiles emerged based on common responses and perspectives of community discussion group participants.

- **Position #1**: Close the Airport
- **Position #2**: Close the Airport Unless Firm FAA Agreement Is in Place to Reduce Impacts
- **Position #3**: Reduce the Airport’s Operations and Footprint
- **Position #4**: Maintain Airport Operations with Significant Mitigations and Improvements
- **Position #5**: Maintain Airport Operations with Selected Mitigations and Improvements
Position #1: Close the Airport

Many participants unequivocally support the closure of all airport operations. Participants who support this position firmly believe that the negative aspects of the airport—noise pollution, adverse health impacts and safety hazards—outweigh any benefits. These participants asserted that the airport’s operations have outgrown the City and no longer add value to local residential communities. These participants identified diverse ideas to repurpose the airport campus as alternative land uses that will more directly benefit the broader community.

Health Impacts

- Some participants view the airport as a health hazard due to the air pollution from leaded aviation fuel and noxious odors emitted from the aircraft.
- Many participants highlighted SMO’s close proximity to homes, schools and parks and the potential dangers posed by the toxic air pollution.
- Other participants raised concerns regarding the health impacts of ultra-fine particulates from aircraft exhaust on airport-adjacent communities.
- Participants feel that the health consequences for residents are not acceptable and any benefits from the airport are insignificant in comparison to the negative impacts.

Noise Pollution

- Many participants highlighted the various ways that loud noise levels from SMO’s frequent aircraft traffic degrade the quality of life for local residents.
- Some participants believe that the noise has gotten progressively worse over the years due in large part to increased jet traffic and flight school operations.
- Participants also asserted that the noise pollution from aircraft operations can lead to learning deficits for children.

Increased Volume and Frequency of Aircraft Traffic

- Many participants believe that SMO has increased both jet and flight school operations, which has translated into significant increases in noise pollution.
- The frequent departures and arrivals from both propeller planes and jets degrade the quality of life for local residents.
Safety Concerns

- Safety issues posed by the inexperienced flight school pilots flying over densely populated communities were frequently mentioned during the discussion groups.
- The possibility of an airplane crash is an ongoing concern for many participants; from the perspective of some participants, there have been significant increases in the volume and frequency of aircraft traffic which raises the risks of accidents.

Disproportionate Impacts Borne by Residents

- Many participants are upset that the needs of a small minority of seemingly wealthy individuals who use the airport are placed above the needs of thousands of residents who bear the brunt of SMO’s adverse impacts.

Inconsistent with Santa Monica’s Position as a Leader in Environmental Sustainability

- Taken together, the noise, health and safety concerns associated with the airport are not well-aligned with the City’s image as a trendsetter in sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- Many participants assert that Santa Monica is acting as a “bad neighbor” due to the adverse environmental impacts that it spreads to neighboring communities of Venice and Mar Vista.

Lack of Citizen Input in the Decision Making Process

- Many participants resent the lack of public recourse and the inability to appeal the FAA’s decisions regarding airport actions that directly affect their lives.
- Numerous participants from Venice and Mar Vista also feel disregarded and disenfranchised by the City of Santa Monica despite the fact that they are significantly impacted by SMO’s operations.
- Some participants are frustrated by the FAA’s absence from the community visioning process as well as the day-to-day operational issues of SMO.

Alternative Land Uses

- Instead of offering strategies to improve airport operations, many participants expressed their preference for the complete closure of the airport.
- Participants protest the fact the airport’s valuable land only benefits a limited number of users.
- These participants identified diverse ideas to repurpose the airport campus through alternative land uses that will more directly benefit the broader community. (See pages 49 to 52 for a list of suggested uses.)
Position #2: Close the Airport Unless Firm FAA Agreement Is in Place to Reduce Impacts

Some participants support closing the airport campus unless proper mitigation assurances from the FAA can be guaranteed. These participants assert that the FAA cannot be trusted to work with the City and to fairly negotiate mitigations. If the FAA were willing to implement impact mitigations, these participants may be persuaded to keep the airport open. Some participants from this group would be amenable to accepting funds from the FAA to implement specific improvements within a programmatic mitigation effort.

Health Impacts

- Some participants view the airport as a health hazard due to the air pollution from leaded aviation fuel and noxious odors emitted from the aircraft.
- Many participants highlighted SMO’s close proximity to homes, schools and parks and the potential dangers posed by the toxic air pollution.
- Other participants raised concerns regarding the health impacts of ultra-fine particulates from aircraft exhaust on airport-adjacent communities.
- Participants feel that the health consequences for residents are not acceptable and any benefits from the airport are insignificant in comparison to the negative impacts.

Noise Pollution

- Many participants highlighted the various ways that loud noise levels from SMO’s frequent aircraft traffic degrade the quality of life for local residents.
- Some participants believe that the noise has gotten progressively worse over the years due in large part to increased jet traffic and flight school operations.

Property Devaluation

- Local homeowners assert that their close proximity to the airport is damaging property values and affecting their ability to sell their homes at market rates.

Unintended Consequences of SMO Closure

- Participants are concerned that SMO’s potential closure may lead to a change in flight paths for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) planes over Santa Monica neighborhoods.
• Some participants also fear a significant increase in vehicular traffic if the airport were repurposed as a more commercial or retail land use.

**Lack of Leadership Guiding SMO’s Policies**

• Participants identified an absence of political leadership supporting the development of the airport as a safe, community-friendly resource.
• Some participants are upset with the lack of sound policies to guide airport operations such as an airport master plan.

**Involvement of City Council Members of Santa Monica and Other Cities**

• Some participants proposed that the City engage, consult and partner with local elected officials from Santa Monica, Culver City and Los Angeles.

**Involvement of State and Federal Elected Officials and Federal Departments**

• Many participants would like the visioning process to include state and federal elected officials to ensure that various community interests are considered during Phase III.
• Participants suggested that the City proactively develop a federal delegation of both Senate and Congress members in an effort to build a power base with federal representatives.
• Some participants proposed engaging the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the environmental impacts of SMO operations.
Position #3: Reduce the Airport’s Operations and Footprint

Many participants hold the position that the airport’s operations have outgrown the City and its context within the immediate neighborhood. These participants maintain this position due in large part to the perceived increase in the volume and frequency of aircraft traffic at SMO. Participants from this group assert that the airport campus is not community compatible in its current form. These participants are in favor of keeping SMO open only if there is a significant reduction in the airport’s operations and overall footprint.

Implement Overall Reduction of Operations at SMO

- Many participants are in favor of SMO reducing its operations and returning to its role as a smaller, general aviation airport.
- Banning jets, eliminating flight schools and reducing hours of operation (i.e., No-Fly Sundays, expanded curfews) were the most recurring recommendations regarding SMO’s operations.
- Participants also recommended shortening the runway to eliminate the capacity of certain aircraft, such as jets and other Class C and D aircraft.
- Several participants support preserving the airport based on a romantic sense of nostalgia and a desire to honor SMO’s rich aviation history.

Make SMO a Green Airport

- Participants demanded that the City align airport operations with Santa Monica’s position as a leader in sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- In the spirit of Santa Monica, participants would like the City to promote green, sustainable aviation.
- Some participants asserted that SMO should undertake green building practices and sustainability initiatives (e.g., renewable energy, recycling, greenhouse gas emissions reductions and clean fuel vehicles).

Close and/or Restrict Flight School Operations

- A large number of participants supported the complete closure of all flight school operations, particularly targeting pattern flying.
- If total closure of SMO’s flight schools is not feasible, participants propose severely restricting their operational capacity, which includes reducing the overall number of flight schools.
**Ban and/or Limit Jets**

- Participants spoke passionately about the need to ban all jets from SMO due to their attendant noise pollution and emissions.
- Several participants asserted that the presence of jets at SMO exacerbates safety concerns in light of the perception that the airport was not designed to handle jets.
- Participants highlighted the toxicity and noxious odor of jet fuel as significant health concerns.

**Implement Environmental Design Improvements**

- Several participants would like the City to invest in the airport’s infrastructure, as well as improve the overall aesthetics of the airport campus.
- Some participants perceived the airport campus as “run down” and indicated that they would like to see increased recreation and community uses, improved accessibility to the property, and improvements to the grounds and facilities.
- Many participants support upgrading mass transit to and from the airport, as well as improving bicycle and pedestrian access routes.
- Participants recommended that the City create a “runway protection” buffer zone in high impact areas on the southern and eastern sides of the airport.
- Participants also advocated for the City to make improvements to the sound blast wall near the eastern end of the runway.

**Avoid Development of SMO**

- Participants cautioned that the City should resist the urge to commercially develop the airport campus.
- Participants suggested that the City allow only limited development of non-aviation-related land to limit further quality of life deterioration and excessive vehicular traffic.
Position #4: Maintain Airport Operations with Mitigation Improvements

Some participants expressed support for keeping the airport campus open if the City implements specific mitigation measures. These participants offered a wide range of strategies to reduce the airport’s adverse impacts on residents and to operationalize “good neighbor” policies. The suggested strategies also included various recommendations to make SMO a “greener”, more sustainable airport. Many of these participants consider closing the airport an impractical solution based on the potential legal battle with the FAA. Although these participants acknowledge the various nuisances created by the airport, they assert that the airport is a valuable asset that should be preserved.

Acknowledge Problems with SMO, but Compromise Is the Best Solution

- Although some participants acknowledged the contentious airport-community relationship, many believe that both parties can reach a “middle ground” that transforms the airport from a nuisance to a community asset.

Consider Unintended Consequences of SMO Closure

- Participants are concerned that SMO’s potential closure may lead to a change in flight paths for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) planes over Santa Monica neighborhoods.
- Some participants fear a significant increase in vehicular traffic if the airport were repurposed as a mixed-use residential, commercial or retail land use.

Implement Overall Reduction of Operations at SMO

- Many participants are in favor of SMO reducing its operations and returning to its role as a smaller, general aviation airport.
- Banning jets, eliminating flight schools and reducing hours of operation (i.e., No-Fly Sundays, expanded curfews) were the most recurring recommendations regarding SMO’s operations.
- Participants also recommended shortening the runway to eliminate the capacity of certain aircraft, such as jets and other Class C and D aircraft.
- Several participants support preserving the airport based on a romantic sense of nostalgia and desire to honor SMO’s rich aviation history.
**Make SMO a Green Airport**

- Participants demanded that the City align airport operations with Santa Monica’s position as a leader in sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- Many participants asserted that SMO should undertake green building practices and sustainability initiatives (e.g., renewable energy, recycling, greenhouse gas emissions reductions and clean fuel vehicles).

**Close and/or Restrict Flight School Operations**

- A large number of participants supported the complete closure of all flight school operations, particularly targeting pattern flying.
- If total closure of SMO’s flight schools is not feasible, participants propose severely restricting their operational capacity, which includes reducing the overall number of flight schools.

**Ban and/or Limit Jets**

- Participants spoke passionately about the need to ban all jets from SMO due to their attendant noise pollution and emissions.
- Several participants asserted that the presence of jets at SMO exacerbates safety concerns in light of the perception that the airport was not designed to handle jets.
- Participants highlighted the toxicity and noxious odor of jet fuel as significant health concerns.

**Implement Environmental Design Improvements**

- Several participants would like the City to invest in the airport’s infrastructure, as well as improve the overall aesthetics of the airport campus.
- Some perceived the airport campus as “run down” and indicated that they would like to see increased recreation and community uses, improved accessibility to the property, and improvements to the grounds and facilities.
- Many participants support upgrading mass transit to and from the airport, as well as improving bicycle and pedestrian access routes.

**Monitor and Enforce “Fly Neighborly Program”**

- Many participants suggested that the City enforce the “Fly Neighborly Program” to minimize the impacts of SMO flight operations on the surrounding communities.
• A more stringent and closely monitored “Fly Neighborly Program” would help establish and maintain a partnership between airport and community members, demonstrating SMO’s commitment to addressing community concerns and acting as a good neighbor.

• Important elements of the “Fly Neighborly Program” would include observing flight path parameters, adhering to curfew restrictions and establishing a more predictable departure and arrival schedule.

• Participants recommended that the City mandate pilot awareness workshops regarding noise abatement practices and procedures.
Position #5: Maintain Airport Operations with Selected Mitigations and Improvements

Some participants spoke passionately about their preference to keep the airport campus open based on the perception that SMO is one of the safest, and highest functioning general aviation airports in California. These participants believe that airport detractors exaggerate the adverse impacts such as air pollution and loud noise levels. Many of these participants assert that SMO detractors are misinformed regarding key issues including noise levels, aircraft accidents and SMO-generated air pollution. These participants view SMO as a treasured regional asset and offered a range of different perspectives on the positive contributions of SMO.

**Economic Engine for Santa Monica**

- Many participants view the airport as an economic catalyst that creates employment opportunities and generates substantial revenue for the City.
- Several community discussion participants consider the airport a positive economic engine that supports tourism, pilots and aviation-related businesses in Santa Monica and the region.

**Historical Significance of SMO**

- Participants honor the rich history of aviation in Southern California and speak favorably of SMO as a local treasure that is vital to the region’s legacy.
- Several participants consider the airport an integral component to the City and an important educational resource for the City.

**Medical Emergency Resource**

- SMO plays a critical role in the City’s and the region’s emergency preparedness, serving as a major emergency response site and facility in case of natural disasters such as earthquakes or wildfires.

**Critical Reliever within Regional Airport System**

- Several participants view SMO as a critical element within the regional transportation infrastructure.
**Myths and Misinformation about SMO’s Impacts**

- Many participants stated that the misinformation regarding SMO’s operations prevents meaningful dialogue between adversely impacted residents and airport proponents.
- Some community discussion group participants disagreed on the source of air pollution. These participants attribute the majority of the air toxins and particulate matter to the adjacent freeways and vehicular traffic in the area.
- Despite the concern of many participants regarding potential crashes, airport supporters assert that flight schools have a good safety record and are compliant with the rules set forth by the FAA.

**Exhibit Patience as Aircraft and Fuel Technologies Emerge**

- Some participants highlighted improvements in aviation technology (e.g., quieter jet engines, more sophisticated noise suppression kits, more efficient propellers and mufflers) that could be standardized at SMO to address community concerns.
- Participants also urged the City to be patient and forward thinking as the aviation industry makes advances in greener fuel alternatives.
IV. Current Status of the Airport

Key issues emerged during the facilitated community discussion groups regarding the opportunities and challenges facing the Santa Monica Airport campus. Participants offered a range of different perspectives on the positive contributions of SMO as well as the negative operational impacts of the airport on the surrounding communities.

The following section highlights participant comments based on their opinions about the current status of airport operations and concerns for the future of the airport campus. Although some of this information has been covered in earlier chapters, this section provides a more in-depth analysis of participant preferences and concerns. This section is organized according to the following overarching themes:

A. Positive Contributions of SMO to Surrounding Communities

B. Negative Operational Impacts of SMO on Surrounding Communities
A. Positive Contributions of SMO to Surrounding Communities

**Economic Engine for Santa Monica**

- Many participants view the airport as an economic catalyst that creates employment opportunities and generates substantial revenue for the City.
- Airport proponents see the airport as a positive economic engine that supports tourism, pilots and aviation-related businesses in Santa Monica and the region.
- SMO is a hub for corporate travel and many businesses choose to locate in Santa Monica due to the convenient airport location.

**Historical Significance of SMO**

- The Santa Monica Airport is one of the oldest and most historically significant airports in the United States.
- Many participants view the airport with a sense of nostalgia given its vital role in the development of the City and the expansion of California’s modern air transportation system.
- Participants honor the rich history of aviation in Southern California and speak favorably of SMO as a local treasure that is vital to the region’s legacy.
- Several participants consider the airport an integral component to the City and an important educational resource for the City.

**Medical Emergency Resource**

- SMO plays a critical role in the City’s and the region’s emergency preparedness, serving as a major emergency response site and facility in case of natural disasters such as earthquakes or wildfires.
- The airport is a valuable resource during times of medical emergencies including serving as a convenient location for the drop-off and pick-up of organ donations for local hospitals and universities (i.e., Cedars Sinai Medical Center, UCLA, etc.).

**Critical Reliever within Regional Airport System**

- Maintaining a network of regional airports throughout Southern California was identified as an important concern among participants.
- Several participants view SMO as a critical element within the regional transportation infrastructure.
Participants described the great need for SMO since the number of small general aviation airports in Southern California has consistently declined over the last twenty years.

**Training Ground for Novice Pilots**

- Many airport proponents see the airport and the flight schools as valuable aviation resources that provide a great opportunity for novice pilots to learn to fly in urban areas and for those maintaining their licenses.

**Mixed-Use Amenities at SMO**

- SMO offers 40 acres of non-aviation land that is open to other uses which serve the broader community including a recreation park, restaurants and cultural events.
- The non-aviation land further provides a home for a thriving cultural and arts community that includes the highest concentration of artist studios in the city as well as galleries and live theater.
- Participants value the affordable art studios housed at the airport, in addition to the Santa Monica College Arts Campus.
- Many participants are supportive of the airport campus because of SMO’s commitment to the City’s burgeoning art scene.
- Airport proponents are pleased by the opening of the Museum of Flying which will introduce the general public to SMO’s storied aviation history.

**Sparking Youth Interest in Aviation and Engineering**

- Many participants believe that the airport campus is a valuable resource to expose youth to the joys of flying and to spark their interest in aviation-related careers (e.g., engineering).

**Myths and Misinformation about SMO’s Impacts**

- Participants expressed concern that many residents are misinformed regarding key issues including noise levels, aircraft accidents and air pollution.
- These myths and misinformation prevent meaningful dialogue between adversely impacted residents and airport proponents.
• Some participants think the number of flights at SMO has decreased and much of the noise attributed to SMO is actually from Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).
• Many community discussion group participants also disagreed on the source of air pollution. Some participants attribute much of the air toxins and particulate matter to the adjacent freeways and vehicular traffic in the area.
• Several proponents of the airport suggest that SMO currently meets air pollution and noise abatement standards.
• Despite the concern of many participants regarding potential crashes, airport supporters assert that flight schools have a good safety record and are compliant with the rules set forth by the FAA.

**Acknowledging Problems with SMO, but Compromise Is the Best Solution**

• Although participants acknowledged the contentious airport-community relationship, many believe that both parties can reach a “middle ground” that transforms the airport from a nuisance to a community asset.
• Many participants described the operational changes that pilots and flight school owners have made to address community concerns. For example, according to some participants, flight schools no longer perform repeat takeoffs and landings and “touch and go” maneuvers are not taught during the weekends.
• However, several participants acknowledged that the airport’s operations need to be improved to address the problems raised by local residents.
B. Negative Operational Impacts of SMO on Surrounding Communities

**Noise Pollution**

- Because of the close proximity of the airport to residential neighborhoods, noise is a major issue for participants.
- Many participants highlighted the various ways that loud noise levels from SMO’s frequent aircraft traffic degrade the quality of life for local residents.
- Several participants describe the loud noise levels as “unbearable” and extremely disruptive to their daily lives.
- The noise levels at the eastern end of the runway are especially disruptive to nearby residences.
- Many participants stated that the airport noise prevents their ability to work from home and also interrupts sleeping patterns.
- Some participants complained that the airplane noise disrupts normal outdoor activities and impinges on their ability to enjoy their private backyards.

**Noise Pollution from Jets and Flight Schools**

- Noise concerns are generated from jet, helicopter and piston aircraft operations.
- Some participants believe that the noise has gotten progressively worse over the years due in large part to the perceived increase in jet traffic and flight school operations.
- Participants identified the jet noise and constant circling of flight school airplanes as significant grievances among residents.
- Some participants believe that flight school students are disregarding the “Fly Neighborly Program” protocol (e.g., evening and weekend flying schedules), which increases noise pollution for residents.
- Many participants also expressed frustration over the excessive pattern flying at the airport.
- Several community discussion group participants assert that the City’s noise monitoring system is both inadequate and inaccurate.
- The disruptive noise levels, late flying schedules and various flight paths have led some participants to believe that the airport is not adhering to “good neighbor” practices.

**Health Impacts**

- Some participants view the airport as a health hazard due to the air pollution from leaded aviation fuel and noxious odors emitted from the aircraft.
- The exhaust from idling aircraft, especially jets, is particularly worrisome for many participants.
- Many participants cited the long-term, adverse health effects (e.g., asthma and cancer) of ultra-fine particles and fuel emissions.
- Participants highlighted SMO's close proximity to homes, schools and parks and the potential dangers posed by toxic aircraft emissions.
- Many participants feel that the health consequences for residents are not acceptable and any benefits from the airport are insignificant in comparison to the negative impacts.
- In addition to concerns about air quality, a few participants described the harmful effects of aircraft pollution on local agriculture. Participants provided several examples of aircraft emissions harming their gardens and plants.
- Participants are concerned about the cumulative exposure of aircraft emissions on residents, especially young children and seniors.

**Increased Volume and Frequency of Aircraft Traffic**

- Many participants expressed an awareness of higher volumes of general aviation activity at SMO over the last fifteen years.
- Participants spoke of a perceived increase in both jet and flight school operations, which has translated into significant increases in noise pollution.
- The attendant increased impacts upon residents living in close proximity to the airport have led to acrimonious relations between residents and airport users.
- The frequent departures and arrivals from both small aircraft and jets degrade the quality of life for local residents.
- Some participants believe that the aircraft traffic growth is out of control, especially the Class C and D planes (i.e., jets).
- Many participants believe that the airport’s operations have outgrown the size of the facility and the volume of aircraft traffic exceeds the capacity of SMO, making it incompatible within the neighborhood context.

**Safety Concerns**

- The flight schools are a significant source of tension among SMO-impacted communities due to safety issues.
- The crash of a single-engine aircraft into a local residence in August 2011 was frequently referenced by participants as a glaring example of the need to create stricter safety guidelines for pilots.
- Safety issues posed by the inexperienced flight school pilots flying over densely populated communities were frequently mentioned during the discussion groups.
• The possibility of an airplane crash is an ongoing concern for community members due to the perception that the volume and frequency of aircraft traffic has increased over the last ten years.
• The gas station located at the end of the runway is a recurring source of worry for local residents due to the possibility of aircraft crashes.
• Many participants assert that the SMO runway is not of sufficient length to handle SMO’s jet traffic.

Property Devaluation

• Local homeowners assert that their close proximity to the airport is damaging property values and affecting their ability to sell their homes at market rates.
• Many homeowners are upset that the SMO nuisance issues were not disclosed prior to purchasing their homes.

Disproportionate Impacts Borne by Residents

• Many participants are upset that the needs of a small minority of seemingly wealthy individuals who use the airport are placed above the needs of thousands of residents who bear the brunt of SMO’s adverse impacts.
• Some participants accuse airport officials of catering to special interest groups at the expense of tax-paying homeowners and residents.
• Participants protest the fact the airport’s valuable land only benefits a limited number of users.

Lack of Citizen Input in the Decision Making Process

• Participants described a feeling of powerlessness and complete disenfranchisement following the FAA’s decision to change to the 250-degree heading test.
• Many participants resent the lack of public recourse and the inability to appeal the FAA’s decisions regarding airport actions that directly affect their lives.
• Numerous participants from Venice and Mar Vista also feel disregarded and disenfranchised by the City of Santa Monica despite the fact that they are significantly impacted by SMO’s operations.
• This sense of disenfranchisement only serves to further fracture the relationship between airport users and community residents.
• Many participants view the airport as a “bad neighbor” that cares little for the adverse impacts borne by local residents.
Inconsistent with Santa Monica’s Position as a Leader in Environmental Sustainability

- A large number of participants mentioned Santa Monica’s progress toward citywide green practices such as banning leaf blowers and plastic bags. However, participants view SMO’s noise pollution, safety hazards and environmental degradation as counterproductive to sustainability goals.
- Taken together, the noise, health and safety concerns associated with the airport are not well-aligned with the City’s image as a trendsetter in sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- Many participants feel Santa Monica is acting as a “bad neighbor” due to the adverse environmental impacts that it spreads to neighboring communities of Venice and Mar Vista.

Lack of Leadership Guiding SMO’s Policies

- Participants identified an absence of political leadership supporting the development of the airport as a citywide resource.
- Some participants are upset with the lack of sound policies to guide airport operations such as an airport master plan.
- This lack of strong leadership has allowed airport users to consistently disregard the “Fly Neighborly Program” due to inadequate enforcement efforts.
- Despite the prestige associated with having a high-functioning, municipal airport, some participants feel the City has done little to invest in the infrastructure of the airport.
- Many participants believe that Santa Monica Airport could be a “crown jewel on the Westside” with the proper leadership and commitment to mitigation improvements.

Unintended Consequences of SMO Closure

- Numerous participants expressed concern that SMO’s potential closure may lead to a change in flight paths for Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) planes over Santa Monica neighborhoods.
- Other participants also fear a significant increase in vehicular traffic if the airport were repurposed as a more commercial or retail land use.
V. Key Thematic Outcomes and Community-Identified Preferences for the Future of SMO

The future of the Santa Monica Airport campus is of serious importance to both the City and the surrounding communities. The forthcoming expiration of the 1984 Settlement Agreement between the City and the FAA and the leases at the airport campus present a unique opportunity for the City to change the direction and scope of activities that take place on the airport campus. The City is committed to considering many different options for the future of the airport.

The purpose of the community discussion groups was to engage participants in interactive discussions about the impacts of SMO on surrounding communities and potential opportunities for change. By extension, participants from community discussion groups were asked to share their opinions and ideas for improving the current conditions at the airport campus. Participants were encouraged to consider both aviation-related and non-aviation-related uses and activities at the airport.

Participants discussed their preferences regarding maintaining current airport operations with mitigation improvements and closing the airport completely to develop alternative land uses. Although some of this information has been covered in earlier chapters, this section provides a more in-depth analysis of participants’ preferences and concerns with the goal of reflecting the texture and richness of the community discussion groups.

This section details the following seven thematic outcomes based on the information collected from all 32 community discussion groups:

A. Information Depth and Credibility

B. Disproportionate Impacts

C. The Sustainable “Green” Airport Campus

D. The “Community-Friendly” Airport

E. Environmental Design Improvements

F. Closure of SMO and Development of Alternative Land Uses

G. City: Stand with Residents!
A. Information Depth and Credibility

*Improve Quality and Depth of SMO Studies*

- Many participants expressed criticism of the economic impact analysis asserting that the study was flawed and not truly reflective of the indirect and induced economic impacts of airport campus operations.
- Several participants asserted that the economic impact analysis failed to incorporate alternative land use comparisons.
- Community discussion group participants also criticized the noise analysis conducted in 2010 and described numerous inaccuracies related to aircraft traffic counts and noise levels.
- Many participants mentioned the perceived inaccuracy of SMO statistics regarding the number of flights, length of average idling times and adherence to flight path restrictions on the City’s website.
- This lack of information credibility diminishes participants’ trust in the legitimacy of the SMO community visioning process.
- A large number of participants prefer to have all data, reports and statistics from independent, third-party sources instead of City officials.

*Conduct a Comprehensive Cost/Benefit Alternatives Comparison*

- Many participants requested that the City hire a credible, third-party source to conduct a new economic cost-benefit analysis of alternative land uses.
- Several participants suggested that the City consider a limited number of priority uses (e.g., retail, recreation, housing, etc.) and hire a third-party researcher to identify the costs and benefits associated with each option.
- Participants would like the City to investigate various scenarios such as recreational uses for the airport campus, and reduced airport operations combined with alternative land uses.
- A large number of participants would like the new economic analysis to include the economic contribution of SMO (including flight schools) to the City through revenues and taxes, as well as the subsidies provided by the City.
- Overall, participants are most concerned with better understanding which land use scenarios would provide the most benefit to the broader Santa Monica community.
**Improve the SMO Community Visioning Process**

- Participants urged the City to conduct a visioning process that is thoughtful of all potential consequences and inclusive of all community voices.
- Community discussion group participants request more transparency throughout the visioning process regarding the City’s potential courses of action to ensure fair and mutually beneficial outcomes.
- Several participants would like clarifying information on the purpose of Phase III and the course of action following Phase III.
- Many participants suggested that the City collect and disseminate supplementary data (e.g., aircraft noise levels, revenue generated by SMO) to the public in order to properly frame the Phase III visioning discussions.
- Some participants stated the need to remove City personnel from the visioning process due to a perception of a potential conflict of interest.
- Participants would like the City to create a frequently asked questions document (FAQ) in collaboration with aviation experts to dispel myths about SMO.
- Numerous participants proposed that the City document the lessons learned from SMO’s visioning process, mitigation approaches and community engagement efforts.
B. Disproportionate Impacts

**Acknowledge the Needs of Residents**

- Many participants are upset that the needs of a small minority of seemingly wealthy individuals who use the airport are placed above the needs of thousands of residents who bear the brunt of SMO’s adverse impacts.
- Some participants accuse airport officials of catering to special interest groups at the expense of tax-paying homeowners and residents.
- Other participants protest the fact the airport’s valuable land only benefits a limited number of users.

**Promote Positive Contributions of SMO to the Community**

- To ameliorate the perception that SMO disproportionately impacts residents, airport proponents recommended that the City engage the public by promoting the positive contributions of the airport to the broader community.
- Airport proponents suggested that the City educate the general public on the important role SMO plays in the economic growth of the City.
- Humanitarian efforts such as “Doctors without Borders” and Hurricane Katrina relief initiatives undertaken by SMO users should be widely publicized and promoted.
- Education and outreach of SMO’s economic contribution and humanitarian projects could enhance the public’s view of the airport.
- Some participants would like the City to embrace and better promote the airport as a valuable and unique resource.
C. The Sustainable “Green” Airport Campus

**Align SMO with City of Santa Monica’s Commitment to Sustainability**

- Many participants demanded that the City align airport operations with Santa Monica’s position as a leader in sustainability and environmental stewardship.
- In the spirit of Santa Monica, participants would like the City to promote green, sustainable aviation.
- Participants would like the City to conduct a comprehensive environmental impact review.
- Participants recommended that the City identify strategies and best practices to make Santa Monica Airport a sustainable “green” airport.
- Some participants asserted that SMO should undertake green building practices and sustainability initiatives (e.g., renewable energy, recycling, greenhouse gas emissions reductions and clean fuel vehicles).

**Eliminate Leaded Fuel**

- Participants passionately urged the City to ban the use of leaded aviation fuel in favor of “greener” fuel alternatives.
- Many participants recommended improving fuel regulations for jets and propeller planes to minimize adverse health impacts.
- Less toxic fuel alternatives should be required of all aircraft to reduce the adverse health impacts to local residents.

**Install Auxiliary Ground Power Units**

- Several participants suggested installing auxiliary ground power units to eliminate the need for engine start-ups while the aircraft is waiting for take-off clearance.
- These auxiliary ground power units are intended to reduce the noise pollution and exhaust of idling aircraft.

**Develop a Mid-field Run-up Area**

- Some participants recommended constructing a midfield run-up area which would allow pilots to queue for takeoff and to check diagnostics in a contained area without disturbing residents who live near the eastern end of the runway.
• The midfield run-ups act as “parking zones” and many pilots in the community discussion groups supported this mitigation strategy.

Exhibit Patience as Aircraft and Fuel Technologies Emerge

• Some participants highlighted improvements in aviation technology (e.g., quieter jet engines, more sophisticated noise suppression kits, more efficient propellers and mufflers) that could be standardized at SMO to address community concerns.
• Participants also urged the City to be patient and forward thinking as the aviation industry makes advances in greener fuel alternatives.
D. The “Community-Friendly” Airport

Conduct a Review of Best Practices

- Many participants recommended that the City conduct a thorough review of best practices used at other general aviation airports across the country regarding community-friendly operations and “good neighbor” policies.
- The best practices review should also include examples of the most appropriate mix of flight operations and activities for a small, general aviation airport such as SMO.

Implement Overall Reduction of Operations at SMO

- Many participants are in favor of SMO reducing its operations and returning to its role as a smaller, general aviation airport.
- Banning jets, eliminating flight schools and reducing hours of operation (i.e., No-Fly Sundays, expanded curfews) were the most recurring recommendations regarding SMO’s operations.
- Participants also recommended shortening the runway to eliminate the capacity of certain aircraft, such as jets and other Class C and D aircraft.
- Some participants recommended that the City shift the majority of SMO’s operations to other regional airports such as Van Nuys or Burbank.
- Several participants support preserving the airport based on a romantic sense of nostalgia and desire to honor SMO’s rich aviation history.

Close and/or Restrict Flight School Operations

- The flight schools are a significant source of tension within the community due to participants’ concerns regarding safety and noise levels.
- A large number of participants supported the complete closure of all flight school operations.
- If total closure of SMO’s flight schools is not feasible, numerous participants propose severely restricting their operational capacity, which includes reducing the overall number of flight schools.
- Many participants would like to eliminate “touch and go” maneuvers and restrict pattern flying in flight schools.
- Many participants support restricting the flight schools’ hours of operation during weekends and evenings (i.e., No-Fly Sundays, expanded curfews).
- Another popular suggestion included subsidizing flight schools to move their operations and conduct their training in less densely populated areas.
Ban and/or Limit Jets

- Participants spoke passionately about the need to ban all jets from SMO due to their attendant noise pollution and emissions.
- Several participants asserted that the presence of jets at SMO exacerbates safety concerns in light of the perception that the airport was not designed to handle jets.
- Community discussion group participants highlighted the toxicity and noxious odor of jet fuel as significant concerns.
- Many participants recommended that the City reduce the length of the runway which would limit the types of aircrafts able to use the airport (e.g., jets).
- If eliminating all jets is not feasible, some participants prefer to only allow jet arrivals and departures to take place during the hours of 10:00 am - 2:00 pm.
- Some community members proposed substantially increasing landing fees for jets to generate revenue for the City.
- Participants also suggested charging more expensive landing fees than LAX and other airports to discourage jet usage at SMO.
- Several participants support establishing jet performance standards regarding noise suppression measures and fuel types.

Change SMO’s Flight Path

- Many participants stressed the importance of not reinstating the 250-degree heading test because it is situated directly above a large number of residences.
- Some participants suggested that all departing flights be mandated to fly high over the Penmar Golf Course unless safety concerns clearly dictate otherwise.
- Raising flight pattern altitudes was another popular flight path mitigation effort among participants to lessen noise impacts.

Monitor and Enforce “Fly Neighborly Program”

- Many participants suggested that the City enforce the “Fly Neighborly Program” to minimize the impacts of SMO flight operations on the surrounding communities.
- Important elements of the “Fly Neighborly Program” would include observing flight path parameters, adhering to curfew restrictions and establishing a more predictable departure and arrival schedule.
- A more stringent and closely monitored “Fly Neighborly Program” would help establish and maintain a partnership between airport and community members,
demonstrating SMO’s commitment to addressing community concerns and acting as a good neighbor.

- Participants recommended that the City mandate pilot awareness workshops regarding noise abatement practices and procedures.
- Participants also suggested that the City develop pilot education materials such as fact sheets, brochures and guidelines which detail noise abatement procedures.
- Implementing and following best practices of the “Fly Neighborly Program” may help establish credibility and build trust among impacted citizens.

*Increase Fines and Penalties for Pilots*

- Participants suggested imposing harsher and more costly penalties for noise, flight path and curfew violators to discourage errant pilot behavior.
- The costly fines are intended to encourage compliance with the “Fly Neighborly Program” which supports pilots flying in the quietest manner possible while observing all FAA safety guidelines.

*Implement More Sophisticated Safety Systems*

- Participants advocated for the City to implement EMAS (Engineered Material Arresting System) to improve situational awareness and manage the risks associated with heavy plane traffic.
- Others proposed switching to a Wide Area Augmentation System to improve landing accuracy and minimize safety risks.

*Implement Noise Abatement Technology*

- Several airport proponents support efforts to implement noise suppression technology at SMO (i.e., hush kits) which are intended to reduce and limit the sound footprint of departing and arriving airplanes.
- Participants would like the City to explore soundproofing options for airport-adjacent homes.
- A few participants recommended that the City apply for grants to finance soundproofing initiatives.
E. Environmental Design Improvements

Upgrade Environmental Design of SMO

- Several participants would like the City to invest in the airport’s infrastructure, as well as improve the overall aesthetics of the airport campus.
- Some participants perceived the airport campus as “run down” and indicated that they would like to see increased recreation and community uses, improved accessibility to the property, and aesthetic improvements to the grounds and facilities.
- Participants suggested that the City allow limited development of non-aviation related activities to limit further quality of life deterioration and excessive vehicular traffic.
- A large number of participants advocated for the City to expand open space amenities (e.g., Clover Park) on the airport campus.
- A few participants advocated for the City to increase security at SMO, enhancing counterterrorism measures and general safety efforts.
- Many participants support upgrading mass transit to and from the airport, as well as improving bicycle and pedestrian access routes.
- Some participants suggested starting a shuttle service from Santa Monica College and Bergamot Station Art Center to the airport.

Implement Airfield Improvements

- Participants recommended that the City create a “runway protection” buffer zone in high impact areas on the southern and eastern sides of the airport.
- Numerous participants proposed that the City acquire vacant parcels and purchase homes surrounding the airport to establish a wider buffer zone.
- Some participants also advocated for the City to make improvements to the sound blast wall near the eastern end of the runway.
- Other related mitigation ideas from participants included adjusting departure clearances and creating 300 ft. safety zones on both sides of the runway to increase the buffer space for local residences.

Expand SMO’s Mixed-Use Options

- In addition to its core aviation services, some participants would like the City to consider expanding SMO’s mixed-use amenities such as more outdoor recreation space, neighborhood-serving retail and educational facilities.
• Of the 40 acres of non-aviation land, SMO currently hosts many business and non-aviation industry-supporting uses. However, participants recommended that the City develop additional uses that more directly benefit members of the broader community.

• Some suggested that the already successful outdoor recreational activities located at the airport can be expanded in terms of their size and programmatic variety.
F. Closure of SMO and Development of Alternative Land Uses

Instead of offering strategies to improve airport operations, many participants expressed their preference for the complete closure of the airport. These participants identified diverse ideas to repurpose the airport campus as alternative land uses that will more directly benefit the broader community.

Develop a Large Recreational Park with Outdoor Amenities

- A large number of participants would like to significantly expand the existing park on the SMO campus to increase the open space resources available to community members.
- Many participants proposed developing the land to serve as Santa Monica’s version of New York City’s Central Park or San Francisco’s Crissy Field.
- Participants suggested adding more recreational and outdoor amenities, such as swimming pools and sporting fields.

Build a Multi-Faceted Economic Incubator Site

- The airport campus could become the site of an “economic incubator” at which small startup companies could be located and supported by shared professional and support staff.
- To align the airport campus with Santa Monica’s reputation as a leader in sustainability and environmental stewardship, many participants would like to repurpose the land as an incubator for green businesses.
- The incubator site could serve as a green tech campus that focuses on research and development of green businesses such as renewable energy and solar power.
- Many participants suggested that alternative economic uses would generate more income for the City and the revenue could be used for citywide improvements.

Develop Sustainable Agriculture Uses

- Some participants would prefer to transform the airport campus into a sustainable agriculture resource that could include community gardens, urban farms and a permanent farmers market site.
Create a Multi-Use Transportation Hub

- Many participants proposed converting the airport campus into a multi-use transportation hub that accommodates public and multi-modal transit options.
- In addition, the multi-use transportation hub could serve as a site for consolidating the maintenance yards of Santa Monica’s Big Blue Bus and the Metro.

Expand Santa Monica College

- Many participants spoke favorably of using the airport campus to expand the capacity of local schools, especially Santa Monica College.
- An attractive land use alternative for many participants involved moving Santa Monica College’s Pearl Street campus to the airport campus.
- In turn, the City’s school district could relocate high schools to SMC’s Pearl Street campus.

Construct Housing for Various Population Segments

- Affordable housing
- Targeted workforce housing for teachers and civil servants
- “Live/Work” housing developments with limited density
- Housing for veterans
- Housing for students and visiting scholars
- Hotels to attract tourism

Create Streets to Ease Congestion along Arterial Roads

- Some participants would like to deconstruct the airport campus and create new streets to improve traffic circulation along arterial roads.
- To accommodate potential increased traffic from new land uses, participants proposed widening roads and connecting major thoroughfares such as National Boulevard and Centinela Avenue.

Develop a Mixed-Use Cultural Center

- Participants recommended that the airport shift its activities to become a mixed-use, cultural center for the City.
• The cultural center would also serve as a highly accessible, community gathering space that enhances Santa Monica’s identity as sophisticated, creative city.

Relocate City of Santa Monica Offices to SMO

• Participants proposed that that City move its governmental offices to the airport facility and utilize their current downtown location for other purposes.

Develop Neighborhood-Serving Commercial Retail

• Many community discussion group participants suggested enhancing retail activity in the area by developing neighborhood-serving commercial uses.

Implement Various Alternative Land Use Suggestions

• Green retirement community
• Fairgrounds for special events
• Vocational training schools which could exist in conjunction with local colleges or high schools
• Manufacturing plant for various products and materials
• Aviation technology center
• Museum for future generations celebrating the rich aviation legacy of SMO
• Aviation-focused high school
• Wildflower park
• Migratory bird refuge
• Butterfly park
• Art center
• Office park for local businesses
• Sports arena
• Large solar power field
• Eco-system restoration site
• Research facility for climate change
• Sculpture garden
**Implement Low-Density, Low-Impact Alternative Land Uses**

- Some community discussion group participants were undecided on specific alternatives; but, they supported a low-density use accessible by free or low-cost public transportation.

**Acknowledge Potential Consequences from New Land Uses**

- Several community discussion group participants cautioned that new land uses (e.g., retail and large-scale housing) may generate undesirable impacts such as increased vehicular traffic.
- Participants expressed the need to critically analyze the potential carbon footprint, as well as the noise and traffic issues that could result from alternative land use options.
G. City: Stand with Residents!

Protect the Rights of Residents

- Many participants advocated for the City to fight for the rights of impacted residents and to value their needs over profits.
- Some participants view the City Council as “pro development” and more concerned with generating revenue for the City than improving the livability of the area near the airport.

Allow Citizens to Vote on the Future of SMO

- Many participants feel strongly that Los Angeles and Santa Monica residents should take a public vote to assess their preferences for keeping the airport open or redeveloping the land for non-aviation-related uses.
- A large number of community discussion group participants asserted that a citywide voting process is the most democratic way to determine the final outcome for the airport.

Make a Decision

- Many participants would like the City to take a definitive position regarding SMO’s future and to develop a long-range plan for the airport campus.
- Several participants stated that uncertainty over the airport’s future creates an unfavorable climate for business owners and all airport tenants.
- Participants urged the City to seize the opportunity presented by the 1984 Settlement Agreement expiration and demonstrate bold leadership while deciding the future of SMO.
- During the decision making process, many participants would like the City to seriously consider airport closure as a potential outcome.

Improve Communications with Local Residents and Community Members

- Consistent and transparent communication with residents and community members offers the opportunity to explain the improvements and efforts to address local concerns.
- Participants suggested that SMO perform more outreach, education and community tours to familiarize the public (i.e., impacted residents) with airport operations and programs.
• Many participants recommended that the City expand SMO’s community events and activities to allow residents to interact with the airport campus (e.g., air shows, fairs).
• Some participants proposed engaging both neighborhood groups and pilots to discuss the logistics of flying and to learn more about the various aircraft operations.
• Another popular suggestion involved creating a permanent Ombudsman position to interact with community members and address impact concerns.
• Participants would like the Ombudsman to update the community on SMO’s efforts to implement “good neighbor” polices and improve airport sustainability.
• Regular communication with residents could foster a “good neighbor” relationship and engender local support for future SMO initiatives.
• Some participants would also like the City to disclose the airport nuisances and future growth plans to potential homebuyers in the area.
VI. Recommendations for Phase III

In an effort to maximize community participation during Phase III of the visioning process, participants were asked to share their thoughts and opinions for ensuring a thorough analysis of all airport concerns. Participants offered a broad range of ideas and recommendations for the City to consider. This section is organized according to the following topics:

A. Supplementary Information Requests

B. Legal Strategies to Challenge the FAA

C. Potential Community Actions

D. Expanded Community Outreach and Political Engagement
A. Supplementary Information Requests

Many participants requested additional data on a variety of topics to better frame Phase III discussions and to ensure meaningful community input.

*Provide Additional Data and Information*

**Airport Statistics**
- An accurate map of current SMO property including ownership information
- Types of aircrafts using SMO
- Information regarding how each operation is defined
- Level of “touch and go” maneuver activity
- Information on the areas of residence of airport users
- Total number of crashes per year
- Total number of “on-the-ground” deaths (non-pilot and passengers)
- Data regarding the emergency usage of the airport

**Noise-Related Information**
- Noise levels including the methodology for noise measurement
- Percentages of noise pollution from different aircraft types
- Dwell time of idling planes
- Flight pattern data

**Miscellaneous**
- Amount of available capacity at other Southern California general aviation airports
- Summary of pilot recommendations on improving airport operations
- Information about the environmental remediation required at the airport campus and the associated costs

**Conduct an Economic Cost-Benefit Analysis of Alternatives**

- A large number of participants requested that the City hire a credible, third-party source to conduct another economic cost-benefit analysis of alternative land uses.
- Participants suggested that the City consider a limited number of priority uses (e.g., retail, recreation, housing, etc.) and hire a third party researcher to identify the costs and benefits associated with each option.
- Many participants would like the City to investigate various scenarios such as recreational uses for the airport campus, or reduced airport operations combined with alternative land uses.
• Participants would like the new economic analysis to include the economic contribution of SMO (including flight schools) to the City through revenues and taxes.
• Overall, participants would like a better understanding of which land use scenarios would provide the most benefit to the broader Santa Monica community.

**Conduct a Health Impact Assessment**

• Several participants demanded that the City conduct a comprehensive health impact assessment of SMO to determine the environmental effects of the noise and air pollution.
• The health impact assessment should include a baseline study of Santa Monica’s current air quality levels, as well as indirect health and social costs borne by residents.
• Participants also recommended that the City follow-up on air pollution studies conducted by UCLA to assess the implications of the research.

**Prepare an Environmental Impact Report**

• Many participants advocated for the City to perform and continuously update an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) of SMO’s operations.

**Create a Map of SMO**

• Participants requested that the City create a map showing parcel ownership within the delineated airport boundaries.
• Participants would also like the map to highlight the schools, parks and residential areas within the SMO flight path.
• The map should be made available to the public and shared with the California Department of Real Estate, local government agencies and local real estate companies.

**Conduct a Best Practices Review of General Aviation Airports**

• Many participants recommended that the City conduct a thorough review of best practices used at other general aviation airports regarding community-friendly operations and “good neighbor” policies.
• Participants suggested that the best practices review focus on strategies to transform SMO into a sustainable “green” airport.
• The best practices review should also include examples of the most appropriate mix of flight operations and activities for a small, general aviation airport such as SMO.
B. Legal Strategies to Challenge the FAA

Participants recommended a wide range of tactical and legal strategies for the City to employ while negotiating with the FAA.

Provide Contextual Information to Community Members

- Throughout the community discussion groups, many participants described a need for more contextual information to understand the legal authority and various outcomes that may arise during the potential legal dispute between the City and the FAA.
- Many participants requested more facts about the FAA’s authority over the SMO decision making process and the City’s ability to negotiate mitigations.
- Participants requested information on the City’s previous lawsuit with the FAA to ban jets and other Class C and D aircraft.
- Some participants would like information regarding the legal strategies for eliminating low-lead fuel and increasing landing fees for jets.
- Participants suggested that the FAA host a public meeting detailing the role of Santa Monica airport in the national airport system and the FAA’s position on SMO mitigation measures.

Strengthen Legal Argument against FAA through Information Collection

- Many participants recommended that the City augment its legal argument by conducting a comprehensive health impact assessment and an EIR.
- Several participants advocated for the City to research successful examples of communities that achieved mitigations with the FAA such as Newport Beach and Burbank.
- This supportive information may give the City more leverage during negotiations with the FAA.

Raise Financial Resources

- Some community discussion group participants recommended that the City raise funds to finance litigation against the FAA to close the airport and/or negotiate mitigations.
C. Potential Community Actions

Create Ad Hoc Working Groups

- Some participants suggested that the City establish an ad hoc airport working committees including pilots and residents from all impacted communities (e.g., Santa Monica, Los Angeles and Culver City) to address specific concerns and issues.
- Another recommendation involved convening small working groups with all parties to collaboratively develop mitigation strategies to improve airport operations and guide next steps with the FAA.
- Several participants would like to find “win-win” solutions in which the City works to mitigate concerns raised by residents and lessen the impacts borne by residents.

Adjust SMO Airport Commission Membership

- Many participants asserted that some airport commissioners do not fully understand aviation and aviation-related operations.
- Participants suggested that the City appoint pilots and aviation experts to serve on the airport commission.

File a Class Action Lawsuit

- Some participants stated their plans to file a class action lawsuit against the City based on the SMO’s adverse health impacts on local residents.
- This potential litigation could include residents of Santa Monica, Los Angeles and Culver City.
D. Expanded Community Outreach and Political Engagement

Expand Outreach to Santa Monica Community Members

- Numerous participants spoke passionately about the need to engage and solicit input from the entire Santa Monica community.
- Participants would like to see more community outreach and resident involvement to balance out the City Council’s “pro-development leanings.”
- Participants recommended that the City engage residents more frequently with informational updates to raise awareness about airport issues.
- The City should create additional channels for the members of the general public to provide feedback and offer suggestions.
- Some participants would like the City to survey local business owners about their opinions and preferences for the future of SMO.
- Many participants recommended that the City involve a larger cross-section of constituents by disseminating surveys and questionnaires to Santa Monica community members.
- Some participants also suggested that the City increase outreach to the local Spanish-speaking population to increase their representation in the visioning process.

Expand Outreach to City of Los Angeles Communities

- A large number of participants recommended that the City engage citizens from neighboring Los Angeles communities such as Mar Vista and Venice address concerns of impacted residents from non-Santa Monica areas.
- Participants recommended that the City involve a larger cross-section of constituents by disseminating surveys and questionnaires to residents in West Los Angeles.

Expand National Outreach to Other Cities

- Many participants also supported the strategy of forming a coalition with other communities who are fighting against general aviation airports (e.g. Long Beach, Van Nuys, Burbank, etc.).
- Some participants suggested that the City elevate the SMO issue to a national stage in order to receive more support from other communities across the country.
**Improve the SMO Community Visioning Process**

- Participants urge the City to conduct a visioning process that is thoughtful of all consequences and inclusive of all community voices.
- Many participants request more transparency throughout the visioning process regarding the City’s potential courses of action to ensure fair and mutually beneficial outcomes.
- Community discussion group participants would like clarifying information on the purpose of Phase III and the course of action following Phase III.
- Participants suggested that the City collect and disseminate data (e.g., aircraft noise levels, revenue generated by SMO) to the public in order to properly frame the Phase III visioning discussions.
- Many participants stated the need to remove City personnel from the visioning process, due to the perception of a potential conflict of interest.
- Participants would like the City to create a frequently asked questions document (FAQ) in collaboration with aviation experts to dispel myths about SMO.
- A few participants suggested that the City document the lessons learned from SMO’s visioning process, mitigation approaches and community engagement efforts.

**Allow Citizens to Vote on the Future of SMO**

- Participants feel strongly that Los Angeles and Santa Monica residents should take a public vote to assess their preferences for keeping the airport open or redeveloping the land for non-aviation related uses.
- A large number of participants asserted that a citywide voting process is the most democratic way to determine the final outcome for the airport.

**Engage City Council Members of Santa Monica and Other Cities**

- Some participants proposed that the City engage, consult and partner with local elected officials from Santa Monica, Culver City and Los Angeles.

**Engage State and Federal Elected Officials and Federal Departments**

- Many participants would like the visioning process to include state and federal elected officials to ensure that various community member interests are considered during Phase III.
• Some participants suggested that the City proactively develop a federal delegation of both Senate and Congress members in an effort to build a power base with federal representatives.
• Participants proposed engaging the Environmental Protection Agency regarding the environmental impacts of SMO operations.

**Engage the FAA**

• Participants recommended extending invitations to authoritative representatives from the FAA and state aviation agencies to discuss cooperative strategies.
• Some participants suggested that the FAA host a public meeting detailing the role of Santa Monica airport in the national airport system and the FAA’s position on mitigation measures.

**Make a Decision**

• Many participants would like the City to take a definitive position regarding SMO’s future and to develop a long-range plan for the airport campus.
• Several participants stated that uncertainty over the airport’s future creates an unfavorable climate for business owners and non-aviation tenants.
• During the decision making process, many participants would like the City to seriously consider airport closure as a potential outcome.

**Avoid Development of SMO**

• Several participants view the City Council as “pro-development” and more concerned with generating revenue for the City than improving the livability of the area near the airport.
• Participants cautioned that City should resist the urge to commercially develop the airport campus.
• Participants suggested that the City allow only limited development of non-aviation-related land to limit further quality of life deterioration and excessive vehicular traffic.
VII. Appendices

Appendix A

Transcribed Participant Comment Cards

During the series of community discussion groups, 309 participants submitted participant comment cards. The participant comment cards included information regarding participant demographics, affiliation, general comments, etc. The comment cards have been compiled and transcribed.
<p>| CDG Date | Time      | Gender | Age  | Residence  | Years of Residence | Affiliation                          | Relationship to Airport                                                                 | General Comments                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----------|-----------|--------|------|------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1/21/2012 | 10:00 AM  | Female | 45-64| Santa Monica | 14                 | FOSP                                 | live 2.5 blocks from western end of airport                                              | there was a consensus that participants would like to come back for a true &quot;visioning&quot; discussion when more data came available including a cost-benefit analysis of different aviation and non-aviation uses of airport |
| 1/21/2012 | Male  | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 13       | Santa Monica Conservancy OPA; not here in any official capacity | impacted since 250 degree heading test                                               | need true visioning; start over!                                                                                                                  |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 45-64 | LA    | 2         | Friends of Santa Monica Airport; AOPA | private pilot/ instrument rated; trained and fly from KSMO |                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 65+   | Santa Monica | 3.5     | SMO Commission                       |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/21/2012 | Female   | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 32     | resident affected by all flight paths (negatively) |                                                                                                                                                   | should be a real visioning process looking at all possibilities and based on real data (EIR, cost-benefit analysis, etc.); top priority: close the airport; next: ban jets and flight schools; then: develop land into community orchards, garden, park land, affordable housing, art space, education and orchards |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 18-34 | LA    | 6         | noise dumping ground                             |                                                                                                                                                   | this has not been visioning of realistic alternatives: housing, transportation, regional infrastructure. This is valuable land, but noise renders adjoining property difficult to occupy |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 30     | under the noise pollution                   |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 16     | <a href="http://www.casmat.org">www.casmat.org</a> concerned citizen           |                                                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                   |
| 1/21/2012 | Female   | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 19     | OPA member                                  | lives in the city; affected by safety, noise, sustainability and economic impacts        | wanted to talk about the future but we focused on the past and current complaints     |
| 1/21/2012 | 2:00 PM  | Male   | 35-44 | Santa Monica | 17       | students circle my home constantly          | eliminate flight schools and pattern flying or training over my neighborhood; it was perfect prior to 2010; eliminate old load planes |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 18     | UCLA Medical School neighbor             | airport presents risks to the health and well-being of Santa Monica citizens             |
| 1/21/2012 | Male     | 45-64 | Santa Monica | 10     |                                                                                                                                                   | noise pollution from small cinching airplanes is unbearable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am subject to its noise pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>justice aviation</td>
<td>business owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>National Business Ar. Association</td>
<td>user</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wilmont</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Mar Vista</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>airport: peaceful, open space, nostalgic, civil aviation is charming; jets: most offensive; 2015: kick out Rick Caruso et al!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aerlex Law Group</td>
<td>work at a business across from the airport</td>
<td>very informative and interesting to hear the diverse opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>live in flight path</td>
<td>I hope the City will resist the urge to develop the airport properties or move slowly to make modest, incremental improvements that add zero traffic, congestion and car pollution to the neighborhood. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>horrible fumer! Horrible noise!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>private pilot (instrument rated); member in Airspacers Flying Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor, resident, landlord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Gardena</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santa Monica Daily Press</td>
<td>I report on it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Palisades</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>under flight path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S.M. Greens</td>
<td>shut it down!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>VNC Airport Committee</td>
<td>homeowner in Sunset Park and Venice (where I currently reside)</td>
<td>Closing the airport should be one of the options studied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>under the flight path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>OPA</td>
<td></td>
<td>SM resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot, my aircraft is based at SMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>office at the airport; private pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>father works on property; general interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor; Friend of Santa Monica Airport</td>
<td>close it down or eliminate jet exhaust; reduce noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>live virtually under flight path near the airport especially when flight path changed</td>
<td>Let’s apply more creative thinking like today; this was very interesting and positive!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>FOSMA; airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>interested community member</td>
<td>great session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOSMA; airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>hangar owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FOSP</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>friends of sunset park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Ojai</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very organized: Daniel kept conversation on point. Great suggestions from participants!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very positive; although I had to attend a class. I’m interested in process and results</td>
<td>so look forward to more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FOSP member (former board member)</td>
<td></td>
<td>live under east end of runway; 2 stroke engine changeover commission</td>
<td>eliminate C and D aircraft usage; curtail pattern flying by schools; install emass barriers at both ends; do not allow 250 degree heading; 7 am-9 pm hours of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunset Park/ airport grounds beneficiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMO Community Visioning Process
Summary of Phase II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>I live on direct path of planes</td>
<td>Since the 90's, the noise of jets are so loud that over and over again, I’ve had to pause business phone calls just because a plane is going over head; the pollution raining down, though unseen, is palpable; safety: one crash a year on record, and a population ever growing is intolerably irresponsible; what’s lost from denying jets could be well compensated by developing it into a cultural park (like you’ve begun to do).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>please ban jet aircrafts of close the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>retiree</td>
<td></td>
<td>prioritizing technical (potential) improvements closely moves decisions off the closing alternative no matter how unlikely possibility is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>resident of SM</td>
<td></td>
<td>encourage SM City Council to consider getting input from all residents on future of SMO; require that Airport Commission include at least some licensed pilots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>noise and pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td>well run discussion; limitations on recreational jet fly times; restrictions on all polluting jets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>El Segundo</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kim Davidson Aviation; SMO business- A.C. maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>neighbor of SMO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>neighbor and pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>President of More Technologies; President of International Fellowship of Flying Rotarians; Past President of Westwood Village Rotary Club</td>
<td>pilot, tenant, repair shop customer</td>
<td>love SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>pilot, airplane owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>nearby resident; airport fan</td>
<td>turn SMO into a center for the development of the future of aviations including electric airplanes and alternative fuels; R&amp;D fuel and electric airplanes; continued training for better safety; pollution (current NYC, Atlanta); noise- helicopters louder and lower; swift fuel; 250-degree heading change reduces pollution on the east side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FOSP, CASMAT</td>
<td>concerned resident</td>
<td>I think the airport should be closed. I appreciate the history of the airport and a museum would be good; however, the airport is no longer appropriate in a densely populated residential area. Jets should be out of LAX and flight schools/ training in less populated areas. The City of SM is progressive and should live by the Sustainability Bill of Rights and resident's rights to clean air and quiet skies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>SM Airport Commission</td>
<td>pilot; neighbor</td>
<td>I believe there is a lot of common ground among the various stakeholders in terms of reducing the noise and pollution from the airport without beginning to discuss closing the facility. Reducing number of flight schools; reducing hours of operation; midfield run-up; upgraded aircraft; sound barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>tenant, pilot, airplane owner</td>
<td>Museum of Flying</td>
<td>more factual data would be welcome</td>
<td>I have a 3 year old daughter and am concerned about noise and pollution. I am especially concerned about leaded fuel and flight schools that circle over my place everyday. Why are there six schools for flying? I don't like students flying over my house everyday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA/ Venice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>hear it everyday</td>
<td>EVAC</td>
<td>past airport commission</td>
<td>The airport makes valuable contributions to the City in terms of jobs and business generated, emergency facilities. But even more important, the see of this valuable land essentially reserves it against commercially and residential development that would only aggravate the existing problems of traffic congestion and overcrowding. We need a proper unbiased venue in which the issues surrounding the airport can be fairly and factually argued.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>pilot, user</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMO Community Visioning Process
Summary of Phase II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Westlake Village</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>FOSMO- Friends of SM Airport</td>
<td>former tenant; current intermittent user</td>
<td>appreciate the opportunity to gain and disseminate the facts about the airport and its users so that a logical and thoughtful decision regarding SMO's future can be made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FOSMO</td>
<td>airport neighbor, pilot, flight instructor, airplane owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>SM Airport Association</td>
<td>pilot for 22 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ocean Park Association</td>
<td>resident with planes overhead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Venice Neighborhood Council (Land Use and Planning Committee; Ad Hoc Committee on SMO)</td>
<td>stakeholder/ property owner in path of planes</td>
<td>concerns: noise, air pollution, safety (crashes); opinion: close the airport in 2015; close flight schools now; change to prop planes asap; eliminate jets now; develop plan for use of space if SMO closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor, resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>excellent moderator with a good mix of varying points of view</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Borderline neighborhood</td>
<td>neighbor under flight plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>committed citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>owner of Smyrski Law Group</td>
<td>tenant, business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>civil air patrol</td>
<td>pilot, search and rescue pilot for USAF auxiliary</td>
<td>the airport, the history and heritage, his jobs and economic benefit, the vistas and views provided by it are all part of what makes SM such a special place. With no airport, we'd have high rises, higher density, traffic and gridlock and the sunlight that makes our city a place where our shadows never fall would be gone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>supporter</td>
<td>work with the surrounding communities to keep the airport but make it cleaner, greener and generate more revenue. Invest in it.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>private pilot, small aircraft owner based in SMO</td>
<td></td>
<td>good session. Thanks for taking the time and money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Red Cross, Earth Angel for Angel Flight West</td>
<td></td>
<td>all given in discourse. Thanks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>tenant</td>
<td></td>
<td>better communication will reduce “noise” level; renew lease now, don’t wait until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>office tenant</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>27 pilot, CAP, MOF</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>pilot who uses airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>user, neighbor, formerly worked at airport</td>
<td>the airport should continue to grow organically with growth of current mixed uses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>30 hangar tenant, aircraft owner</td>
<td>pilot, aircraft owner (with a tie-down)</td>
<td>get on the bus or off the bus! SMO should be the crown jewel of airports! It is the only airport on the left coast in LA!! Wake up and smell the coffee!!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>20 pilot</td>
<td>Berlin Aviones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>44 SMAA, AOPA, Cal Pilots Association, EAA</td>
<td>pilot, owner at KSMO since 1971</td>
<td>FAA will predominate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>planes over my head everyday</td>
<td></td>
<td>need airport specific plan to meet existing needs for open space, housing and arts; no artificial turf; promote green community based business in city leases; solar based / generate solar energy; affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>close the airport; change land use to generate revenue for the city; in the interim, increase fuel tax by SM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>under flight path it seems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>community member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>2 FOSMO</td>
<td>pilot, private and recreational</td>
<td>love SMO and hope it stays around!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>resident, airport commission</td>
<td>neighborhood- SMO commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td></td>
<td>Venice Community Council working group</td>
<td>Venus Community Council working group</td>
<td>I am a victim of the airport</td>
<td>repurpose, shut down the airport; create open space park and workforce housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>nearby resident and user/pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>we are just friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Friends of Sunset</td>
<td>near flight path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>close to flight path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>pilot and aircraft owner</td>
<td></td>
<td>fantastic meeting; let's do this more often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Santa Monica resident</td>
<td>conflicted to negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>homeowner nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marina del Rey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Airspacers</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Friends of Santa Monica</td>
<td>pilot, aircraft owner, hangar owner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>not against the airport; would like to see the jets banned or limited to 15 a day; should also pay the city a $10,000 landing use fee at the least; limited flight schools; would love to see a Central Park in the airport's place should it be closed. We added streets created to help reduce neighborhood traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>FOSP, FOSMO, Air Spacers</td>
<td>neighbor and user</td>
<td>thank you for using paper flyers to provide notice of this event and hearing process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LA/ 2 blocks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>interested neighbor</td>
<td>I believe the city has made up it's mind and these meetings are just set up for us to vent. At least that has been my experience with other issues in Santa Monica. For example the traffic pattern on Ocean Park Blvd,- the city did what it wanted and the Blvd is congested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>victim of noise and pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand Oaks</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Airspacers Flying Club; Angel Flight</td>
<td>GA Pilot</td>
<td>thank you for giving me the opportunity to participate. I also fly for Angel Flight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>nearby resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>concerned resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>The City should adopt usage fees for all landings and a 100% tax on all leaded gas sold in Santa Monica.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>resident, friends who live under flight path; aware of noise and planes which turn north and loop back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA/ Border of SM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Friends of Santa Monica Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>I learned to fly at SMO and fly quite regularly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>FOSP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Pacific Palisades</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>close</td>
<td>25 years near airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>7:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>closeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Mar Vista Hill</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>grew up around aviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>great group meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>not in favor- noise pollution and safety concerns</td>
<td>explore alternate uses that benefit a larger portion of the population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>with the airport?</td>
<td>too much traffic, dangerous</td>
<td>questions above are poorly worded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>keep this airport open; it is a great asset. Heard about meeting through airport services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>my office is at the airport</td>
<td>concerned with noise and safety</td>
<td>consider a compromise; no fly Sundays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>husband is a pilot (recreation/ airspaces)</td>
<td>enthusiastic neighbor</td>
<td>heard about CDG through FOSP and FOSMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>personal; president of Ocean Park Association</td>
<td>neighbor concerned with noise and safety</td>
<td>well conducted workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Mar Vista Hill</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>member of airport association</td>
<td>runway parked there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Venice Neighborhood Council/ SM Airport Committee</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>pro airport, mitigate issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Ocean Park Association; Borderline Group</td>
<td>under the flight path</td>
<td>concerned with noise and safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA/ Venice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Want airport closed! Or no jets, no flight planes</td>
<td>airport safety issues, lead and ultra-fine particles, black soot concerns. Also noise and safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>OPA</td>
<td>live under flight path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>member of FOSP</td>
<td>loved the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Had an artist studio for 7 years, also learned to fly</td>
<td>I love the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA/ Venice</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>resident who gets bombarded everyday</td>
<td>SMO has destroyed my quality of life since 250 degree test ended. My home value has been harmed and pollution is toxic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>close it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Chair of Airport Committee; Ocean Park Association</td>
<td>none except it has hurt my quality of life</td>
<td>close the airport to flight schools and jets; shorten runway or turn into a park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>live close</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident living nearby</td>
<td>I would like to reduce or eliminate flights making noise over my house; if possible, I would like to close the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>FOSP</td>
<td>upset resident</td>
<td>close airport- cost of litigation with FAA? Prepare for fight; mitigate- green airport; City Council needs to consider this population, not the visitors who use SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mar Vista resident- south of airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>concerned citizen- not happy with noise and pollution</td>
<td>very much want to see the airport closed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>affected neighbor</td>
<td>I oppose the renewal of the airport's license to operate. The space could be divided into many purposes including a park, low-impact business, housing, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>under 250 flight path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 OPA board member</td>
<td>noise- recipient of noise</td>
<td>resident who is hurt by airport</td>
<td>either mitigate noise and pollution issues or CLOSE IT!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>FOSMO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td>good job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>citizen of Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>local resident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>listener</td>
<td>too much noise and air pollution from planes; not safe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA/ Mar Vista</td>
<td>10 MVCC, NWNA</td>
<td>I chair the MVCC SMO Committee and am Zone Z director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>be a better neighbor; stay open!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>reduce the number of flights; eliminate the 250 degree heading and mini route that brings more planes over Sunset Park and Ocean Park (it's intolerable); eliminate pilot schools- very disturbing and dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/3/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>victim- very noisy, dangerous, unhealthy as time has gone by; resident of Bryn Mawr Ave</td>
<td></td>
<td>No 250 heading and mini route that brings more planes over Sunset Park and Ocean Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>rent studio space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>in flight path, tenant at the airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Marina del Rey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>City of SM employee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>arti st tenant</td>
<td>too much noise; too many fumes and fuel residual (particulates); better use of the property by City of SM; many more jobs if land is developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>concerned resident</td>
<td>no leaded fuel; no flight schools; no jets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>homeowners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>SM Conservancy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>citizen living nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>tenant of office space at 3400 Airport Blvd</td>
<td>was able to gather knowledge about what’s going on with airport land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>VNC/ SMO</td>
<td>immediate neighbor</td>
<td>noise and pollution aside, the bigger picture: environmental; recreate nature; therefore close SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Venice Neighborhood Council Airport Committee</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CRAAP- concerned residents against airport pollution; North Westdale Neighborhood Association neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>close SMO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Venice Neighborhood Council Airport Committee</td>
<td>flight path neighbor and patron of restaurants</td>
<td>over the past 8-10 years, we have changed from lovers of this small general aviation airport to wanting this constantly polluting (noise and emissions) quasi commercial airport to close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident in flight pattern: annoyed! Going deaf from noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm representing 25 families from condo complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>resident Northwestdale Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>safety and pollution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/10/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>resident Northwestdale Neighborhood Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>FOSMO user, pilot</td>
<td>very concerned about the airport and impact on the residential homeowners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>proximity to the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>resident of Ocean Park/Sunset Park</td>
<td>50 year family relationship; general aviation use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>SMC trustee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>bombarded by noise of the planes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>FOSP</td>
<td>dislike it; eliminate replace airport with iconic park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>pilot and airport neighbor have airplane based airport; live under the flight path</td>
<td>would like to see the contract renewed and keep airport here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>many</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>medicine</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>Close the airport! Make it something that serves our community and is sustainable such as an urban farm /eco-village/cooking school/ park land. If airport stays, shorten runway to end at 27th St as it previously did, smaller planes. No flight schools=pattern flying constantly. no Sunday flights! no jets! No leaded fuels!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>I vote to close the airport and to replace it with a massive park and public spaces. Edible schoolyard? Community gardens? Parks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>preferred option: close SMO in 2015 on grounds if environmental health, noise impacts and safety, which lead to massive unpopularity of the airport among SM residents. If SMO cannot be closed, flight operations should be greatly reduced by closing/ reducing flight schools, increasing landing fees and regulating more strictly. alternative uses for airport land. more public parks, community and school gardens, research, showpiece for green sustainable development, consistent with LUCE and SM priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>30 Krueger Aviation, Inc</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>tenant</td>
<td>reduce number of flights dramatically by raising fees by multiples which might also prevent flight schools, fractional jets, etc.; do not go back to &quot;test pattern&quot; that so terribly increased the number of flights over Ocean Park and Sunset Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>thank you. It is important to get reviews and absorb perspectives of all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>keep the airport open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/14/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>user, tenant, aircraft owner</td>
<td>keep the airport open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>FAA licensed pilot; SM Spoke</td>
<td>have lived 29 years south of it on Warren Avenue near Walgrove; now live on the north side of the airport in Santa Monica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>positive, I'm for improving the airport</td>
<td>good and thoughtful discussion!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>irate neighbor</td>
<td>I support the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>&quot;History&quot; flyer was not objective, should have info about the other uses, not just aviation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4.5 resident</td>
<td>neighbor, UCLA scientist (air quality)</td>
<td>ban jets = priority #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>negatively impacted by noise and air pollution</td>
<td>the airport needs to close and Santa Monica must take the lead</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>neighbor; airport manager</td>
<td>keep the airport open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>member of CRAAP neighbor</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>neighbor 2 blocks east of the airport under the flight path</td>
<td>I would like to see some positive changes to the neighborhood of SM and LA surrounding the airport including limiting jet operations or even eliminating them and use the land for other purposes. The time has come to change the status quo, no longer is relevant. expand the museum (rich history), park and other uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>neighbor 2 blocks east of the airport under the flight path/fume path</td>
<td>I would like to see some positive changes to the neighborhood of SM and LA surrounding the airport including limiting jet operations or even eliminating them and use the land for other purposes. The time has come to change the status quo, no longer is relevant. expand the museum (rich history), park and other uses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>OPA</td>
<td>homeowner impacted by excessive flight operations</td>
<td>long term solution: SMC should be moved to SMO (in part). The existing SMC campus to be urban park. 20 yrs? 30 yrs?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>in flight path</td>
<td>I appreciate the freedom to express my views and to hear the views of others attending this session.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>city resident</td>
<td>get LAX to lower their landing fees to match those at SMO or raise ours to match theirs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>victim of air and noise pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>too much pollution, negative impacts to the environmental dangers to the community; close the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>pollution and noise; increased traffic at airport has changed quality of life for the worse. LUCE does not address airport uses in future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>lifetime</td>
<td>nearby resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>the airport does not serve the community, it serves the elite! Further, it does not support the “green” spirit of Santa Monica! It is a environmental hazard: pollution, noise! Close fuel center; do not renew leases for aviation related businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Sunset Park resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>closes the airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Sunset Park neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>It’s been clear for years that the Santa Monica, Mar Vista, Venice community is adversely affected by SMO on so many levels. What’s needed is more political will by Santa Monica and Los Angeles with action by our federal lawmakers to close or greatly alter (reduce) SMO operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>FOSP neighbor/ resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>review and document all the comments and reasons for closing the airport that were detailed on the discussion group chart of March 16th, 10 am meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Our group was unanimous!!! Close the airport! In the mean time, do not renew leases of flight schools, relocate them, pay them to move. Do not renew the fuel center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>co-chair of North Westdale Airport Committee; CRAAP member</td>
<td>affected grossly by the pollution</td>
<td>close the airport and replace it with a large entertainment center (like Dorothy Chandler) etc. Museum of Air at SM; no apartments or condos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>FOSP neighbor</td>
<td>live in flight path</td>
<td>taxpayer for house and business thanks for focus groups; may these be the beginning of people input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>resident; neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jet the federal obligations expire in 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>artist with a studio at the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>this is so necessary; we need to be proactive on this. It is so important to our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>FOSP neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>no 250 degree flight path; no jets (or stringently limited); limit flight school touch and go; no leaded fuel; ban pilots who deviate from the established flight plan for takeoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Mar Vista</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>residential area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>angel flight west</td>
<td>work at airport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Malibu</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SMAA; FOSMO tie down tenant</td>
<td>airport tie down tenant for 26 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDG Date</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Years of Residence</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Relationship to Airport</td>
<td>General Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>now immediate cessation of jet traffic later; empty it, leave it fallow; don't immediately fill it up again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>Miserable. I demand a public health study of the idling toxic fumes of the West LA area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am impacted by the noise and pollution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>Jet's plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>get the jet fuel fumes and noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Marina del Rey</td>
<td>1 work for Air Share; pilot work at airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>38 VNC SM airport committee</td>
<td>neighbor; concerned resident of Venice (I live under flight path)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>10:00 AM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8 homeowner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>neighbor living below the flight path</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20 homeowner</td>
<td>neighbor; our home and community affected daily by noise and pollution from SMO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4.5 homeowner</td>
<td>find it a danger and nuisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMO Community Visioning Process
Summary of Phase II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>very close neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>I hope this is really a productive, worth everyone's time, and results in a positive balanced outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>VNC block association</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td></td>
<td>would like to know the position of the city attorney on the 2015 contract with FAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighboring resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor; airport commission</td>
<td>well done, broad ranging discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>good meeting; please close the airport. It is a horrible blight in our community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>FOSP</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>live nearby; concerned about general health issues</td>
<td>I think the City of SM needs to align the airport with it's general mission of sustainability and environmentalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident; neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunset Park resident; proximity to airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>I would love to see the airport land reassigned for quiet and healthy uses that benefits all SM residents. How can SM portray itself as a green sustainable, progressive city to continue funding this unsafe, dirty, noisy activity in its own backyard. Let's be visionary!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>FOSP; resident</td>
<td>SM resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>very concerned resident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SMO Community Visioning Process
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>25 member of FOSP</td>
<td>victim of noise and pollution from airport</td>
<td>passenger</td>
<td>1.) I can’t wait for the airport to be closed down. It is frightening how many crashes have occurred in our neighborhood. It is frightening how many crashes have occurred in our neighborhood. A friend’s babysitter cancelled one day and she had to take her 2 children to another person’s house. When she came home two hours later, there was a crashed plane in her backyard and her two children could have been killed if they had been at home with the babysitter. The City is playing Russian Roulette with our safety. It is the only airport in the country that is separated by the surrounding community by single streets. 2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8 SM resident</td>
<td>resident only</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Mar Vista</td>
<td>21 homeowner</td>
<td>resident who needs clean air and quiet</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>50 FOSP</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2012</td>
<td>3:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4 Sunset Park resident</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>2.) Health dangers: I have smelled extremely toxic smells driving south on centinela by the airport, south of Ocean Park Blvd. when a plane was landing. It also made a very loud noise that startled me in my car. I know people east of Centinela that have developed cancer which they think is from the airport. 3.) Does not serve the local citizens: many if not all the local jets are used by very rich people or corporations, or people such as Governor Schwarzenegger who flew everyday to Sacramento. When the economy is good, the tax payers subsidize airport; not sustainable, global warming, carbon footprint; Resident leaders should have a seat at the table in setting the scope.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CDG Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Years of Residence</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Relationship to Airport</th>
<th>General Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>2:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>nearby resident</td>
<td>I like having an airport in the community, but do not like jets. The jets are very noisy and not appropriate to the surrounding community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>close the airport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>community member impacted by SMO operations</td>
<td>I live under the approach to SMO, need human health risk assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>airport commission</td>
<td>neighbor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>local resident concerned with how City manages its assets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Venice Neighborhood Council</td>
<td>under flight school path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>pilot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65+</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mid-city neighbors</td>
<td>concerned citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>concerned citizen</td>
<td>Let's take as much local action to reduce negative impacts of airport. Immediately lose jets (or as soon as possible), reduce helicopters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/24/2012</td>
<td>6:00 PM</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>Santa Monica</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>live close by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Flight path on Ocean Park is unacceptable, a violation of the protection of the capital investment made by capitalists who own property in the neighborhood. Our quality of life is TRASHED by the noise pollution. A survey sent to all property owners should be required. Replace airport with a sports facility, especially major league football stadium (Sunday traffic in winter only); or low density, affordable housing; or museum and sculpture garden.
Appendix B

Additional Written Participant Comments

Some participants elected to submit written comments to City officials regarding their opinions and ideas for the future of Santa Monica Airport. These comments have been documented and compiled in this appendix.

Written Comment #1

To Susan Cline and the Santa Monica City Council,

Please include the concerns of the Mar Vista community in the Santa Monica Airport Visioning process. I live a mere 300 meters from the east end of the runway. I attended one of the recent discussion groups and am actively involved in the local efforts to reduce or eliminate noise and pollution from the airport. Although we are not Santa Monica residents, we receive the lion’s share of the pollution from SMO and therefore wish to be fully represented in this discussion. The following is a general overview of our goals.

1. CLOSE THE AIRPORT: First and foremost, we would like to see the airport closed permanently. In its place we would strongly prefer an open parkland (the majority of the runway sits on state-designated parkland anyway). The remaining land could be used as a green energy station (solar, wind, etc), expansion of Santa Monica College, or other types of revenue-generating businesses. We fully understand that Santa Monica has a vested interest in finding income-producing uses for the land, and although we’d rather not see a giant WalMart in its place, we’d rather have anything than an airport.

2. IF NOT CLOSED, REDUCE: If efforts to close SMO again run up against FAA opposition, the next best thing would be a safer, more environmentally-friendly airport with significantly fewer flights. This would entail four major components:
   a) NO FLIGHT SCHOOLS
   b) NO JETS
   c) NO USE OF LEADED AVGAS
   d) SAFETY BARRIERS AT BOTH ENDS OF THE RUNWAY

3. BUSINESS AS USUAL IS NOT AN OPTION: In light of the expiring 2015 lease agreements, the Mar Vista community is willing to remain patient and see the visioning process through while standing side-by-side with our Santa Monica neighbors. If, however, the FAA again prevails and the end result is the status quo, we would like to suggest several measures that would ultimately help to protect our own health, safety, and way of life. The immediate purpose of these efforts would be to give the City of
Santa Monica added ammunition in its legal battle with the federal government, and might include:
   a) Working with the LA City Attorney’s office to legally reclaim the parcels of Los Angeles-owned land that lie within the current boundaries of SMO and could impact the runway alignment.
   b) Pursuing legal action under the Clean Air Act for lead poisoning of nearby residents, including all children at Mar Vista and Richland Avenue elementary schools, seeking either punitive damages or closure of the airport.
   c) Forming a class action lawsuit on behalf of all homes within a half-mile radius of the airport seeking either $40k per home for upgrades to windows, doors, and air-filtration systems, or closure of the airport. (Similar programs have already been completed at all other LA area airports and many airports around the country).

In summary, the Mar Vista community can no longer tolerate the relentless noise, pollution, and safety risks posed by SMO. As the majority of Santa Monica residents and our neighbors in Venice will echo, we’re ready for a change. The evolution of aviation has made this airport’s tiny footprint of land unsafe and obsolete. Please include our concerns and goals in the airport visioning process so that we may bring an end to this blight on our community.
Written Comment #2

Dear Ms Cline:

I am an aviation consultant who used to live in the area where Santa Monica Airport is located. In the 1970s I rented aircraft at the airport, and was involved in some community consultations at the airport.

The City of Santa Monica has requested citizen input for the future of the airport. I feel that I understand the issues of the airport and that I can be objective. I no longer live in the area, and can be unbiased.

I was involved with the El Toro International Airport program and presentations - and I learned a volume of information about airport operation and community impacts.

The greatest hindrance at Santa Monica is the flow of objection from a minority of residents who constantly complain. The proponents dismiss these complaints as being NIMBY complaints but that won't stop the complaints. I must say that it is hard to distinguish a valid objection through the noise of overall objections, and I suspect that the volume and number of valid objections to the airport continuing is small.

At El Toro I learned that airports are friendly neighbors after all, and while they generate some noise, and some emissions, the noise and emissions are minuscule when compared to the alternative usage of the area should the airport be closed and the land redeveloped.

It seems that the NIMBYs assume that the land would become a park - a use with no traffic, few people, and no emissions. This won't happen because developer demand for land is too strong. If it is not an airport, then it will likely become a dense multi-use complex of homes, apartments, shopping malls and theaters, all traffic generators and all emission producers to some extent.

I learned at El Toro when the noise study was conducted by Maestre Graves that while cars go in and out of airports, the traffic volume volume is tiny when compared to a development alternative. The El Toro traffic study, for instance, indicated that a typical development assumes ten vehicular trips per day, per residence. When I queried that, I was told this is a conservative (low) number, and that when every vehicle (postal service, FedEx, meter readers, delivery people, folks going to and from work, shopping and entertainment), that every residence accrues more than ten VTPD (vehicular trips per day). The air quality report at El Toro showed that the emissions produced by aircraft are actually very low, that even at busy periods they generate fewer than thirty movements per hour, and the air quality is excellent from airport use because most of
the emissions produced are spread over a wide area and are relatively infrequent (especially when compared to alternate uses like diesel trucks etc).

Should Santa Monica Airport be closed as an airport and redeveloped, the traffic increase on suburban streets will be massive, and will lead to great increases in street traffic, vehicular emissions, and noise emissions. While locals presently complain about occasional aircraft noise, the El Toro studies made it clear that noise levels (especially from the dense multi-use that would be expected in the Santa Monica redevelopment) would be much greater as a mixed use development than from the existing airport use.

Presently, Santa Monica tries to make the airport as inhospitable as possible by charging landing fees and noise fees. The city council has been clear in trying to dissuade pilots from using Santa Monica Airport, and penalizes and charges them if they do. On the other hand, I have read recently that the airport is running at a negative, so what is the answer.

I propose to you and to the City Council that you do what any suffering business does - grow out of the problem. Make the airport more user friendly, and encourage pilots to come to the area. Occupants of aircraft are great for the local economy. They rent cars, use hotel rooms, support local restaurants, and often buy retail items locally. In other words, aircraft occupants are great for the local economy, and I propose that the landing and noise fees (stated in the media to be less than 10\% of total revenue) be removed and that the airport make strides to welcome light air traffic so as to build the local economy. Local business would spring up on the airport perimeter as a result, strengthening the local economy and building the local tax base.

Clearly, something must be done. Clearly, if the site is closed as an airport it is not going to become a park with flowers growing through the old runway. Instead, it will be aggressively, and densely, redeveloped with mixed use development with the consequent traffic, noise and air impacts. Playa Del Rey is an example - it had zero traffic as the old Hughes Airport, and look it now! The best remedy is to go in the other direction by building the airport business, making pilots welcome, and bringing their passengers spending to Santa Monica merchants.
2015 represents an opportunity for the City of Santa Monica to demonstrate visionary leadership for our community and the nation. I envision a SUSTAINABLE Golden Gate Park-type CULTURAL COMMUNITY SPACE with easy foot/bike access, and such features as a large bike loop, state of the art playground, innovative sidewalk cafes, art galleries, performance venues, possibly a movie theater, meeting spaces open for community use, organic Farmer’s Market perhaps more than once a week, etc. Everything would be as sustainable as possible- including the buildings and way that parking was structured. There should be no regular vehicular access beyond the entry parking point, so that pedestrian health and safety are maximized.
Written Comment #4

I am a homeowner of two residences on Palm Blvd, Venice Beach. Unfortunately, we live just below the Santa Monica Airport and I understand that the residents of Santa Monica do not want the airplanes they own and store at this airport to fly over the city; but rather, have planes redirected in a Southern flight pattern, that brings the planes directly over Venice. That is not right! I have owned my home for 10 years. The noise is getting worse.

I get awakened in the morning by the planes going overhead. Especially the Bi-planes. That causes the dog two doors down to start to bark and I start my day...noise pollution and dogs barking. Lincoln traffic. Honestly if I had known that Santa Monicans were going to pay off some Politician to direct their air traffic over my home, I would have never bought here. And I am planning to leave. Just going to be more careful about where I choose to live.

I know we can’t stop flying; I just don’t want to live under the low flying noisy planes anymore. But I wonder who will want to buy my house with so much noise? I believe it has decreased the value of my home. And now, every once in awhile, I see a large JET flying, so close. I took a photo of it.

In fact a few minutes before I began to type this out. I had to tell someone I was on the phone with to hold, as I could not hear them on the phone. A loud plane was taking off, I had to end the phone conversation, because it seems a plane is taking off every two to three minutes or so. And I cannot hear. I think I am going deaf from all the noise. Sometimes I wish I was. I am opposed to having any Airport so close to a heavily populated area such as where the airport is located. We have apparently been allowed to grow around this airport. It seems that a city, like Santa Monica, who bans smoking cigarettes anywhere in the City would also be concerned about themselves and their neighbors, breathing air pollutants caused by planes. And it seems that the City of Santa Monica could use the money for something that would actually make some money. I understand that the Airport is running at a deficit.

This is prime property, on a hill. With a view! Thank you.
Appendix C

Community Discussion Group Wallgraphics

During each community discussion group, facilitators used wallgraphics (a unique, visual representation of the discussion points) to highlight participants’ thoughts and opinions regarding airport operations. The wallgraphics from each community discussion group have been compiled in this appendix.
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Santa Monica Airport Community Discussion Groups

Key Issues:

- Airport's long-term development
- Community's role in airport planning
- Economic impact of airport

Community Visioning Process:

- Stakeholder engagement
- Feedback collection
- Decision-making process

Proposed Actions:

- Enhance community involvement
- Improve airport aesthetics
- Address noise and traffic concerns

Discussion:

- Need for a comprehensive approach
- Importance of long-term sustainability
- Challenges in balancing interests
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**KEY ISSUES**

- CITY HAS NOT DONE ANYTHING TO HELP THE AIRPORT.
- AIRPORT SUPPORTS 것은 돈
don't
- LACK OF CLARITY RE: LICENSES
- NEED: REQUIRE CITY TO OP. AIRPORT.
- CITY IS LEGALLY OBLIGATED TO OP. AIRPORT.
- NEED FFL RE: NON RESIDENT USERS.
- BETTER CONS. ARE NEEDED.
- WE'VE HAD A LOT OF MIS INFORMATION.
- DON'T WANT: REPEATED AGREEMENT NOW.
- IMPROVE INTERNAL CIRCULATION.
- IMPROVE NAME AMOUNT PROCEDURES.

**POT. UPGRADES**

- UPGRADE FUEL TECHNOLOGY
- SETtle LEGISLATIVE CHANGE @ STATE LEVEL
- ELIMINATE LOW LEVEL FUEL
- ADJUST FLYING SCHOOL PATTERNS
- CONSIDER PROGRAM TO ENC. TECH CHANGES
- CONSIDER MID FIELD RUN UP USE OF APIU
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