March 10, 2005

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE TORRANCE AIRPORT COMMISSION

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Torrance Airport Commission convened in a regular session on Thursday, March 10, 2005, at 7:00 p.m. in the West Annex meeting room at Torrance City Hall.

2. ROLL CALL

Present:	Commissioners Browning, Dingman, Donnellan, Gates, Pyles, Tymczyszyn and Chairperson Ouwerkerk.
Absent:	None.
Also Present:	Facility Operations Manager Megerdichian, Airport Business Manager Zucker, Environmental Services Administrator Cessna, Sr. Environmental Quality Officer Richards and Land Management Team Chair Sunshine.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Browning led the Pledge of Allegiance.

4. AFFIDAVIT OF AGENDA POSTING

MOTION: Commissioner Browning, seconded by Commissioner Donnellan, moved to accept and file the report of the City Clerk on the posting of the agenda for this meeting; voice vote reflected unanimous approval.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – February 10, 2005

MOTION: Commissioner Browning moved for the approval of the February 10, 2005 Airport Commission minutes as submitted. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Dingman and passed by roll call vote.

6. ACTION ITEMS

6A. REPLACEMENT OF AIRPORT NOISE ABATEMENT CENTER EQUIPMENT

Recommendation
The Airport Noise Abatement Capital Project Committee and the Environmental Division of the Community Development Department recommend that the proposal submitted by the Lochard Corporation be forward to Council with the following conditions:

- That the cost of the system not exceed $256,000.

- That prior to installation of any equipment, a study be conducted by Lochard Corporation to determine the fewest number of monitors necessary given today's technology to operate the system while maintaining the system's effectiveness.

Environmental Services Administrator Cessna introduced the item and thanked Commissioners Browning, Donnellan and Tymczyszyn for serving on the Noise Abatement Capital Project Committee.

With the aid of slides, Sr. Environmental Services Officer Richards provided background information about Torrance Airport and the noise abatement program. He explained that citizens became alarmed when aircraft operations hit 400,000 per year in the 1970s and the City Council sought solutions for airport problems through the creation of an Airport Master Plan. He advised that, in conjunction with the Master Plan, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was prepared, which identified two major mitigation measures: 1) the creation of an aircraft noise detection system, and 2) the adoption of a noise ordinance establishing acceptable aircraft noise limits. He noted that in 1977, following several years of study and input from residents and pilots, the City Council mandated that a permanent system of aircraft noise monitoring equipment be installed at Torrance Airport and sections were added to the Torrance Municipal Code specifying noise limits for aircraft.

Mr. Richards reported that the Noise Abatement Center created at that time has been very successful in enforcing noise limits and that violations have decreased from 5% of operations when the center opened to fewer than ½ of 1%. He explained, however, that the equipment has become obsolete and can no longer be repaired or serviced and the City is seeking to replace it with a new, more efficient system that can be operated remotely from City Hall when airport staff is not available.

Mr. Richards advised that the City sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP); that proposals from two companies, Lochard Corporation ($256,000 basic system/$301,000 enhanced system) and Rannoch Corporation ($249,000 enhanced system), were received; and that the Airport Commission formed a committee to evaluate the proposals. He explained that the committee saw the need for a more efficient system rather than just replacing the old one and suggested the possibility that fewer monitors could perform the same function. He stated that the two companies responded with a cost estimate to conduct a study – Lochard $3,000 and Rannoch, $15,000 - and the committee decided to recommend the Lochard system with a provision that the cost of the system not exceed $256,000 and a study be conducted prior to installation to determine the fewest number of monitors needed. He noted that important factors in choosing Lochard were the company's history of providing reliable equipment and service to the City and its Web-based system would allow residents and pilots to view reports on complaints and noise test results on the Internet, thereby reducing time spent by staff on the telephone.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn, chair of the Noise Abatement Capital Project Committee, reported that the committee met with staff four times over a two-month period to thoroughly evaluate these proposals. He stated that in addition to the reasons mentioned by Mr. Richards, the committee decided to recommend the Lochard system because the company also has systems at LAX and Long Beach, which provides access to radar data that will make the system more efficient in filtering out non-aviation related

incidents that “ring the bell” on noise monitors. He explained that aircraft account for only 1 out of 15 noise exceedances registered by the monitors and under the current system, it is a very time consuming process to determine whether the noise came from an airplane or some other source such as a barking dog or motorcycle.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn stated that Rannoch proposed a system using transponder sensors to create a pseudo-radar, which would do the same thing, however, in order to identify an aircraft, it would have to have a Mode-S transponder and only about 5% of aircraft at Torrance Airport are so equipped. He noted that Rannoch has suggested that using radar data from LAX and Long Beach would not be optimal because of the line of sight issues, however, he personally observed aircraft at all altitudes when he viewed the radar data online, including airplanes only 200 feet above the water off the cliffs of Palos Verdes, so he did not believe this would be a problem.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn indicated that familiarity was also a factor because Lochard has a record of reliable service with the City of Torrance. He related his understanding that Rannoch recently lowered its bid, but noted that the committee had not had an opportunity to review the revised proposal.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Sr. Environmental Quality Officer Richards provided information about enforcement actions, explaining that the Noise Abatement Office switched from an enforcement mode to an education mode in the mid-1990s, encouraging pilots to take advantage of the test program, and there have been only approximately three hearing boards since 2000 and the last misdemeanor to go to court was in 1996.

Mr. Richards clarified that staff was recommending the purchase of Lochard’s “optimized” system, which will utilize radar data from LAX to track aircraft.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn noted that the radar data would be provided by another company at a cost of approximately $8,000 per year. He explained that radar data can be viewed online at LAX’s website; that it is slightly delayed for security purposes; and that the data is time-stamped so it can be correlated with noise monitoring data.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn pointed out that both proposals would allow the system to be operated remotely from City Hall so pilots would be able to conduct noise tests 8-9 hours a day as opposed to the current situation where the Noise Abatement office is staffed a maximum of 4 hours a day.

In response to Chairperson Ouwerkerk’s inquiry, Mr. Richards stated that he envisions that the Noise Abatement office at the airport will continue to be staffed on a part-time basis, but conceded that if it turns out that the system can be run just as well from City Hall, there will be a temptation to spend less time at the airport and more time at City Hall where there is more staffing.

Commissioner Dingman asked about the procedure for requesting noise tests. Mr. Richards explained that it could be done by phone or online and the results would be posted on the Web if the City goes with the Lochard system.

At Commissioner Browning's request, Mr. Richards reviewed the cost savings that will be achieved by using DSL as opposed to the current practice of using dedicated phone lines for the monitors. He noted that Rannoch mentioned the possibility of using WiFi, but he had doubts about whether it would work.

Mike Rikard-Bell, president of Lochard Corporation, noted his company's positive experience with the City of Torrance over the past 14 years; maintained that the company could provide expert service unmatched in the industry with all skills under one roof; and noted that he had letters from satisfied clients from all over California, North America, and around the world.

Commissioner Gates asked about Lochard's experience with general aviation airports comparable to Torrance's, and Mr. Ricard-Bell reported that Palomar Airport is probably the most similar, but conceded that it has more executive jet traffic

Robert Blair, commercial sales manager for Rannoch Corporation, reported that his company has been awarded 80% of contracts over the past 2½ - 3 years because of its pricing, customer service/support, and reliability and expandability. He stated that the cost of the system has been revised from the original bid of $249,000 to $174,000 because the company has recently formed a global partnership with Bruel & Kjaer, a figure that would be further reduced if it is determined that fewer than 11 monitors are needed. He noted that Bruel & Kjaer is a worldwide leader in sound and vibration, with over 3,000 noise-monitoring units installed throughout the world. He indicated that he could also provide references and urged the Commission to take the time to check references from both his company and Lochard.

Mr. Blair maintained that his company would offer superior customer service and support as it has local offices and two accredited calibration labs in the United States, one of which is in Los Angeles. He noted that the representative who would be servicing the account lives two miles from the airport. Commenting on the system's reliability, he explained that Bruel & Kjaer has over 1700 noise monitoring units that are still in operation after 10 years, while his competitor's units have only been on the market about 5 years.

Mr. Blair reported that his company was proposing a highly accurate, autonomous system, which is not dependant on FAA radar at Long Beach and LAX and which can track aircraft all the way to the ground. He explained that any of the data captured by FAA radar would be captured by his company's system and that Mode S was just an enhanced feature of the system, which tracks Mode A, C and S transponders. He stated that Rannoch supports only one version of its software and all clients with maintenance contracts receive upgrades at no additional charge, however, his competitor has a history of charging hundreds of thousands of dollars for software upgrades. Additionally, he explained that Bruel & Kjaer's hardware is non-proprietary and offers more flexibility, as opposed to Lochard's hardware, which is proprietary and limits the City's choices in the future.

In response to Commissioners' requests for clarification regarding the airports Rannoch listed as references, Mr. Blair explained that Rannoch installed a test flight tracking system at San Francisco Airport some years ago in partnership with another company that is not currently operational, but his company is negotiating with the airport to upgrade the system. He reported that Las Vegas McCarran and Houston Airport are

using the company's software, but neither has noise monitoring equipment and that San Antonio Airport has the company's flight tracking system and a noise monitoring system is currently being installed. He advised that airports are focusing more on flight tracking with limited noise monitoring.

Commissioner Browning noted that committee members spent a considerable amount of time reviewing the proposals and investigating both companies and expressed concerns about the last minute revisions to Rannoch's proposal.

Mr. Blair explained that the Rannoch/Bruel & Kjaer partnership was announced last week at a noise symposium in Northern California and formalized this week in Las Vegas and emphasized that it is a global partnership and not just for this proposal.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn asked about Rannoch's experience with general aviation airports in Southern California, and Mr. Blair reported that Santa Barbara Airport has Bruel & Kjaer hardware and software. He noted that Bruel & Kjaer has noise monitoring equipment in over 200 airports worldwide and urged the Commission to take a second look at the company's proposal because of the change in dynamics since the partnership was formed.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn stated that one of the factors that concerned the committee was that unlike Lochard, which manufactures its own equipment, Rannoch purchases commercial, off-the-shelf equipment and there was a question of whether the manufacturers of that equipment would continue to support it.

Mark Serridge, Bruel & Kjaer representative, explained that the most crucial element of the system is the outdoor microphone; that Bruel & Kjaer has exacting standards for the manufacturing of these microphones; and that not all outdoor microphones are built to the same quality.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn noted that Rannoch's proposal also mentions the use of voice recognition software to identify aircraft, however, the company's own data indicates that this technology was successful in identifying aircraft at general aviation airports only 50% of the time.

Mr. Blair explained that the voice recognition software would only be a supplement to the system.

In response to Chairperson Ouwerkerk's inquiry, Mr. Blair advised that Rannoch would be responsible for integrating the system's hardware and software, along with Bruel & Kjaer, and that Mr. Serridge, who lives in the area, would service the account.

Mr. Rikard-Bell wanted to clarify that Lochard has won 71% of contracts by value and 60% of contracts by count over the last 2-3 years; that the company's monitors have been in operation in excess of 12 years; and that they have been certified according to the most stringent standards in the world. He pointed out that the majority of Rannoch's references do not pertain to noise monitoring systems and urged the City to check with San Antonio Airport regarding Rannoch's installed, but not yet accepted, system. He questioned the viability of Rannoch's two-week old partnership with Bruel & Kjaer; explained that during his company's 15 years in the industry, every competitor has either gone out of business, been sold, or formed alliances that have fallen apart; and reported

that Rannoch's inoperative system at San Francisco Airport was the result of a failed partnership. He noted that the system proposed by Rannoch tracks the altitude of aircraft only, with no geometric or cartographic location. He also clarified that his company does not charge for software upgrades as they are included in the price of annual maintenance contracts. He submitted letters of reference to rebut claims that his company has a reputation of poor service.

Frank Rizzardi, representing Southwood/Riviera Homeowners Association, stated that a viable noise abatement program is vital to the coexistence of Torrance Airport and residents and provides a valuable tool for pilots to assess the noise impact on neighbors. He commended Sr. Environmental Quality Officer Richards for his briefing and very thorough written report and expressed confidence that the Commission would make the right decision.

John King, resident, contended that more study needs to be done before a decision is made on this issue because many changes have taken place since the noise abatement program was instituted and both of the proposed systems would simply continue the current system, expanding it to include an office at City Hall. He suggested that the program should be operated either from City Hall or the airport, but not both of these places. He noted that helicopters are a major source of noise, however, they are eliminated from noise monitoring activities because they fly along PCH where there are no sensors.

Nancy Clinton, resident, suggested that Rannoch's proposal merited a second look due to the significant price reduction and asked how transient pilots would be able to reach someone to obtain information about the airport.

Sr. Environmental Quality Officer Richards stated that the details of the system have not been worked out, but phone calls to the airport office will either be forwarded to City Hall when the office is not manned or two phone numbers will be maintained. He explained that employees answering phone lines at City Hall will have other duties; that the City was trying to stretch the allocated staff time to provide assistance at the airport; and that it was an imperfect solution but better than the current situation.

Ms. Clinton suggested the possibility of having a line to City Hall on the select-a-call phone in the pilots lounge.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn took issue with an article in Torrance Airport Association's most recent newsletter, which stated that the City was seeking proposals that would perpetuate a labor-intensive, expensive solution instead of investigating modern automatic technologies. He explained that, to the contrary, both proposals are very modern and automatic and will eliminate 90% of wasted time, thereby freeing staff to interact with pilots. He reported that this article also claimed that current noise abatement policies do not address helicopter traffic, but this is not true as all helicopters are subject to noise monitoring. He noted that Coast Guard helicopters are usually the only ones that exceed noise limits and they are exempt.

Mr. King, author of the article, maintained that the proposed systems are a continuation of the same inefficient system that currently exists, noting that this matter was brought to the Commission after the RFP (Request for Proposal) was issued and the proposals had already been received. He stated that while helicopters are not

exempt from noise monitoring, they are able to skirt it because their agreed upon route takes them away from sensors, however, they still impact residents who live in the vicinity.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk, in response to Commissioner Pyles, provided clarification regarding the purpose of the tracking system. He explained that in order to enforce noise limits specified in the Torrance Municipal Code, the City must have noise monitoring equipment and the tracking system is an enhancement, which will help screen out non-aviation related noise, thereby cutting down on staff's workload.

Commissioner Pyles questioned whether the Lochard system would be expandable if the City wants a more sophisticated tracking system in the future. Chairperson Ouwerkerk suggested that any system can be modified, it's just a matter of cost and compatibility.

Commissioner Gates maintained that spending a quarter of a million dollars on noise monitoring equipment was like using a sledgehammer to kill an ant. He provided background information about the history of the noise abatement program, explaining that the decision to install a noise monitoring system was predicated on a study that predicted an increase in airport operations to over 1 million per year if extended out to today. He noted that this increase never materialized and in 1995 the airport experienced only one-fifth of the air traffic that was projected and that this year, the airport will have only 37% of the operations it had in 1980. He stated that another factor in the decision was the number of complaints about airport noise, however, according to data starting from 1989, complaints doubled during a time period when violations decreased by 90%, so clearly the system has not been effective in reducing complaints.

Mr. Gates reported that he compiled a list of 25 airports and divided them into two categories – those that have a lot of executive jet traffic and commercial operations, and those that do not – and of the 12 that do not, Torrance Airport is the only one that has a noise monitoring system. He noted that City policies preclude the establishment of executive jet centers and commercial operations. He indicated that he had calculated the City's cost per violation at $381, not including the cost of the software maintenance contract, and approximately $1200 per violation taking into account that Torrance-based aircraft account for only about one-quarter of the noise violations. He conceded that tonight was probably not the appropriate time for this discussion, but suggested the fact that the City is no longer providing funding for staff to compile noise reports is an indication that there is no longer a need to spend this kind of money on noise monitoring equipment.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn noted that changing to a system with reduced capability would require City Council and homeowner association involvement. He explained that the Noise Abatement Capital Project Committee was charged with the task of evaluating the two proposals and members focused on finding an optimum system that would have the same capabilities as the current system but with a lower cost to operate. He indicated that he viewed the low number of violations as a good thing and expressed the hope that this trend would continue. He related his observation that executive jet traffic at the airport is increasing, even in the absence of the sale of jet fuel.

Facility Operations Manager Megerdichian suggested that the Commission focus on the topic at hand.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn expressed concerns that the committee had not had an opportunity to evaluate the changes to Rannoch's proposal. Commissioner Gates questioned whether a company is allowed to change its bid during the evaluation process.

Environmental Services Administrator Cessna advised that she had checked with the City's legal staff and it is permissible in this case because the proposal deals with a computer-related service and there is more flexibility for this kind of procurement.

Commissioner Pyles suggested the possibility of delaying action on this item so both companies could provide additional information regarding the exact cost of their proposals, i.e. the cost savings should some of the monitors be eliminated.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk indicated that he was inclined to allow staff to work out the details with regard to the number of monitors.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn stated that he was very comfortable with the Lochard proposal and offered the following motion:

MOTION: Commissioner Tymczyszyn moved to recommend that the City Council approve the proposal submitted by the Lochard Corporation with the following conditions:

- That the cost of the system shall not exceed $256,000.
- That prior to installation of any equipment, a study be conducted by Lochard Corporation to determine the fewest number of monitors necessary given today's technology to operate the system while maintaining the system's effectiveness.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk proposed that the motion be amended to specify that the $256,000 will be for "an enhanced and optimized" system.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn amended his motion as follows:

MOTION: Commissioner Tymczyszyn moved to recommend that the City Council approve the proposal submitted by the Lochard Corporation with the following conditions:

- That the cost shall not exceed $256,000 for an enhanced and optimized system.
- That prior to installation of any equipment, a study be conducted by Lochard Corporation to determine the fewest number of monitors necessary given today's technology to operate the system while maintaining the system's effectiveness.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed as reflected in the following roll call vote:

AYES:	Commissioners Browning, Donnellan, Tymczyszyn and Chairperson Ouwerkerk.
NOES:	Commissioners Dingman and Pyles.
ABSTAIN:	Commissioner Gates.

The Commission recessed from 8:55 p.m. to 9:00 p.m.

6B. CONCEPT PLAN FOR LEASE WITH VERIZON WIRELESS

Recommendation

The Land Management Team recommends that the Airport Commission review, comment and give input regarding a conceptual plan to lease airport property to Verizon Wireless for the construction and maintenance of a cell tower to be located at the east washrack area of Zamperini Field/Torrance Municipal Airport.

Land Management Team Chair Sunshine reviewed the conceptual plan to lease a 500 square-foot area at the airport to Verizon Wireless for the construction of a cell tower with a maximum height of 50 feet for a term a 5 years, with four 5-year options, at a rent of $2,300 per month with an annual increase of 3%. He noted that should the lease go forward, the lessee would have to obtain Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) approval prior to the construction of any improvements.

Responding to questions from the Commission, Mr. Sunshine advised that insurance requirements would be reviewed by the City's Risk Manager; that the FAA would determine what type of lighting would be required on the cell tower; that the revenue from the lease would go into the Airport Fund; and that that the tower would not interfere with navigation equipment.

Commissioner Dingman stated that while there may be some concern about a 45-50 foot tower at the proposed location, any pilot who would hit the tower would have already hit a number of other buildings

Commissioner Tymczyszyn agreed that the proposed tower should not be an impediment to fixed-wing aircraft, but questioned whether Robinson Helicopter had been contacted to see if they had any concerns.

Mr. Sunshine indicated that he had a very brief discussion with Robinson but did not go into specifics.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn questioned whether FAA approval guarantees that there will be no electromagnetic interference, and Commissioner Gates related his understanding that it does.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn asked about the possibility that other cell phone companies would share the tower. Mr. Sunshine stated that cell phone companies generally do not like to co-locate, however, any co-lease would require City approval.

In response to Chairperson Ouwerkerk's inquiry, Mr. Sunshine explained that there are currently no cell towers on City property, but he is negotiating with Verizon for this location and with Sprint for another site in the City. He noted that Verizon will be responsible for all improvements and that they will have to build a fence around area, matching the existing fencing, in order to confine those servicing the facility to this site to maintain airport security.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk asked about camouflaging the tower, Mr. Sunshine advised that Verizon was proposing a “stealth tree,” but this type of camouflage is not very effective for a single tower.

Commissioner Dingman related his observation that trying to camouflage a tower sometimes makes it stand out more.

Commissioner Gates asked about parking for trucks servicing the tower, and Mr. Sunshine advised that parking is available across the street on Airport Drive.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn questioned whether any minimum distance from cell towers has been established for human safety. Mr. Sunshine stated that while he is no expert, studies have indicated that cell towers emit no discernable radiation and noted that they must meet FCC guidelines.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk suggested that Commissioner Tymczyszyn read the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Section 704, which discusses the purview of local authorities.

Mr. Sunshine explained that if Commissioners are concerned about safety, the only protection available would be to recommend that the City Council not approve a cell tower at this location, however, it is staff’s belief that the tower would not pose a health risk.

In response to Chairperson Ouwerkerk’s inquiry, Mr. Sunshine advised that cell towers in commercial areas, which are not within 500 feet of residential uses, are subject only to the standard Building and Safety regulations for this type of structure.

Nancy Clinton, resident, noted that the cell tower will likely get sprayed with water from the washrack and the equipment could be subject to corrosion. She also noted that the tower could make it difficult for some of the larger airplanes to access the washrack.

John King, resident, voiced his opinion that locating a 50-foot tower along the perimeter of the airport was a poor idea and a hazard to navigation. He noted that while it would not be an obstacle for aircraft in the normal traffic pattern, it could be a hazard for an aircraft in distress. He suggested a more appropriate location for the cell tower would be in the park on Crest Road off Crenshaw.

Commissioner Gates reported that he looked up height requirements and learned that a 240-foot high tower would be allowed at this location according to FAA regulations.

Commissioner Donnellan voiced support for the proposed lease, stating that he saw no hazard associated with the tower as long as it meets all FAA requirements and that he thought it would be good for the City and good for residents.

Commissioner Gates stated that while he tends to be adamant about not using airport property for non-aviation related uses, this particular piece of land is not suitable for any other purpose and the $27,600 per year can be used to offset airport expenses.

Commissioner Tymczyszyn voiced support for the proposed lease, stating that he saw no risk to navigation and no downside to the proposal.

Chairperson Ouwerkerk indicated that he shared Commissioner Gates' concerns about the conversion of airport property for non-aviation related uses, however, this site is an odd-shaped corner with very limited potential uses.

Commissioner Gates suggested the possibility of using a landscaped area across the street, but Mr. Sunshine advised that the area was not large enough to accommodate the cell tower.

Mr. Sunshine indicated that he would discuss concerns about over-spray from the washrack with Verizon and it would be up to them if they wish to go forward.

MOTION: Commissioner Pyles moved to recommend that the City proceed with the conceptual plan to lease airport property to Verizon Wireless for the construction and maintenance of a cell tower to be located at the east washrack area of Zamperini Field/Torrance Municipal Airport. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Browning and passed by unanimous roll call vote.

7. INFORMATION ITEMS

7A. AERONAUTICAL OPERATIONAL INFORMATION UNDER THE PURVIEW OF THE GENERAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Chairperson Ouwerkerk noted that the following reports were included in the agenda material: Hangar and Tiedown Rental Status; Ongoing Projects; March Meeting Room Schedule; and Hangar Waiting List.

7B. AERONAUTICAL OPERATIONAL INFORMATION UNDER THE PURVIEW OF THE PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Chairperson Ouwerkerk noted that the following reports were included in the agenda material: Events Requiring Emergency Response and Airfield Operations Status.

7C. LAND MANAGEMENT REPORT

Chairperson Ouwerkerk noted that a report from Land Management Chair Sunshine was included in the agenda material.

7E. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Community Outreach and Education Committee

No report.

Disaster Plan Committee

Following a brief discussion, it was the consensus of the Commission to deactivate this committee.

Hangar Rental Agreement Committee

Chairperson Ouwerkerk reported that the committee hopes to bring a recommendation on the revision of the Hangar Rental Agreement to the full Commission at the April meeting.

Commissioner Gates questioned whether insurance companies were consulted regarding liability issues. Chairperson Ouwerkerk reported that a survey of liability requirements at other general aviation airports was conducted; that significant changes were made in this area; and that the City's Risk Manager plans to look into whether the liability requirements are acceptable to insurance companies.

Noise Abatement Capital Projects Committee

Considered earlier in the meeting, see pages 1-8.

8. ORAL COMMUNCIATIONS

8A. Commissioner Gates reported that he learned that Torrance Airport is not eligible for the $10,000 grant he mentioned at the previous meeting because it is categorized as a reliever airport.

8B. Noting that Caltrans conducts an annual inspection of the airport, Commissioner Gates indicated that he recently obtained a copy of the 2004 report and questioned whether the repairs mentioned in the report have been made. Facility Operations Manager Megerdichian offered to check into this matter.

Commissioner Gates expressed an interest in being present for the 2005 inspection.

8C. Commissioner Gates requested information on the airport budget. Chairperson Ouwerkerk reported that a budget review is planned for the next meeting.

8D. Facility Operations Manager Megerdichian noted that the Commissioner Orientation scheduled for March 15 has been postponed.

8E. Nancy Clinton, representing Torrance Air Fair Association, expressed appreciation for the Commission's recommendation to the City Council regarding the B-17 Bomber exhibit, noting that the Council concurred with the Commission's recommendation and approved funding for the event.

Facility Operations Manager Megerdichian reported that the Council voted unanimously to fund the event in the amount of $3812 at the March 1 Council meeting.

8F. Chairperson Ouwerkerk noted that a Lowe's home improvement store was approved on Skypark adjacent to the airport at the March 8 City Council meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 p.m., the meeting was adjourned to Thursday, April 14, 2005 at 7:00 p.m.

Approved as Written
April 14, 2005
s/ Sue Herbers, City Clerk