

**C**oncerned  
**R**esidents  
**A**gainst  
**A**irport  
**P**ollution

# C.R.A.A.P. REPORT

*By Martin Rubin (Founder/Director of Concerned Residents Against Airport Pollution)  
And Joan Winters, contributing writer.*

**SEEDS OF CHANGE HAVE BEEN PLANTED:  
ENVIRONMENTALISTS GET THEIR ONE-TWO-PUNCH ELECTED!!**

**CONGRATULATIONS to MAYOR-ELECT ANTONIO VILLARAIGOSA!**

**CONGRATULATIONS to OUR NEW COUNCILMAN-ELECT BILL ROSENDAHL!**  
Pictured below, he acknowledges victory at his election-night party in Venice.

### In This Issue

- 1.** May 17 LA City Election Results.
- 2.** May 23 SM Airport Commission meeting and Environmental Workshop.
- 3.** Two new permanent noise monitors coming soon.



Photo by Marty Rubin

**Concerned Residents  
Against  
Airport Pollution**

**Martin Rubin – Director  
P.O.Box 643033  
Los Angeles, CA 90064**

Donations sent to the above address are not tax deductible.

Make checks payable to:  
Martin Rubin

Thank you.

[jetairpollution@earthlink.net](mailto:jetairpollution@earthlink.net)

[www.jetairpollution.com](http://www.jetairpollution.com)

(310) 479-2529

[Click here for more details about how communities and precincts voted along with a color coded map, plus: A thank-you message from Bill Rosendahl!](#)

## 2. May 23, 2005 Santa Monica Airport Commission meeting and Environmental Workshop:

This meeting had a fairly good turnout. Those attending were interested in both the Environmental Workshop and the Santa Monica College Bundy Campus update. As with workshops in the past, there were lengthy reports at the start, much of the material dealt with how Commercial Airports are regulated by various governmental agencies. General Aviation Airports like Santa Monica Airport (SMO) are overlooked by these regulations. We who are impacted by SMO operations are interested in what we can do to address our environmental injustices, and we do not want or need to listen to lengthy and tedious reports that are not relevant and not helpful. It is also frustrating and upsetting to listen to reports that are obviously biased as experts paid by Santa Monica spin their reports away from reality as we residents experience it. When **Dr. Paul Roberts** repeatedly points to Bundy Drive traffic and a gas station located across the street from the runway as potentially significant sources of pollution and avoids calling attention to the emissions from the idling jets, it is very disturbing to those of us who experience the pollution from the idling jets on an ongoing basis. As **Tom Parsons**, Atmospheric Measurements Manager, SCAQMD said, the human nose is much better at smelling odors than any scientific measuring device.

It is interesting to hear how the efforts to address air quality concerns have advanced and who is given credit. For over ten years I continue to, at every SM Airport Commission meeting, make references to air pollution from jet operations at the airport. Jet operations numbered about 4,000 a year when I got involved and now they are over 18,000. This was the third Environmental Workshop, somewhat better than last years, which was somewhat better than the first, but they have come about only from the **persistent pressure put on the SM Airport Commission from community activists** like myself. Make no mistake about it; the City of Santa Monica would prefer that this matter stay hidden under the rug, but as with any pile of dirt that is continuously swept under a rug, eventually as the pile gets too large to hide it will expose itself. We are asking that the City of Santa Monica live up to its reputation as an environmentally “green” city and make this a priority issue. Those members of the Santa Monica City Council who have weighed in on the issues regarding this airport have all said that they were in favor of addressing air quality, safety and noise concerns. From a Friends of Sunset Park candidate survey (two elections ago), **Bob Holbrook** wrote, “I want to get the jets out of our airport. I am not opposed to a community airport for recreational small planes, flight schools, etc. If the jets remain, I think the public will pressure the City Council to do everything possible to remove the entire airport. My goal is to return Sunset Park and Ocean Park to peaceful quiet neighborhoods, not ravaged by noise, fumes, and engine blasts.”, and “The quality of life of residents is my priority and should be the city’s priority. People first, ALWAYS!” For that same survey, **Kevin McKeown** wrote, “We are David to the Federal Aviation Administration’s Goliath, but that should just spur us to invent better slingshots. There can be no compromise of resident interests from the City’s point of view. We continue to do battle with a federal bureaucracy which is self-perpetuatingly dedicated to seeing aviation as a function of Almighty Commerce. I stand on the side of resident quality of life.” And also from the same survey, now **Santa Monica Mayor Pam O’Conner** wrote, “As I’ve done throughout my term on the City Council, I’ve supported our residents and City as we work to limit the noise and increase safety and security. I’ve also supported candidates to the Airport Commission who have a strong commitment to the residents.” In the last Santa Monica City Council election we get the following answers to a Friends of Sunset Park questionnaire. From **Herb Katz**, “First, the City Council should enact stricter Airport noise ordinance that would have the pragmatic effect of inhibiting use of the Airport by C and D class aircraft. We also need to establish a committee that will research our most effective approaches to the air pollution concerns. And we should make clear that commercial air passenger service should not be allowed at S.M. Airport” From **Bobby Shriver**, “Yes. We know from other studies how loud noise affects people, but we need to know exactly how much our airport’s noise affects its neighbors. To study the effect of jet fumes, I will request the FAA to bring in the federal Environmental Protection Agency to measure levels of jet fumes in the surrounding neighborhoods, and in the area of airport land where new soccer fields are planned. I understand these fields will be the smaller ones used by younger players, whose lungs are more vulnerable to air pollution. If the EPA concluded the airport is endangering people’s health, the FAA would be much more receptive to amending its 1984 agreement with the city to restrict or ban the heavily polluting jets from using the airport.” **Richard Bloom**, “I have been resolute on this issue since I became active in Sunset Park: I will do whatever it takes to reduce and eliminate the impact of jet traffic at Santa Monica airport.” **Ken Genser**, “Future use of the airport parcel must be the product of a meaningful public discussion. I am very, very unlikely to support continued operation of the airport beyond 2015 unless we are able to ban jet traffic.”

**Concerned Residents Against Airport Pollution** held a Candidates Forum and submitted a questionnaire for the last Santa Monica City Council election. Here are a few responses: **Bobby Shriver**, “Any city that operates a facility potentially harming

people's health is morally and ethically responsible—regardless of geographical boundaries—to investigate the extent of the damage and mitigate it if necessary. Because the airport is part of the federal transportation system, the City should call for the FAA to ask the Environmental Protection Agency to measure the pollution in the air around the airport and determine any danger to people's health. (Special attention should go to the air quality in the area on airport land where soccer fields are proposed. I'm told these are to be the smaller fields for younger players, whose lungs are even more vulnerable to pollutants.) The EPA can then report its findings to the FAA and recommend steps it needs to mandate to reduce the pollution." **Richard Bloom**, "Santa Monica understands that we are part of a region and that we all need to be good neighbors." "I support ongoing discussions regarding airport issues, including concerns of airport neighbors in Santa Monica and Los Angeles." **Herb Katz**, "The airport needs to be a healthy, sound, sensitive neighbor and must co-exist properly."

These statements show that the Santa Monica City Council has a strong desire to correct the situation that now exists, and again I would urge that this matter be made a priority issue. Santa Monica will now have the opportunity to work with newly elected Los Angeles City Councilman, **Bill Rosendahl**, on a regional plan to address SMO impacts on the nearby communities.

Getting back to the Environmental Workshops; this third one had a new format that was an improvement. Question cards were handed out to be filled out with a question, and request an answer from a specific person by circling their name. It is interesting that the card title, **2005 SMAC Air Quality Workshop**, actually used the words "Air Quality" for the first time. The questions were read at the appropriate time by the Airport Manager. However, the way the workshops are conducted assure minimum public involvement. The hour that they are held, along with the length, tediousness, and irrelevance of much that is presented for the public's information, has the public leaving early and not eager to come back again another time. And yet we keep hearing from airport staff, how neighborly the airport is. I beg to differ. What we need is a full and complete Environmental Workshop. It should have a format that the public approves of, and it should be held at a convenient time and place. It might even offer child care so mothers and fathers of young children could participate more easily. That would be neighborly. It should focus on Santa Monica Airport's issues, and it should include back-and-forth question-and-comment sessions.

**Tom Parsons**, of the SCAQMD, reported on the planning progress of the General Aviation Air Quality Study. I have to disagree with Mr. Parsons for crediting Santa Monica Airport Staff with pursuing this study. The one thing that I give credit to the City of Santa Monica for doing, is requesting that this study also include other general aviation airports. Hence, six months of monitoring that might have focused on Santa Monica Airport will instead be done at Van Nuys Airport. In my opinion, the real credit for this study goes to our **53<sup>rd</sup> District California State Assemblyman, Mike Gordon**, who expedited this study, through **Los Angeles City Councilwoman Jan Perry**, Chair of the SCAQMD Governing Board, in addition, I give credit to the Santa Monica Task Force on the Environment for encouraging the City of Santa Monica to pursue studying the air quality around the airport, especially at the proposed new "Airport Park" area. To read the minutes of the General Aviation Air Quality Study Advisory Planning Committee meetings, and to see the tentative monitoring schedule along with proposed monitoring sights and other information, [Click Here](#).

After the workshop concluded, about 10:30 p.m., the regular Commission meeting began. At the beginning of the meeting, during the Approval of Minutes item, I brought up that I did not receive a response to my request for written answers to the questions that I submitted at the previous month's Noise Workshop, and I also reminded the Commission, later, during Public Comment, that public access to the meeting's audio recordings should be made easily available. Otherwise, I told them, I would, if necessary, take legal steps to obtain them.

The discussion of the proposed Santa Monica College Bundy Campus, the other item that members of the public came to this meeting to hear about and make comments on, started quite late and the Commission had to twice extend the meeting to allow for time. It was a good update, in my opinion. A representative from Santa Monica College basically said that without access to Airport Avenue, there would be no Bundy Campus.

The date of the next Santa Monica Airport Commission meeting is Monday, June 27, 2005, 7:30 p.m.

**3. Two new permanent noise monitors coming soon.**

I would like to thank, **Matthew Majoli, Santa Monica Airport Operations & Noise Manager**, for keeping me informed about the new noise monitors. They will not be used to measure noise violations or to implement fines as he mentions in his letter to me. In the 1984 “Santa Monica Airport Agreement” it is stipulated that the two monitors already in use at that time, would be used to determine noise readings. To read his full letter and to see monitor pictures and renderings on our website [Click Here](#).

