

From: JOHN MCKIBBEN
To: [Ken Mason](#)
Subject: Item 17007AC on Tomorrow's Airport Advisory Commission Meeting Agenda
Date: Wednesday, March 15, 2017 4:29:16 PM

Hello, Mr. Mason. After our conversation last week, I was unable to figure out how to email the Airport Advisory Commission Members about Item 17-007AC on tomorrow's meeting agenda. As I said on the telephone, I wanted to make my views on the FIS matter known to the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

I still hope to attend the meeting, but I have a conflict that may prevent my remaining more than an hour or so.

Would it be possible for you to relay to the Commissioners the following information?

- The proposal to construct a Federal Inspection Station that would facilitate international flights into Long Beach has been thoroughly vetted over more than two years. No new information has been made available that would change anyone's mind. There is no need, whatsoever, bring it back before the City Council.
- As I understand it, the Airport Advisory Commission chose not to make a recommendation to the City Council prior to the proposal appearing on the Council's agenda. This new recommendation seems merely to be a desperate attempt by FIS backers to take a second bite of the apple. I believe that this is yet another attempt to, not just get approval for FIS, but to also increase pressure on the Council to modify or ultimately scrap the noise ordinance. Adding international flights would add more and more pressure to do so. Really, to think otherwise, would be naïve.
- The City Council sent a very clear message to FIS advocates in its 8 – 1 vote in January.
- As you might guess, I live near the flight path, in my case, the Cal Heights neighborhood in the 7th District. We live with a lot of flights, but currently, it is bearable. However, I don't like to think what would happen to the quality of life in large portions of Long Beach were the noise ordinance done away with or significantly modified. I also don't like to think about what would happen to the real estate values in those portions of Long Beach, either. I strongly believe that these steps would significantly lead to the decline of the much of the city, and not just those areas under or adjacent to the flight path.
- I think the Commissioners who are dredging up this matter need to look around at major airports to see the impact of heavy air traffic on surrounding communities. It's instructive. Inglewood is but one example. I think if one were to ask any resident of Inglewood and nearby residential areas, one would get a very clear – and probably loud – answer.
- I strongly urge the Commissioners to reject the recommendation in Agenda Item 17-007AC

Thank you, Mr. Mason, for forwarding this information to the Commissioners.

John McKibben
((562) 492-6947

John McKibben
3726 Rose Ave.
Long Beach, CA 90807
jmckibben@verizon.net

March 16, 2017

Long Beach Airport Advisory Commission
c/o 4100 E. Donald Douglas Dr., Floor 2
Long Beach, CA 90808
Attn: Ken Mason

Via e-mail

Dear Chairperson Sherman and Commission Members:

Agenda Item 17-007AC of the Meeting of March 16, 2017
Recommendation to the City Council re: Federal Inspection Station
OPPOSE

As a resident of Long Beach and a father and grandfather of five other residents, I strongly urge you to vote "no" on the recommendation in Agenda Item 17-007AC. The proposal to construct a Federal Inspection Station at the Long Beach Airport is yet another step to add additional pressure on the City Council to greatly modify or even repeal the City's current noise ordinance. The proposed recommendation is not in the best interests of the many residents of the city who live near the airport and near the aircraft flight paths, nor is it in the overall best interests of residents and business owners throughout Long Beach.

As you are certainly aware, the City Council already has made very clear its views on the subject in their 8 – 1 vote against the proposal. Prior to that January 24 Council meeting, the proposal was thoroughly vetted over more than two years during which many residents and business owners, as well as the outside interests that most desire the facility, have weighed in on the matter, repeatedly, at many meetings and public hearings, including at the City Council itself. Since that City Council meeting, no new information has been made available that would change anyone's mind. There is no need, whatsoever, to bring the matter back before the City Council.

Although I am aware that, were the Council even to reverse its vote based on your recommendation, this would not mean immediate elimination of our city's airport noise ordinance and current restriction on the number of commercial flights coming out of Long Beach, it should be completely obvious to everyone that this is only a first step in a long-term strategy -- an ongoing effort -- to eventually repeal or gut the city's noise ordinance. Once the FIS facility is in place, the commercial interests behind this

March 16, 2017

Page 2

effort will continue to increase pressure on the City Council to add more and more flights into Long Beach Airport. To think otherwise would be terribly naïve. I beg you to stop that effort now.

The City's recent study shows that establishing an FIS and opening the airport to international flights has relatively little economic benefit to Long Beach. However, it should be obvious that, with more and more flights into Long Beach, over time, the decline in value in currently moderate and up-scale residential areas will most certainly more than offset whatever benefit international operations would bring to the City due to reduced city revenue from the property tax.

Not too far from Long Beach we have a good example of what I'm talking about: In Inglewood, as LAX grew, the residential and commercial areas of that city and surrounding areas declined. Property values in Inglewood, compared to areas not impacted by the airport, became, and remain, significantly lower. If you were to ask the residents of Inglewood – or residents who live near any commercial airport -- how they like living under the flight path, I think you would probably get a very clear, and probably very loud, answer. I don't believe that you would want to see the same thing occurring here in a large part of Long Beach.

And keep in mind that Inglewood is only under the landing flight path. In Long Beach, we have fine residential neighborhoods and commercial areas on both the landing path and the take-off path. If flights were greatly increased, as I believe they eventually would be, large swaths of Long Beach would decline. The quality of life in large areas of the city would be affected very significantly, and not in a good way. If you must look at it from only an economic standpoint, the overall revenue to the city, I believe, would decline. Such a decline also is accompanied by an increase in crime and other problems of urban blight that would eat up city revenues.

I don't mean to make this sound like a Doomsday prediction, but again, it is naïve to think that this proposal is not part of a long-term strategy, for it clearly is, and the final step would not be good for the people of Long Beach, regardless of where they live.

Once again, I urge you to consider both the well-being of residents and businesses in the affected areas of the city and the long-term well-being of the city as a whole. Please do not lend your support to this proposal based on the short-term gain of a few, largely out-of-town-based businesses. Please reject this misguided proposal.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

John McKibben
Resident of the Seventh District