



---

# City Council Report

---

City Council Meeting: February 28, 2017  
Agenda Item: 8.C

To: Mayor and City Council  
From: Rick Cole, City Manager, City Manager's Office, Administration  
Subject: Resolution of the City Council of the City of Santa Monica Implementing the Consent Decree and Authorizing All Actions Necessary to Ensure the Closure of Santa Monica Airport Effective as of Midnight on December 31, 2028, and the Shortening of the Santa Monica Airport Runway Pending Closure

## Recommended Action

Staff recommends that the Council adopt the attached resolution adopting three measures to implement the February 1 Consent Decree with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the Federal Government regarding Santa Monica Airport (SMO):

1. The City Council directs the City Manager, City Attorney and their staffs to take all actions necessary and proper to ensure that SMO will cease to operate as an airport and shall be closed to all aeronautical use forever effective as of midnight on December 31, 2028.
2. The City Council directs the City Manager not to enter into any agreements with the FAA, or any other party, that may have the effect of requiring the City to continue to operate SMO after December 31, 2028.
3. The City Council directs the City Manager to ensure that the City provides 30-day prior notice to the FAA of the City's intent to initiate shortening of SMO's runway to an operational length of 3500 feet at the earliest feasible opportunity.

## Executive Summary

The recommended resolution reaffirms Council policy to close the Santa Monica Airport (SMO) as soon as legally permitted. It gives required notice to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) that the City will be shortening the runway to 3,500 feet at the earliest feasible opportunity, and will close SMO to aviation uses forever at midnight, December 31, 2028, under the terms of the recently adopted Consent Decree with the FAA and the Federal Government which was effective on February 1, 2017.

## Background

The passage of Measure Local Control (Measure LC) in November 2014 and the subsequent expiration of the City's 30-year agreement with the FAA to continue to operate SMO (as well as the disputed expiration of the 20-year Grant Assurances in

2015) have set the stage for the City of Santa Monica to definitively re-exert local control over 227 acres of land owned by the City for more than a century.

The City has vigorously disputed legal claims by the FAA and the Department of Justice that asserted that the grant assurances ran until 2023 and that the 1947 Instrument of Transfer ending the wartime lease with the Federal government required SMO to continue to be operated as an airport in perpetuity or be surrendered to the Federal government.

On August 23, 2015 the City Council selected “Reclaiming local control of Santa Monica Airport” as one of its five long-term Strategic Goals (Attachment A). That Goal anticipated exercising the power affirmed by Measure LC to replace the obsolete aviation uses at the physically-constrained site with a great public park encompassing public open spaces and recreational facilities along with compatible cultural, arts and education uses.

Over the subsequent year, the City took a number of legal and administrative actions to assert local control and minimize adverse health and safety impacts on the surrounding community. On August 23, 2016 the City Council adopted a resolution expressing the Council’s intention to close the Santa Monica Airport to aviation use, as soon as that is legally permitted, with a goal of June 30, 2018 and, authorizing the City Manager to initiate all administrative measures necessary to implement the resolution (Attachment B).

In January 2017 the City agreed to enter into a Consent Decree with the United States of America and the Federal Aviation Administration that resolved all outstanding disputes between the parties, and relinquished all claims by the U.S. and the FAA. The Consent Decree allows the City to close Santa Monica Airport to aviation uses forever after December 31, 2028; mandates that the operational Airport runway length be shortened from just under 5,000 feet to 3500 feet; and includes other terms governing the operations of the airport until its closure. The Consent Decree was agreed to by the Federal Government on January 27, 2017. The City Council gave its approval the

following day, on January 28. The Consent Decree was approved on February 1 by Judge John F. Walter of the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

### **Discussion**

City Council has previously enunciated its policy to close the airport as soon as legally permitted. The recent Consent Decree with the FAA and the Federal Government authorizes the City to close the airport to aviation uses after December 31, 2028. The purpose of this resolution is to reaffirm that commitment and under the terms of the Consent Decree to officially notify the FAA of the City's intention to close Santa Monica Airport to aviation uses forever at midnight on December 31, 2028, subject only to legal compliance with the Consent Decree. The resolution also precludes the City from the future use of Federal grants that would impose operating obligations on the airport.

The resolution affirms the Council's clear commitment not to take any actions which would create additional obligations or limits to the City's rights of local control, including accepting any Federal funds that would involve grant assurances. Finally, the resolution gives explicit direction to the City Manager to provide the required 30-day prior notice to the FAA of the City's determination to shorten the runway at the earliest feasible opportunity. The City is authorized under the Consent Decree to use Airport Funds to accomplish the shortening of the runway.

### **Financial Impacts and Budget Actions**

There is no immediate financial impact or budget action necessary as a result of the recommended action.

**Prepared By:** Christopher Smith, Assistant to the City Manager

**Approved**

---

**Forwarded to Council**

---

  
Rick Cole, City Manager 2/22/2017

**Attachments:**

- A. Staff Report on Council Strategic Goals Dated August 23, 2015
- B. Staff Report with Resolution Regarding Local Control and Closure of the Santa Monica Airport dated August 23, 2016
- C. Resolution
- D. Written Comments

RESOLUTION NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_ (CCS)

(City Council Series)

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA  
IMPLEMENTING THE CONSENT DECREE AND AUTHORIZING ALL ACTIONS  
NECESSARY TO ENSURE THE CLOSURE OF SANTA MONICA AIRPORT  
EFFECTIVE AS OF MIDNIGHT ON DECEMBER 31, 2028, AND THE SHORTENING  
OF THE SANTA MONICA AIRPORT RUNWAY PENDING CLOSURE

WHEREAS, on January 30, 2017, the United States of America, acting through the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and the city of Santa Monica (City) filed a Settlement Agreement/Consent Decree (Consent Decree) with the Federal District Court for the Central District of California in *City of Santa Monica v. United States of America, et al.*, Case No. 13-CV-8046-JFW (C.D. Cal.); and

WHEREAS, on February 1, 2017, the Court approved the Consent Decree and entered it as the judgment in *City of Santa Monica v. United States of America, et al.*, Case No. 13-CV-8046-JFW (C.D. Cal. Feb. 1, 2017); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of the Consent Decree, the City may, in its sole discretion at any time after December 31, 2028, cease to operate the Santa Monica Airport (SMO) as an airport and may close the Airport to all aeronautical use forever; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to the terms of the Consent Decree, the City has agreed to operate SMO with a runway of 3,500 feet until December 31, 2028, unless an earlier date is agreed to by the FAA and City; and

WHEREAS, initiation of the shortening of the Airport's runway to 3500 feet may commence upon 30-day prior notice to the FAA in accordance with 14 C.F.R. Part 157.5(b)(2); and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires that the City take all actions necessary to comply with the Consent Decree so that SMO will close effective as of midnight on December 31, 2028.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANTA MONICA DOES RESOLVE AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. The City Manager, City Attorney and their staffs, consistent with the terms of the Consent Decree, shall take all actions necessary and proper to ensure that SMO will cease to operate as an airport and shall be closed to all aeronautical use forever effective as of midnight on December 31, 2028.

SECTION 2. The City shall not enter into any future agreements with the U.S., FAA, or any other party, that may have the effect of requiring the City to continue to operate SMO after December 31, 2028.

SECTION 3. The City Council directs the City Manager to ensure that the City provides 30-day prior notice to the FAA in accordance with 14 C.F.R. Part 157.5(b)(2) of

the City's intent to initiate shortening of SMO's runway to an operational length of 3500 feet at the earliest feasible opportunity.

SECTION 4. The City Clerk shall certify to the adoption of this Resolution, and thenceforth and thereafter the same shall be in full force and effect.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JOSEPH LAWRENCE  
Interim City Attorney

## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** Council Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2017 11:09 AM  
**To:** Ted Winterer; Gleam Davis; Pam OConnor; Sue Himmelrich; Terry O'Day; Kevin McKeown Fwd; Tony Vazquez  
**Cc:** councilmtgitems  
**Subject:** FW: I support 8C to close SMO and shorten runway asap with the following changes

Council-

Please see the email below re: airport runway shortening.

Thanks,

Stephanie

---

**From:** Michael Brodsky [mailto:mbrodsky@lmu.edu]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2017 4:28 PM  
**To:** Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>  
**Cc:** Cynthia Rose <Cynthia.Rose@smspoke.org>; Rick Cole <Rick.Cole@SMGOV.NET>; Nelson Hernandez <Nelson.Hernandez@SMGOV.NET>  
**Subject:** I support 8C to close SMO and shorten runway asap with the following changes

Dear City Council,

I support item 8c on 2/28/2017 with the following changes:

1. Close the airport "...effective as of midnight on December 31, 2028 (**or earlier if legally possible or agreed upon with the FAA**)

3 (A). The shortening of the runway should occur asap and include the **REMOVAL of ALL tarmac no longer in use for the 3500' ACTUAL runway** so that this land could be reclaimed for PARK USE for walking, jogging and views, natural ground vegetation and porous water reclamation.

3 (B).The shortening of the runway should be designed and constructed to **INCLUDE pedestrian and bicycle access path** at both the east and west ends of the runway.

The EXISTING David Douglas Loop could easily be repurposed for this use with new fencing installed.

This bikeway would provide much needed safe access to Airport Ave, SMC and the existing Airport Park and 12 Airport Park Expansion and would support our Vision Zero and Safe Route to Schools efforts.

Additionally this bikeway proposal is ALREADY part of the "20-Year Vision Plan Recommended Bikeway Projects" as listed in the "2011 Santa Monica Bike Action Plan" as the "AIRPORT LOOP," a "Recreational loop roughly circumnavigating Santa Monica Airport site, Airport Park, and Clover Park."

Please include INCLUDE these 3 additions in any motions that you might make regarding item 8C.

Sincerely,

Michael Brosky

*Jennifer Glaser*  
*1309 Amherst Avenue #201*  
*Los Angeles, CA 90025*

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

310.395.5432

February 18, 2017

**To: The Mayor of Santa Monica and the entire City Council.**

I would like to offer a suggestion for the most sensible use of the eleven acre land that will be available after the Santa Monica Airport closes.

An Intergenerational Village could be implemented to become a model, for the nation, which would help solve the crisis situation of low cost housing for people of all ages.

Its purpose would be to have a living standard for active seniors, young families, foster children, single parents and perhaps college students that need housing. It would be a peaceful community of intentional interactive people who accept a commitment to care for each other and keep the village self sustaining.

I have attached some instructions of how to set this project up as there have been several other smaller communities across the states that have proved that this idea is successful.

Those pioneers of a new/old concept of intentional living are finding that their elderly are healthier and happier while productive in a meaningful way, and young adults and children feel safe and satisfied always having competent people to care for them, so it

eliminates much of the stress of raising a family alone. Everyone gains by this interactive community.

The buildings currently on the airport site might be used as a beginning re-development for housing.

I encourage all members the City Council to look into this idea and go to the websites of those Intergeneration places that have already achieved success.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Glaser

*I am a retired teacher and early childhood specialist.  
I love Santa Monica and have lived locally since 1976.*

Please visit : <http://generationsofhope.org/publications/fuller-response-to-vulnerability>

<http://generationsofhope.org>

February 22, 2017

# Next Steps at SMO - II

## A suggested strategy

### **Executive Summary**

In January 2015, following the historic defeat of Measure D and passage of Measure LC in the November 2014 elections, I sent you a document entitled “Next Steps at SMO” which among other things pointed out the potential to convert the 12 acres of tie-downs on the south side of the airport into expanded park space. That process is now well underway. As Chair of the Yes on LC, No on D campaign, and as a board member of Airport2Park, I commend you for your steadfast and unanimous support for the dream of Measure LC. It is now two years later, and with the signing of the historic agreement between the City and the FAA to close the airport at the end of 2028 and shorten the runway effective immediately, please allow me to once again offer my suggestions moving forward. Please consider the following:

- Direct staff and the contractor that is selected to do the shortening that the only option of interest is one that involves the removal of the hard surface that lies beyond the ends of the shortened 3,500’ runway and its restoration to raw compacted topsoil.
- Authorize staff to immediately begin planning for this new phase-2 park space and its integration with the existing airport park expansion, including initiating a visualization process. Inform contractor tasked with clearing runway surfaces of those areas of surface that should be left in order to play their new role in the expanding great park vision.
- Immediately give formal 30-day notice of intent to close SMO to aviation completely at the end of 2028 to FAA and all SMO tenants. Pass formal “resolution to close” declaring this to be the City’s intent.
- Immediately give formal 6 month notice (with expected timeframe) to FAA and SMO FBO’s and tenants of City’s intent to shorten the runway as expeditiously as possible, and following that to become an exclusive FBO provider. Fast track this process. Evict existing FBOs as soon as allowed by the agreement.

- Do not take any new money from FAA that might encumber the City. Incorporate language to this effect into the wording of the “resolution to close”.
- Strictly enforce the existing noise ordinances including fines and suspensions applied on a per-entity/operator, not a per-aircraft basis (as the ordinance reads).
- Continue to fast track improved Airport security measures including TSA style baggage inspections to access airport facilities.
- Ensure all leases are at market rate. Continue policy of offering leases to desirable interested non-aviation tenants as for Snapchat.
- Require installation of (subsidized) mufflers (depending on A/C type) per City’s existing voluntary subsidy program as a condition of all flight school leases. Seek a way to cause flight schools to abide by the intent of the pattern flying ordinance (no pattern work on weekends, holidays, or evenings).
- Immediately after runway shortening, initiate all planning and other activities including preparing for funding and visioning of the ‘great park’ (phase-3) to ensure that on January 1, 2029 park building can begin immediately.

## Background

The key facts in the agreement signed between the City and the FAA which guide and constrain future actions may be summarized as follows:

- City may immediately initiate shortening of the runway from 5,000 ft to 3,500 ft providing such reconfiguration meets FAA standards and provides Runway Protection Zones (RPZ) and Engineered Materials Arrestor System (EMAS) at either end. Released land beyond 3,500' can be repurposed. Costs for this must be born entirely by the City to avoid additional encumbrances. Environmental studies (if required) are the City's responsibility.
- City may unilaterally close the Airport completely at the end of 2028. If mutually agreed by the City and FAA, the airport could be closed earlier. Until that time, the City is obligated to operate the remaining airport according to FAA standards.
- City is released from all encumbrances imposed by earlier agreements with the FAA.
- Land released by runway shortening may be repurposed as desired subject only to an aviation easement (preventing obstacles etc. on that land alone) reflecting the continued flight of aircraft above most of it (section III of the agreement - page 6) viz:

*...The FAA agrees that prior to closure of the Airport, the City may use the property no longer needed for the Airport with a shortened or reconfigured runway, ... for non-aeronautical uses that are safe and compatible with the operation of the airport. **Such land** shall be subject to an aviation easement for the period the airport is operated...*

- After shortening the runway, the City has the right to become an exclusive FBO and provide all fuel services. The City shall initially offer 3 year leases to aviation tenants. Once that FBO is stood up, leases for existing FBO's providing the similar services may be terminated with 6 months notice.
- City may apply for an enhanced curfew.
- City may not restrict the use of leaded fuel.
- All disputes to be resolved in Federal Courts. FAA and City to jointly defend the agreement against all legal attacks.

For the purposes of this document, it is assumed that the City will chose to center the 3,500 ft runway (plus assumed 300' minimum length RPZs/EMAS) equidistant from both ends of the existing runway thereby giving equal relief to communities at either end of the existing runway.



Fig-1 - Airport Parcels Showing initial 12 acres (from Jan 2015 document)

Fig-2 - Airport Layout Following Runway Shortening



### Runway Removal

Figure 2 above shows the layout of the airport with a centered 3,500 ft runway having a 300 ft RPZ at either end, and with all Tarmac cleared beyond the 3,500 ft extent of the runway. This implies clearing a total of 1,500 ft of runway and surrounding tarmac that is now beyond the 3,500 ft runway. This is the land referred to as ‘such land’ in the Agreement Section III. In total this cleared area amounts to 12.7 acres at the western end and 17 acres at the eastern end (due to the wider tarmac profile at that end). The distinction between the two original aviation parcels (see Fig 1) is now moot, hence the ability to center the runway.

The first and most obvious question is how much would it cost to clear all the freed up land. We can find an approximate answer to that question in the estimates for recent LAX airport renovations (courtesy Joe Schmitz). Table AF-2 from that document tells us how to estimate the costs:

Description	Unit	Quantity	Unit Cost	Estimated Cost	Related Use	Quantity	Reference	Comments
<b>Overall Runway 6L-24R to 300' x 150'</b>								
Concrete Slab	SF	1800	15.6	\$28,080				For Runway Assume 12" PCC over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
Removal of Runway Concrete pavement 15' wide	YD	180000	29.0	\$5,220,000		2110,000	Cost Analysis	Existing Runway is 300' x 150'
Removal of Shoulder Asphalt Pavement 5' wide	YD	20250	38.5	\$780,000		1170,000	Cost Analysis	Assume 4" shoulder and include concrete & steel 10'
Removal of Concrete 12" thick	YD	180000	46.0	\$8,280,000			Cost Analysis	
Removal of asphalt base course 12" thick	YD	180000	25.5	\$4,590,000			Cost Analysis	
Grading of subgrade material (see table)	YD	180000	17.8	\$3,204,000				12' wide base for 12" aggregate over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
Gravel Incurable concrete forms	SF	180000	2.8	\$5,040,000				12' wide base for 12" aggregate over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
Gravel Curable concrete	SF	119000	5.8	\$6,902,000				12' wide base for 12" aggregate over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
Gravel in concrete	SF	119000	2.2	\$2,618,000				12' wide base for 12" aggregate over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
Remove Miscellaneous items	\$	-	\$1000000	\$1,000,000				12' wide base for 12" aggregate over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder Assume 4" AC over 12" aggregate base.
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>\$11,944,080</b>		<b>\$11,944,080</b>		Existing Runway 300' x 150' wide

The LAX estimate to remove 150' by 9,000' of runway together with its surrounding tarmac comes out to a net cost per square foot removed of \$8.66/sf. This presumes a runway of 19" PCC over 12" Econcrete over 12" aggregate base course. For shoulder it assumes 4" AC over 12" aggregate base. The SMO runway is also 150' wide, but we are removing 1/6th the length. The SMO shoulder is somewhat wider, but still amounts to less than that removed for LAX runway 6L-24R. Working the numbers we come up with a ROM to remove the required SMO surface of between \$1.5M and \$2M (a bargain compared with ongoing litigation!).

The next question would be why go to the expense of actually removing this surface rather than just marking lines on it and telling pilots they should not cross them? An approach aviation advocates hoping for SMOs ultimate restoration, will no doubt advocate. To this question there are a number of answers as follows:

- Ultimately the surface must be removed, better to do it while the runway is shortened and the airport is shut down anyway. Removal addresses some SMO rainwater runoff issues.
  - If removed now, costs can be paid down by aviation revenue during the wait till 2028.
  - There is a big difference practically and psychologically between a 3,500' runway that you cannot overrun/undershoot, and a 5,000' runway with painted lines at 3,500' that you could overshoot without repercussions. This difference impacts insurance rates for aircraft using SMO. Without removal the City would be unable to enforce penalties for under/overshoots so opening up the potential for pushing the limits (e.g., to allow scheduled passenger flights). This cannot be allowed, and with removal the possibility does not exist.
    - Part of the surface removed can become potential park land (see below) for a phase-2 park expansion beginning immediately after shortening. Removal contributes to that goal.
    - If the surface is not removed, the potential remains that under some future change in the political climate a Council might decide once again to lengthen the runway and keep SMO open. With the surface removed, the option of re-lengthening would simply be too expensive and utterly implausible (particularly if a park is in the way).
    - By removing the surface, Council sends a strong message not only to aviation opponents scheming and hoping for an ultimate reprieve, but also to the people of Santa Monica who voted for Measure LC in the hope of a great park, and finally to those anti-aviation activists that distrust the City's motives in all this, namely "SMO is irrevocably heading for closure and the great park is in all our collective futures". If not removed, the future danger of backsliding on airport closure and/or park creation becomes all the more real.
    - The existing runway is in need of maintenance and resurfacing. With the shortening, it will experience more aggressive breaking thus increasing maintenance needs. The costs for this maintenance (reduced by 30% due to runway shortening) can be combined with all other reconfiguration efforts and the work performed contemporaneously so that the airport is down for the minimal amount of time.

**Recommendation 1:** Council should direct staff and the contractor that is selected to do the shortening that the only option of interest is one that involves the removal of the entire hard surface that lies beyond the ends of the shortened 3,500' runway and its restoration to raw topsoil.

Fig-3 - Details of Potential Phase-2 Park Land



## **Phase-2 park expansion**

The next issue I want to raise (illustrated in Figure 3 above) is that there is the potential to immediately free up additional acres of parkland for phase-2 of the 'great park' expansion following runway shortening. In fact, there is approximately 28 acres of land that can be used for this purpose. In that sense we are in much the same position as at the beginning of 2015, that is we have another huge chunk of potential parkland readily available, for which planning can begin almost immediately. Once again Council has an opportunity to re-affirm its unwavering commitment to Measure LC and the great park by fast-tracking this new park space, just as you did for the first 12 acres. At the same time the land freed up gives us the potential to resolve a couple of significant issues caused by the current airport configuration:

- The two new parcels of land (one at the Western end, one at the Eastern end) that are to the sides of the flat airport surface, and below it at the ends, give us the potential to connect the newly emerging Airport Park expansion to the rest of Santa Monica via easy bike and pedestrian access. This is particularly critical if the playing fields that are part of the expansion are to be used by SAMO High students since they would otherwise be forced to navigate either Bundy or 23rd, both of which are extremely dangerous (particularly the intersection at 23rd). By running two new bike/pedestrian routes (as shown in blue on Figure-3) round either end of the airport, we can resolve this issue while also giving better access to arts and other facilities and to SMC students moving between the main campus and satellites at the airport. The phase-2 contiguous border with the Airport Park expansion needs to be communicated with Mark Rios so that its presence can be incorporated into the Phase-1 park expansion currently in the design phase.
- As also illustrated in the diagram, there is the potential to extend Centinela past the current north gate into the airport and have it follow the existing road that is currently within SMO grounds to join Bundy to the South of the Ocean Park/Bundy intersection. It is the huge lines of traffic that build up at peak times trying to go South around the airport, particularly onto Bundy, that cause much of the traffic congestion in the local area. This can now be relieved with some new construction since an existing road surface already travels most of the path desired.



Fig-4 - Detailed view of Western End Phase-2 Park Space (10.6 Acres)

Figure 4 above shows a detailed view of the proposed additional park space at the Western end, and of a suggested configuration of the revised airport footprint. The first point to realize is that the existing airport peripheral road (seen just inside the proposed inner park boundary) is at the top of a slope that falls from the airport surface down to the level of 23rd street. This slope is already in its natural state consisting of scrub, trees and vegetation along the hillside. The proposal is to move the existing airport perimeter fence (the black line) to just inside this peripheral road, making the road the uppermost limit of the park. This avoids the need to

construct a new road through the park (just repurpose the existing road as a new park road), and allows people the potential to climb to this level and see the amazing views it affords (while still being outside the aviation perimeter). Leaving this roadway in place at the top of the hill is likely also necessary to avoid soil erosion issues. A new bike/pedestrian trail (the blue line) would be constructed down-slope and thus out of sight/danger from aircraft taking off from the reduced runway. This new trail would run along Airport Avenue on the south, up the side of 23rd (which would now have an unobstructed view of the new park and trails), and along the northern edge coming out near the fire station (or if possible connecting directly to Clover park behind the row of small hangars shown in the upper right of the image). By so doing this path affords direct pedestrian and bike access to Airport Avenue from the rest of Santa Monica. The existing contract to remove gunnite along Airport Avenue needs to be modified to take account of the planned existence of bike/pedestrian trail along the Western end of the road. A new airport peripheral road (shown in red) would go around the newly installed RSA connecting north and south sides of the field for aviation use. This entire path is already paved, so this road does not need to be 'constructed' simply not removed with all the rest of the surface, so saving costs.

Note that at South-east limit of this park area there is a paved area of aircraft tie-downs which would be removed and the aircraft re-located. Other than that, and the construction of the new pedestrian/bike path, there is little if any major work to be done over and above tarmac removal for this park to come into use as 10.6 acres of completely un-structured natural habitat parkland marking the Western gateway into the City of Santa Monica.



Fig-5 - Detailed view of Eastern End Phase-2 Park Space (17 Acres)

Figure 5 above shows a detailed view of the proposed additional park space at the Eastern end per the suggested configuration of the revised airport footprint. Just as for the changes at the Western end, the existing airport peripheral road (seen just inside the proposed inner park boundary) is at the top of a slope that falls from the airport surface down to the level of Bundy. This slope is already in its natural state consisting of scrub, trees and vegetation along the hillside.

The proposal is to move the existing airport perimeter fence (the black line) to just inside this peripheral road, making the road the uppermost limit of the park. This avoids the need to construct a new road through the park (just repurpose the existing road as a new park road), and allows people the potential to climb to this level and see the amazing views it affords (while still being outside the aviation perimeter). Leaving this roadway in place at the top of the hill is likely also necessary to avoid soil erosion issues. A new bike/pedestrian trail (the blue line) would be constructed down-slope and thus out of sight/danger from aircraft taking off from the reduced runway. The slope at this end is somewhat narrower in places so some widening might be required. This new trail would run along Bundy (which would now have an unobstructed view of the new park and trails), and along the northern edge of the existing open space (through the existing shady tree lined 'avenue' along the northern edge of the existing airport boundary, ending at the current airport gate at what is currently the end of Centinela. By so doing this path affords direct pedestrian and bike access to the expanded airport park from the rest of Santa Monica. A new airport peripheral road (shown in red) would go around the newly installed RSA connecting north and south sides of the field for aviation use. As for the western end, this entire path is already paved, so this road does not need to be 'constructed' simply not removed with all the rest of the surface. Once again this saves costs.

The existing natural land to the north surrounds a parking lot which should be removed. To the Western end at the top (to the west of the line of Centinela within the airport boundary), an area of small hangars is freed up from aviation use and could thus be cleared for further park space, or alternatively converted to a parking lot for both park and aviation use (thus this tarmac would not be removed). Along the very top of this area is a road (currently within the airport boundary) which would remain, and on it, at the point where the new airport perimeter fence (black line) meets the road, a new security gate would be installed for entrance to the remaining aviation area.

On the southern side of the runway, a large additional area of aircraft tie-downs and some small hangars is released from aviation use. This area is contiguous with the existing Airport Park expansion and so should meld naturally with it. It is presumably too close to the end of the runway to put playing fields, so perhaps it too should be left as natural habitat for now (minimal cost) with just a few trails added to allow people to enjoy it and the incredible views it affords. In effect at the Western end of the runway, combining north and south parks and the strip of

connecting land, we would have created a single contiguous park of nearly 40 acres with a mix of natural habitat to the north and planned uses to the south. Views of this park would delineate the Eastern gateway for people coming into Santa Monica.

As mentioned earlier (see purple line), it is also possible to continue Centinela along the path it already follows within the current boundary turning east towards Bundy and along the end of the runway (all existing roadway) and then extend it down the slope to join Bundy at an angle, so affording a path for traffic going south to avoid the Bundy/Ocean Park intersection. This would greatly relieve traffic congestion on Ocean Park by avoiding this intersection, indeed traffic originating from the Business Park could emerge directly onto Centinela so avoiding the need to ever join Ocean Park and thus extending traffic relief all the way back along Ocean Park. Another possibility is to construct a new road through the tree-lined avenue (which should be preserved) on the northern edge and then down to Bundy (i.e., the blue line in Figure 5). This is more construction work, but means the Centinela cut through would no longer split the newly created park space in half as it would otherwise.

**Recommendation 2:** Authorize staff immediately to begin planning for this new phase-2 park space and its integration with the existing phase-1 airport park expansion, including initiating a phase-2 visualization process. At the same time the contractor tasked with clearing runway surfaces needs to be informed of those areas of surface that should be left in order to play their new role in the expanding great park vision.

### **Other Recommendations**

No doubt you have received numerous recommendations and justifications relating to the more obvious actions to be taken in pursuit of the newly signed agreement. For that reason I won't belabor these points and have simply enumerated my recommendations for other actions the Council should take or initiate at the upcoming Council meeting in the Executive Summary that begins this document.

John Fairweather  
CASMAT ([www.casmat.org](http://www.casmat.org))

## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** Council Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2017 11:10 AM  
**To:** councilmtgitems  
**Subject:** FW: My thoughts on next steps at SMO  
**Attachments:** NextStepsSMO2Small.pdf; NextStepsSMO\_II.pdf

---

**From:** John Fairweather [mailto:johnfairweather@earthlink.net]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2017 2:41 PM  
**To:** Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <tedwinterer@gmail.com>; Tony Vazquez (tvazquez1516@yahoo.com) <tvazquez1516@yahoo.com>; Kevin McKeown Fwd <kevin@mckeown.net>; Gleam Davis <gleam.davis@gmail.com>; Terry.O'Day@nrgenergy.com; Sue Himmelrich - Western Center on Law and Poverty (suehimmelrich@suehimmelrich.net) <suehimmelrich@suehimmelrich.net>; Pam O'Connor <pam.oconnor.samo@gmail.com>  
**Cc:** Rick Cole <Rick.Cole@SMGOV.NET>; Nelson Hernandez <Nelson.Hernandez@SMGOV.NET>; Susan Cline <Susan.Cline@SMGOV.NET>; Elaine Polachek <Elaine.Polachek@SMGOV.NET>; Joseph Lawrence <Joseph.Lawrence@SMGOV.NET>; Stelios Makrides <Stelios.Makrides@SMGOV.NET>  
**Subject:** My thoughts on next steps at SMO

In January 2015, following the [historic defeat](#) of Measure D and passage of Measure LC in the November 2014 elections, I sent you a document entitled “Next Steps at SMO” which among other things pointed out the potential to convert the 12 acres of tie-downs on the south side of the airport into expanded park space. That process is now well underway. As Chair of the [Yes on LC, No on D](#) campaign, and as a board member of [Airport2Park](#), I commend you for your steadfast and unanimous support for the dream of Measure LC. It is now two years later, and with the signing of the historic agreement between the City and the FAA to close the airport at the end of 2028 and shorten the runway effective immediately, please allow me to once again offer my detailed suggestions moving forward. I have attached both hi-rez and lo-rez (image compressed) versions of the document. You may directly access a detailed image of the proposed runway layout and phase-2 park concept here:<http://casmat.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/ShortenedRunwayAndPark.png>.

This document reflects purely my personal opinions on this matter.

## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** Council Mailbox  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2017 11:11 AM  
**To:** Ted Winterer; Gleam Davis; Pam OConnor; Sue Himmelrich; Terry O'Day; Kevin McKeown Fwd; Tony Vazquez  
**Cc:** councilmtgitems; Rick Cole; Joseph Lawrence; Stelios Makrides  
**Subject:** FW: What are you doing to undo the betrayal of the residents with SMO?

Council-

Please see the email below re: SMO.

Thanks,

Stephanie

**From:** jpadelson [mailto:jpadelson@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2017 9:38 AM  
**To:** Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>  
**Cc:** airport2park@gmail.com; contact@opa-sm.org  
**Subject:** What are you doing to undo the betrayal of the residents with SMO?

Traitorous Santa Monica City Council Members,

Shame on the council for betraying the residents of SM and WLA who are affected by SMO by extending its life by 12 years which will degrade our lives for 12 more years!!

Why do I have to wait until im 70 to enjoy the closure of SMO on land that already belongs to me and the residents of SM?

I am discusted by your betrayal and lies.

How you could possibly rationalize this, and I know you will try Winterer- liar!, but you can't convince us not to believe our own eyes,ears,experience. You are as bad as fascist trump.

You are traitors!

You discust me.

Julie Adelson

## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** Laura Silagi <Irsilagi@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 1:22 PM  
**To:** councilmtgitems; Mike Bonin; mike.n.feuer@lacity.org  
**Subject:** Santa Monica Airport closure and other issues

Dear Councilmembers,

I am Laura Silagi, the former chair of the Venice Neighborhood Council's SMO committee and organizer of the Venice Residents Against SMO

Here are some of our recommendations that can take place immediately and extend until the airport is closed.

1. Have limited hours of fuel sales, and airport operations.
2. Increase the landing fee and the fee for stop and go practice
3. Do not allow commercial scheduled flights
4. Do not allow any more flight schools and if those who run these schools close, do not allow any new ones
5. Do not allow increase of jets to the airport--use whatever means necessary.
7. Shorten the runway ASAP
8. Rent to non-aviation "environmentally sustainable tenants only.
9. **Reject the current "Fly Neighborly"** program that shunts props over Venice on departure. This departure pattern is recommended for props **by the City of Santa Monica**. The FAA this confirmed fact in a meeting we had a couple of years ago. As did Bob Trimborn, the former airport manager. "Fly Neighborly" policy tells pilots of props to fly over Venice to the ocean when turning north, and fly over Venice and then Mar Vista when turning east.

This Santa Monica City policy of shunting visual flight operated air crafts over Venice and Mar Vista affects thousands on the ground, including many hundreds of children in schools in Venice and Mar Vista and the surrounding communities over which these planes fly.

The UCLA Pediatric Study as pertains to SMO, and the World Health Organization as pertains to airports and noise pollution worldwide, document these detrimental health and learning effects. These leaded-fuel, noise-polluting air crafts affect the health of all, and stunt the learning abilities of children. You are placing an unfair burden on the surrounding community.

If the airport were indeed to stay open to until 2029, then a child born today would be twelve by the time the airport closed. I would be 83. That is too long to wait for relief. Our sanity, health and the health of our children are at stake. This is a serious matter, as is all the pollution, both air and noise from planes using SMO put us all at risk.

In the meantime, until the airport closes, we need all our elected officials in Santa Monica and Los Angeles to find a fair solution to the “Fly Neighborly” program. As well as take steps to reduce the other impacts of SMO for residents in Santa Monica and Venice.

Best,

Laura Silagi

[LRSILAGI@GMAIL.COM](mailto:LRSILAGI@GMAIL.COM)

## Vernice Hankins

---

**From:** Council Mailbox  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 2:05 PM  
**To:** councilmtgitems  
**Subject:** FW: Request Immediate Steps to Shorten SMO Runway to 3500 Ft

---

**From:** LSAPC@aol.com [mailto:LSAPC@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2017 1:45 PM  
**To:** Sue Himmelrich <Sue.Himmelrich@SMGOV.NET>; Gleam Davis <Gleam.Davis@SMGOV.NET>; Ted Winterer <Ted.Winterer@SMGOV.NET>; Pam OConnor <Pam.OConnor@SMGOV.NET>; Council Mailbox <Council.Mailbox@SMGOV.NET>; Tony Vazquez <Tony.Vazquez@SMGOV.NET>; Kevin McKeown Fwd <kevin@mckeown.net>; terry.oday@smgov.n  
**Cc:** lsapc@aol.com  
**Subject:** Request Immediate Steps to Shorten SMO Runway to 3500 Ft

Dear City Council,

**As the Mayor and the City Manager have publicly announced and committed to do, please take immediate steps at your Tuesday meeting to shorten the SMO runway to 3500 feet.**

**The voters of Santa Monica, who passed Measure LC, count on your integrity to shorten the runway.... NOW!!**

**We will all be watching. The back door deal by the majority of the City Council with the FAA was abominable.....12 additional years of toxic fumes, unbearable noise and constant danger of a horrendous crash.**

**Do the right thing. Please don't disappoint the voters of Santa Monica once again.**

Thank you for your concern and onsideration.

Sincerely,

Lou Ssutu

Resident of Sunset Park --- under the flight path.

## **Reference:**

Resolution No. 11026 (CCS)