

**MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
REGIONAL AIRPORT AUTHORITY**

March 8, 2007, 2:00 p.m.
MTA Headquarters
Board Room, 3rd Floor
1, Plaza Drive
Los Angeles, CA 91765

I. ROLL CALL

Board Chair Bill Rosendahl called the meeting to order and began roll call.

PRESENT: Board Members Paul Glaab for Alan Wapner, Gary Ovitt, Don Knabe

ABSENT: Board Member Bob Buster

II. ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR MARCH 8, 2007

No announcements.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Presentation for approval - Minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 11, 2007.

APPROVED AS CORRECTED

Moved by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Seconded by: Board Member Knabe

Ayes: Board Members Ovitt, Knabe and Glaab

Nays: None

Discussion: None

IV. FINANCIAL REPORT

Presentation of Financial Report – Same as the last regular meeting of January 11, 2007.

**V. BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS
DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTIONS**

a. Review and approve the process for staffing SCRAA

Staff member Herb Glasgow presented Board Item (a) and stated that the language will need to be modified per the legal counsel.

RECOMMENDATION: *Approve, with legal counsel's language change, to authorize staff to begin search for two interim staff members for an Administrative role and a Visionary Role.*

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED AS AMMENDED

Moved by: Board Member Glaab
Seconded by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Ayes: Board Members Gladd, Knabe, Ovitt and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: Board Member Knabe asked who was going to handle the search and whether it had already been discussed.

Staff member Glasgow responded that the county would handle the search and this approval would initiate that discussion.

Board Chair Rosendahl feels that it is inevitable to hold the discussion of hiring and the job should be separated into two jobs. This action would allow for the process to be initiated and for staff to come back to the board with recommendation or job description.

Board Member Knabe sees no problem with moving forward with it and the new position with a job description, but would like to see how they compliment each other and not overlap especially with SCAG's role.

Board Vice Chair Ovitt asked what was the timeline, (months?), before there is a real candidate.

Staff member Glasgow responded that possibly sixty days and that he is hopeful that staff could bring back something to the next board meeting.

Board Vice Chair Ovitt asked what happens after sixty days, recruitment, six months for the total process?

Staff member Barbara Martinoff responded that it would take four to six months and proposed to hire an interim and after about a year maybe go on to a more thorough selection for a permanent position.

b. Review and consideration of funding issues

Staff member Glasgow presented Board Item (b) into three different actions: 1) Approval to refund LAWA money already spent on SCRAA meetings; 2) Approval to pay future expenditures for SCRAA meetings; and 3) Approval to designate a staff person with authority to pay invoices up to \$1500.00.

RECOMMENDATION: *Approve to refund LAWA money already spent on SCRAA meetings.*

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED

Moved by: Board Member Knabe
Seconded by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Ayes: Board Members Knabe, Ovitt, Glaab and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: Board Member Knabe requested a breakdown of the expenditures.

RECOMMENDATION: *Approve to pay future expenditures for SCRAA meetings up to \$1500.00 per meeting.*

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED

Moved by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt
Seconded by: Board Member Knabe

Ayes: Board Members Knabe, Ovitt, Glaab and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: None

RECOMMENDATION: *Approve to designate a staff person with authority to pay invoices on behalf of SCRAA by working with the Los Angeles County Controller's Office.*

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED

Moved by: Board Member Knabe
Seconded by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Ayes: Board Members Knabe, Ovitt, Glaab and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: Board Members approved that for purposes of flexibility, either Barbara Martinoff or Herb Glasgow be those designated staff.

c. Review and consideration of establishing a website

Staff member Glasgow presented Board Item (c) to approve the establishing of a SCRAA website and pay for operational support of the website.

RECOMMENDATION: *Approve to establish a SCRAA website and pay for operational support with a refund to LAWA for the establishment of \$1000.00.*

RECOMMENDATION APPROVED

Moved by: Board Member Knabe
Seconded by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Ayes: Board Members Knabe, Ovitt, Glaab and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: None

d. Motions

Motion made by Board Member Knabe to direct staff to revise the JPA with the recommendation of deleting the powers already recommended for deletion.

MOTION: *Staff to revise the JPA with recommendations and comments made.*

MOTION APPROVED

Moved by: Board Member Knabe
Seconded by: Board Vice Chair Ovitt

Ayes: Board Members Knabe, Ovitt, Glaab and Rosendahl

Nays: None

Discussion: None

**VI. JOINT POWER AGREEMENT
STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS**

a. Power Point Presentation

Staff member Barbara Martinoff summarized that at the last board meeting, board members instructed interim staff, the interim staff made up of staff from each of the board members, to work on the staff memorandum for the Joint Power Agreement and review and incorporate the comments received.

Comments received included ten letters from different communities and twelve oral comments from the community workshop. One comment that kept coming up was the issue of a Vision Statement. Comments received questioned why there was no Vision Statement. At the staff level, it was discussed and decided that the logistics should be done first and then move on to a Vision Statement. It was clarified that the presentation did not include any discussion on Vision Statement but it did include Purpose and its definition and it delineated SCRAA Powers, deleting those that caused the most controversy.

Staff member Martinoff went on to present the staff memorandum on the Joint Power Agreement.

Board Member Comments/Questions during the Power Point Presentation

Chair Rosendahl asked if the recommendation made on the deletion of powers had come from the public.

Staff member Martinoff answered that it did. Letters received from SCAG and other jurisdictions expressed concern on SCRAA's ability to run and operate an airport.

Board Vice Chair Ovitt asked whether board members would serve on the committees as well as the board or executive committee for the new option one or otherwise called the U.N. model.

Staff member Martinoff responded that it would be up to the board to decide.

Chair Rosendahl expressed his desire and hope that all the options were derived from the public comments received.

Staff member Martinoff responded that it did.

Board member Knabe asked what was the amendment process.

Los Angeles City Attorney, Bill Waterhouse, offered clarification on the process to amend the JPA. 1) Board would direct staff to come up with a recommended JPA. 2) Board members would send the recommended JPA back to their respective appointing body for approval. 3) The appointing body would take action and decide whether to accept it or not. The vote must be unanimous from all in order to amend. 4) Document would become effective once everyone, all the appointing bodies, have signed it.

Chair Rosendahl asked clarification since in his case he was appointed by the Mayor of Los Angeles and approved by the City Council.

City Attorney Waterhouse responded that he would have to get approval from the governing body.

Chair Rosendahl thanked the staff for all their work and opened the meeting for public comment.

Board Member Comments after Public Comment

Chair Rosendahl asked staff to make a recommendation on how to proceed.

Staff member Martinoff recommended that the board either take action, delay taking action or discuss the options, but ultimately, it was up to the board members.

Board Member Knabe responded that the information was out too late and the public has not had a chance to review. He wants public to review. The issue of an MOU versus a JPA is not included to take action and he feels that a JPA is the way to go particularly since the statements of concern have been taken out, but would like to take action on items on page five regarding actions for deletion. He feels that it would be a starting point since there are a lot of other things that they can deal with.

Board Member Ovitt agreed with Board Member Knabe's suggestions and feels that the recommendation makes sense for deletion. It gives the new direction of SCRAA to promote/market/lobby on everyone's behalf. On option two, he stated that nobody mentioned that San Bernardino would have four votes.

Board Member Glaab agreed that deleting the items is consistent with SCAG's recommendations.

Chair Rosendahl asked the city attorney to clarify the procedure if they were to move on that item.

City Attorney Waterhouse stated that the board would need to direct staff to prepare a revised JPA with the new changes and it is up to the Board on how to proceed, whether to prepare a whole new JPA or piece by piece. If done piece by piece, each piece would need to be approved by governing body of each member. With respect of removing items from the JPA, the board cannot take action since the only ones with that power are the governing bodies of each member, but they can make recommendations.

Board Member Knabe stated that they could make recommendation for the deletion of the items and that it would be more appropriate to wait until all the changes have been made to make a single recommendation instead of doing it piece by piece.

Board Member Glabb commented that there is overlap and redundancy on SCAG's role and requested from staff to address it in the future discussions.

Chair Rosendahl responded by asking SCAG to join and be part of the working group.

Board Member Knabe stated that SCAG as a planning body, and SCRAA as an implementer, should work together with staff.

Chair Rosendahl concurred and directed all to work together and iron out SCAG's role and redundancy. He invited that all that spoke should work together with the staff.

Board Member Knabe stated that if there is a need for flexibility and move meeting dates to iron out the document, they would. He wants all to work together.

Chair Rosendahl feels that all eight counties and all cities be part of the working group to work together before the next meeting. He feels that it is a success to delete what makes others uncomfortable.

Staff member Martinoff asked clarification on direction been given staff as to working together with all individual entities that spoke and draft out a Vision Statement in conjunction with everyone before the next meeting.

Board Member Knabe emphasized that all should talk to each other and work out the details and not just the Vision Statement and draft something that all agree with.

Board Member Glaab stated that a Vision Statement should be forthcoming especially after the discussion made on redundancy.

Chair Rosendahl asked for discussion on any new business.

Board Member Ovitt responded that Riverside should be encouraged to come to the meetings.

Board Member Glaab thanked Orange County for attending and participating and hopes that they become members.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Todd McNamee, Ventura County – Director of Airports, stated that Supervisor John Flint had left early but he wanted to update the board that they did take this issue up to their Board of Supervisors and they decided that Supervisor Flint would be the appointed member to work on the re-constitution of SCRAA on behalf of the County of Ventura. Once SCRAA has come up with a new document, they will once again take the matter to their Board of Supervisors for them to decide whether they will join SCRAA or not, but they are looking to join.

Board Member Knabe responded that he thought it was great that they want to participate.

Mario Mainero, Orange County - Chief of Staff for Supervisor Moorlach, who is designee from Orange County on discussions with SCRAA, stated that the Supervisor apologizes for not attending but the County is being represented by the Director of John Wayne Airport, Alan Murphy, and the Deputy Director Courtney Wiercoch and himself. He was pleased to have had a meeting with SCRAA staff today and pleased with the direction the comments were going and that staff is working with them on the details. The County of Orange did not submit formal comments because they wanted to wait until the meeting had taken place with SCRAA staff. They are planning to submit comments and would like to outline their ideas in order to feel comfortable to participate. They hope that their comments are included in the next draft and that the document is circulated well in advance of the next meeting.

1. They recommend an MOU instead of a JPA. They feel that an MOU is more consistent with the recommended changes to the JPA since it will no longer have powers. He feels that changing it to an MOU would add credibility.
2. They are not prepared to make comments today on the new proposals, but whatever is chosen should be based on logic/consistency to that vision: respectful to local communities, airports traffic is not about getting airplanes off the ground is about getting people out there. A purpose should be set first.
3. Specifically, they concur with the deletion of powers. They feel that aviation growth, dispersion and local communities' desires should be defined and clarified. Global terms should be clarified/defined in the document such as Regional Dispersion/Marketing/Planning/Promoting.

Board Chair Rosendahl asked whether the proposed deletion of powers gives them the comfort level they need to participate

Mr. Mainero responded that it gives them some comfort but that it needs to be explicit. It must also include the affirmative statement.

4. They feel that members should not be allowed to lobby/promote/advertise the use of a particular airport, such as John Wayne Airport, in a way that would limit their operations or would be inconsistent with any current or future agreements made by that airport.
5. They support veto authority for various items, such as contracts, advocacy initiatives, grant applications, retention of consultants.
6. Feels that the roles of SCRAA/SCAG should be defined, there shouldn't be duplication of work in terms of planning functions.
7. They support the Affirmation of Independence but feels that LAWA shouldn't be SCRAA staff since its credibility may be compromised.
8. They are withholding comments on member dues except to say that SCRAA does have some of their money.
9. They support 60 to 90 day withdrawal notification.

More comments will follow in writing as they continue to meet with SCRAA staff in the future. The Supervisor will be back with him at the next meeting and they appreciate the opportunity to work with staff.

Board Chair Rosendahl answered that LAWA would be moved from SCRAA staff duties and asked if they had any gut reactions on the new options.

He felt that Los Angeles seemed to have more votes with representation from Los Angeles County and Los Angeles City, he feels that LAWA doesn't need to be represented.

Board Chair Rosendahl asked what he thought of the new U. N. model.

He responded that he would need time to look at it and analyze it.

Board Chair Rosendahl responded that the board wanted all to take this information back, analyze it and make comments. The board is not tied to the alternatives and wants the input from everyone.

He responded by saying that they were also not tied to SCRAA, and they are still not sure whether they are going to join.

Board Chair Rosendahl asked if they were pressed to answer right now, would they join.

He answered that they are thinking of joining but still not sure.

Board Member Knabe responded that Orange County is important and should be on their side of the table and shouldn't be skeptical about everything.

Board Chair Rosendahl concurred by saying that Orange County is critical to the region and it would hurt the organization and its purpose if they don't join. He feels they should join and he hopes that they do.

Chris Kunze, City of Long Beach – Councilwoman Rae Gabelich relinquished her turn to Mr. Kunze. He stated that the new proposal was not available before the meeting and therefore they didn't have a chance to review, but Option 2 includes some of the comments they have made. He feels that it does not address a redefined Mission Statement to include support of growth only if the airport desires it, the issue of an MOU versus a JPA, and that the Mission Statement should support noise compatibility ordinances, but he supports veto powers and respect to local agreements. He feels that the JPA/MOU should not be amended without a unanimous vote and he posed the question of SCAG/SCRAA roles. The city is supportive of the current intent of SCRAA to generate air transportation service and use at airports where growth is desired, however, without addressing the noted issues there wouldn't be a cohesive/unified effort due to lack of trust. He feels that the more inclusion the greater the effectiveness. He also stated that there is a lack of definition for the Purpose in terms of regionalization and feels that unless everything is spelled out clearly, most would be scared to participate.

Board Chair Rosendahl asked that he explain his comment on SCAG versus SCRAA.

Mr. Kunze responded that their roles need to be defined and that they should both be working together.

Rae Gabelich, City of Long Beach Councilmember – stated that she didn't have a chance to review the new proposal, but made the following observations: On page three for Purpose; all impacted cities need to be included and the respect for local ordinances such as the one for Long Beach should be included. On page five under Owning/Operating/Aircraft; it should say Airports not Aircrafts. On page six, the fifth bullet needs to say respect local ordinances. For the new option, she disagrees with the three standing committees. In option one, Long Beach only participates in a committee and they feel that they are not the same as the other local municipalities that are just impacted/interested. She feels that they have more at stake and should have a stronger role. On option two, page twenty, LAWA has a vote along with Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles and Long Beach only has one. Feels that all cities need to be protected and participation should be narrowed down. She supports an MOU format versus a JPA. She would like to hear the Board's perspective rather than just hear staff recommendations. She questions the membership amount of \$20K and higher since the organization is growing, it should need less money. She wants to know what the budget would look like and what will be used for. She emphasized the respect for local community agreements and ordinances. She recommends amending it so that the JPA states that the JPA nor any of its members should take any action/lobbying that is inconsistent with current/future operational agreements already established.

Bruce Boland, SDCRAA – stated that he is attending as an observer. SDCRAA's background includes four years in existence, it was established by State legislation and it does all the planning for all sixteen airports in the San Diego County. He recommended on the planning side that the purpose should be redefined and clearer; and on original structure that it should be more inclusive. He hopes to learn more about SCRAA and be invited to join.

Board Chair Rosendahl responded by asking him to be a part of the working groups. He stated that San Diego is also critical and that their leadership is critical to Southern California. He feels delighted to have them here and hopes that they become a stakeholder and join to help mould SCRAA.

Mr. Boland responded by clarifying that a measure to build an airport in Miramar was soundly defeated by the voters and that SDCRAA board is now looking to a long range horizon in integrating their airports in the area and they are certainly a player in the Southern California aviation region and they look forward to finding a place to work with SCRAA.

Charles Griffin, Newport Beach resident, stated that most of his adult life he served as an Aerospace Engineer and would like to discuss a little on the technical area and watershed changes occurring. He stated that California has passed a law, AB32, calling for the reduction of emissions of CO2 and the Supreme Court and the Senate are looking to limit emissions of CO2. All aircrafts carry Kerosene and he feels that legislation will limit CO2/Kerosene emissions and it will affect the aircrafts. He recommends the inclusion of the Orange Line Development Authority, which is a new organization that has not been mentioned yet. He stated that they were planning a MagLev system and that they should be included as well as CARB.

Arnold Sachs, resident, began by saying this was only his second meeting and that he had missed the first one. From the things he has heard, there needs to be a consensus on desired growth versus needed growth. He feels that nobody seems to want growth, yet right now there is needed growth. He thinks that some need to step up and assist with the public's needed demand. He also feels that setting restrictions before joining doesn't get the job done. He feels that if an organization wants to be part of the team, they should be part of the team and not set restrictions to join. Everyone needs to step up.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT