

Re-envisioning Whiteman Airport: Final Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting, February 23, 2023

Agenda Item #2

Motion by Charles Nelson: Recommend to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors that the Airport be kept open, impose a nighttime curfew for non-emergency air traffic, implement a residential sound insulation program, pursue use of unleaded fuel, and approve the recommendations put forth through the community engagement process.

[Link to full motion](#)

Motion did not receive a second.

Agenda Item #3

Motion by Veronica Padilla-Campos: Recommend the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors pursue airport closure with associated recommendations that County not accept federal grants for airport; prohibit the sale, storage, and use of leaded aviation gas; address noise and air quality impacts for residents; enact additional sound barriers; implement additional health studies; implement redevelopment study; implement emergency response; restrict touch-and-go aircraft landings; address makeup of the LA County Airport Commission; and require non-emergency flights follow FAA Above Ground Level recommendations.

[Link to full motion](#)

Agenda Item #3 received 7 yes, 3 no and 2 abstain votes from CAC members.

Agenda Item #4

Motion by Penny Alderson: Recommend to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors that Whiteman Airport remain open, County address safety and environmental impacts, pursue sale of unleaded fuel, pursue the General Improvements and Scenario 2 options in Re-envisioning report, pursue funding to mitigate residential and community impacts, engage a reconstituted Community Advisory Committee to maintain an open dialog on the progress of improvements, and County pursue job training and additional outreach to educational community.

[Link to full motion](#)

Agenda Item #4 received 7 no, 4 yes and 1 abstain vote from CAC members.

Agenda Item #5

Motion by Jeanne Fenimore: Recommend to the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors that Whiteman Airport remain open and that a Community Advisory Committee be formed between the Pacoima Citizens and Whiteman Airport to work together for a better Pacoima.

[Link to full motion](#)

Agenda Item #5 was withdrawn by Ms. Fenimore at the February 23, 2023, meeting.

Public Comment for Agenda Item #3 & #4

Roberto:

Thank you very much. Roberto, Managing Director, Icon CDC, longtime employed and working in Pacoima for the last 25 years. I want to thank the County. I want to thank the County for allowing us to be able to have this conversation, to have this dialogue, to be able to actually, to have community come together in a democratic process and speak to what we believe the Whiteman Airport should become. I want to thank the tenants and plane owners at Whiteman Airport. For the last 75 years, they have been the stewards of this incredibly important location, incredibly important resource for LA and for the community, and have preserved a large portion of land in our community into the present. But now it's time to move on and allow for the community to pursue another future, one that addresses the community's need for housing, jobs, community serving retail, and open space.

Now is time to move on in the 21st century and look at what that property can be, what that land can do, what it can do in terms of redress to the Tataviam tribe, who has been sorely affected by urbanization and civilization in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. Now it's time for community organizations to come together and with the County and with the stakeholders, look at this, what kinds of jobs, what kind of housing, affordable housing, and open space, and to finally address long, long time environmental issues that continue to plague Pacoima for decades. Now is the time to basically move on and to accept the fact that while we have a good and solid history, it is now time to change and now time to return that land to the local indigenous population and to the community that needs it. Thank you.

Bob:

I'd like to applaud the engagement of HMMH for their analysis and observations about the Airport. I think it was excellent. I think that the Motion that recommends the constraint, the very severe constraint, is a very dangerous Motion because the FAA requires the Airport to work to be a break-even Airport economically, and that motion constrains operations so dramatically, that the airport will not be able to survive financially. Then I'd like to address Ms. Alderson's motion. I thought it was excellent. I would like to see more specificity on the operation of the Advisory Council and how their communications with the commission will be transmitted and how they will be received. But I think that it sets the basis for conducting the business of aviation that is so desperately needed and is very, very important to Pacoima because it's a big economic engine in the community. And I think those are show aspects of what's going to be happening. I think that I would like to see a recommendation in Ms. Alderson's motion for safety in the operation of aircraft with respect to maintenance and periodic checks. But that can come at a later date. I thank you for the opportunity to speak. Good evening.

Jim:

I would like to first speak to oppose motion number three to close the airport. The motion has a number of problems with it. The, prohibiting the sale of unleaded fuel is prohibited by the FAA. They require that the airports continue to make unleaded or leaded low-lead fuel available until the suitable drop-in replacement has been identified and becomes universally available. And to

prohibit the use of aircraft that use unleaded fuel would be cumbersome at best because aircraft coming to the airport from other parts of the country do not have any options for getting unleaded fuel. And so now you're closing an airport to people who have a legitimate need to use the airport.

With regard to recommendation number four, I support it. I believe that it addresses all the issues that have concerned the community. It has provisions to address the noise problems, the pollution problems, and the safety problems, while still allowing the airport to remain, and remain open, as a viable part of the community.

And with regard to jobs that have been mentioned, there are a number of companies that would love to bring businesses to the airport that are going to employ a large number of people in the vertical takeoff and landing air taxi business in both the manufacturing and maintenance of those aircraft. And Whiteman could be a hub for training people in those areas as well as employing those people after they're trained right there in Pacoima's neighborhood. So, I believe that it is the best motion to go forward with and it will serve the community the best. Thank you.

Burton:

I realized that the motions on the agenda from Charles Nelson and Jean Fenimore were incorporated into the motion that Penny Alderson were covered in that. I think that Penny Alderson's proposal and motion is both a comprehensive and sensible and practical approach to dealing with the airport situation.

In regard to the motion introduced by Veronica Padilla-Campos, I do have some issues with them and the second item prohibiting the sale and storage of leaded aviation fuel. I don't think it's practical to prohibit that until unleaded aviation fuel is available. For the fourth item on there, new air conditioning units for all of the housing units around there. I don't see how that's applicable. I skipped something in the third item there, where the departing aircraft, I can see putting limits on that except for the things noted here. I think there's a punctuation problem with that. Just the fact that only medical emergency and military flights are exempt. I would think any kind of emergency perhaps there needs to be a comma between medical and emergency and military flights if that were to be the case, because I don't think it's practical to exempt just those.

The housing units in the San Fernando Gardens, only the ones to the very west of that are directly adjacent to the airport, so I don't see how the other one should be included. Thank you.

AnnaKaren:

To address Ms. Penny Alderson's motion, I appreciate your work and putting this together. I do also want to point out that in Supervisor's motion to have this better determine what the future operations of the airport would be to benefit the community, the end of operations is also an option that needs to be considered and that the community has been pushing for and it's incredibly valid. I want to highlight that and the fact that just yesterday, the request for proposal documents to provide full serve and self-serve fueling services at Whiteman Airport was approved, meaning this would reduce the amount of jobs at the airport while increasing

profits. And it's clear that the airport is not prioritizing creating jobs at this moment. And I don't see how that's going to happen in the future, especially if we're going to start doing self serve and self-serve fueling services.

The priority is clearly profits over the people in the community. To address the second motion that I do want to support, because I do want to reiterate that prohibiting the use of leaded fuel is protecting the community, the public health and safety of a community that for decades has been living with the emissions of leaded fuel. Just because someone else doesn't understand why folks can't open their windows and need AC units because there's no fresh air outside. Lead never leaves the environment and it continues to accumulate in the system. And that's why it's important to also move forward with a study on the blood lead level content of children living a mile radius away from the airport. It's been proven that other communities living adjacent to airports have experienced the same issues, so that's why I support that motion. Thank you.

David:

First, I think we've been overlooking the idea that the county's charge to this group was to maintain the property's primary function as an airport. We've been hijacked by a bunch of vocal people who are wanting to bring it down. The idea of unleaded fuel is a moot point because it's coming, and it will come relatively soon. California has the highest priority in the country of getting that fuel into the distribution system. The idea of ready, fire, aim with the idea of windows that would be soundproofed is crazy. Do a study first to find out which ones need it and address only those. The idea of not accepting federal funds is also not very wise because when it's available, why should the county spend our own money? Take money from around the whole country to use it for these various things.

I think that this group has completely failed to address the real thing that it's about. And that is how can this use space at this airport best be used? I've made the suggestion before, and I've heard it go absolutely nowhere that perhaps we should construct some dorms and maybe even classrooms for such STEM things. But the dorms I had in mind were for people who graduate out of the foster care system because I remember how I felt when I heard that people when they turn 18 and they have no place to go, I would not have fared very well myself. There's an area where the helicopter operations could have been improved significantly except for the financing fell through a year or two ago. Those ideas have not been explored by this group at all. And I think the group should be ashamed of itself for not exploring those things and getting sidetracked into the idea of closing the airport. Thank you.

Matthew:

Good evening everyone. I'm Matthew, a local pilot who flies out of Whiteman and has been around the airport forever. I'd like to say that the Alderson motion is good, and I agree with a new advisory committee being established with the proviso added that, let's not waste any more time with Pacoima Beautiful. This CAC gave Pacoima Beautiful a seat at the table three actually. And all Pacoima Beautiful did with this is deny the facts, ignore the community and push their politics. The community deserves better than that. With that said, the Padilla motion is still worth looking over. The Padilla Motion prioritizes politics over public safety by arbitrarily restricting funding, which would have a negative effect on safety. Just as Pacoima Beautiful's

actions in 2011 hurt the safety of the community by restricting safety zones at the edges of the Airport. Now the motion further demands that you, the taxpayer, finance work to redevelop this public land for private use and private profit.

And along the way, it pushes to exclude millions of Angelenos on this with the bogus proximity restrictions on three miles, or whatever it is, that would exclude people from all over the county who, this airport belongs to them. It is a county airport. So, there's no place for these proximity restrictions. Further Padilla's motion condemns the aviation commission for having qualified knowledgeable officials who know what they're talking about on aviation for no reason. I suppose they would prefer that her preference is to have people reading off these scripted sheets of information given to them. The Alderson motion reflects best. What we've seen is the will of the community throughout these meetings. Only a tiny minority has ever backed closure, and they've all mostly come from one group. The Alderson motion is the natural choice. Thank you. Have a good night.

Stephen:

So first, the motion by Ms. Padilla-Campos, I think is misguided. It's a mishmash of pipe dreams and attempts to usurp FAA authority in several cases and generally is unrealistic. I think without solid plans for what would happen to the airport afterwards, I think it would eventually just become home to another developer's strip mall or something equivalent to that. I just don't think it's a viable solution and fails to address the concerns of, as noted, the majority of the participants in this committee and the community.

Secondly, I think Ms. Alderman's motion is robust. It's responsive to the community, it's practical, it's realistic. It addresses concerns about safety with realistic approaches to solving any safety issues and environmental issues such as phasing out of low leaded gas, the noise abatement procedures that could be put into place and access to federal funding for those activities. I wholeheartedly support Ms. Alderson's motion, and with that, I'll yield back my time.

Josh:

So, first of all, I wholeheartedly support this motion. I believe aviation has become a paramount function of our society. And the educational opportunities Whiteman has to offer are just too valuable to sacrifice. Truly re-envisioning the airport means improving the airport and making it more of an asset for the community.

It should serve the youth as a safe haven for learning and understanding the STEM pursuits that will benefit not only the local community, but the world in general. The community's voice is still a major priority within this motion, and there are concerns about their health and they're completely valid. And it's all being taken into consideration in an ongoing process. So I wholeheartedly support that. And I believe additional outreach to the educational community is huge and should be the greatest emphasis of this motion, and with that, I yield my time. Thank you.

Teodora:

Thank you. Hi everyone. My name is Teodora. I grew up here in Pacoima, in Northeast San Fernando Valley, and I'm a supporter of Motion three and a supporter of the shutdown of Whiteman Airport. Today I'm calling to urge you and committee members to please support Motion three in order uphold LA County and the FAA accountable for the detrimental health, safety and environmental impacts Whiteman Airport has had on Pacoima.

Throughout the duration of the CAC process, there's continuous asks of more information upon the environmental impacts, the negative impacts that Whiteman Airport has had in our community. That was something that we definitely haven't gotten our answers to. But regardless, the county and federal agencies must prioritize the public safety of Pacoima residents and communities living under the flight path. We know that every plane that takes off and lands at Whiteman, Airport, even if it doesn't crash, poses a significant threat to our community's health, safety and wellbeing.

And although they may not be physical, these effects do show up generationally and also through mental health issues. Through that, we know we never have peace or quiet in our community. There's always the 24-hour operations. And for these reasons, we really want to push the committee members to please support motion three and recommend to the board of supervisors that scenario one, airport closure, is pursued. Because again, we are asking to prohibit the sale, storage, and use leaded aviation gas, address noise and air quality impacts for residents, and additional sound barriers, implement additional health studies, implement re-development studies, and implement emergency responses. We have prioritized public health versus profit, and at this point we know that Whiteman Airport should definitely be closed, and we're done carry the health burden.

Victoria:

Thank you. I guess my comment today is just to say that the community has been clear about wanting to keep Whiteman Airport open and envisioning a different Whiteman Airport. We want youth programming specific to aviation. We want job opportunities. We want it to not look like an eye-sore. And I also just wanted to mention during this discussion that I believe it would be disingenuous to vote for closure on the basis of health and safety because there has been no evidence of adverse health impacts, no scientific studies at all. And I know that again, during that Pacoima Neighborhood Council meeting where a committee member here spoke on it, it was acknowledged as such that there have been no scientific studies. I believe the phrase was "no fancy studies." I think we need studies. I think we need to know what the health and environmental impacts are on an ongoing basis.

But, right now there is no evidence of any adverse health impacts. There have been studies, some of them show that it's not bad at all at other small airports. I think that the Padilla-Campos motion has some good points in it. Whatever we can add, whatever you could add to the Alderson motion would be great. Let's do as much as we can keep the county as accountable as we can, not let go. I just wanted to reassure the CAC that a vote to keep the airport open is not a vote against the community because they've been so clear. At Pacoima Neighborhood Council, which is full of amazing community members and stakeholders in every neighborhood

council in the Northeast San Fernando, which is full of amazing community members and stakeholders, have voted to keep it open. Thank you.

Melisa:

Yeah. Hi everyone. My name is Melisa, and I just first want to say thank you to CAC members for being here for another long meeting. I want to say that I'm in support of agenda item three, Veronica Campos' motion. I would just like to comment and say that this motion not only addresses a lot of the injustices that community members have faced because of this airport, but also creates a line of restorative justice in a way that can really restore community members and their health and wellness, and also just spirit in general. It's time to re-envision the airport into a space where families and friends can come together and not a space where a lot of community members feel left out of. Thank you. I yield my time.

Matt:

I'd like to just state that having followed the procedures of this committee, I don't think it's done a particularly good job meeting its mandate of re-envisioning Whiteman Airport. That said, I most support the Alderson motion going forward. I think it's the most comprehensive and the most realistic representing the 29 Mountain View Homeowners Association, which lives not far away in Sylmar.

We support keeping the airport open as much as possible. We support keeping all of the firefighting assets and other emergency management benefits that it would provide in good standing. We are very concerned that the closure of the airport will actually have an extremely negative effect, not just on Pacoima, but on the surrounding neighborhoods. Having personally witnessed what happened with the closure of the Hughes Airport on the west side, it took an area that had a very similar economic profile to Pacoima at the time, and allowed developers to come in and gentrify the neighborhood to the point where most families that had lived in that area for generations were forced out because they just simply could not afford the area. The area also became exceptionally difficult with traffic and other issues, and we foresee that happening, especially with no actual re-envisioning of the area.

We are concerned that there was not enough scientific research done into the health effects. We definitely support the people of Pacoima, and we absolutely support the usage of any federal funds that are available for noise abatement and for any other health and safety measures that can be provided. And yes, we do support the restriction of leaded gasoline as soon as that is possible. But the airport itself should remain open. It should remain available both as a very, very necessary flight school, which is important not just to the region and to the history of this region, but also to just the transportation of people and goods around this country. And to the educational opportunities it provides and also the economic benefits that it provides to the area. Please go with the Alderson amendment. Thank you very much.

Lisa:

I'd just like to make a couple of comments. In 2017, the Santa Monica Airport shortened their runways. All of that air traffic now goes to the Van Nuys Airport. The Santa Monica Airport is scheduled to close permanently in 2028, which means all of that air traffic will be going to the

Van Nuys Airport. And if Whiteman was to close, that traffic would also more than likely end up at the Van Nuys Airport, which is currently already busting at the seams and annoying the community. I'd also like to add the leaded aviation fuel is coming. We have it at the Van Nuys Airport currently. So it is there and it's coming. And I think people underestimate how important it is to have emergency services that close to your homes in case of a fire or a search and rescue and those kinds of things. So I vote that we keep Whiteman open so that it doesn't put an undue burden on the Van Nuys Airport, which is already taking the brunt of the burden from the Santa Monica closing. Thank you.

Crystal:

Thank you. I'd like to first say thank you to the community members in attendance and Pacoima Beautiful for the work that you do in the face of overwhelming opposition and in the face of harassment, dog whistles. I believe this motion is the most comprehensive and considerate of the community surrounding the airport. I believe that economic opportunities do not outweigh the negative impacts or the trauma this community faces. And I also believe that as the city of Los Angeles, we can figure out a way to make these things work. We've never been ones to say things are too hard. So with that being said, I yield the rest of my time.

John:

The motion by Ms. Alderson calls for environmental studies to assess the airport's environmental and health risks. But we've known for some time now that Whiteman Airport is the largest identified toxic source emitter in Pacoima. The motion by Ms. Alderson calls for the creation of local jobs, establishment of community meeting space, educational space, a restaurant, open space...all these things and more can happen in a future without Whiteman Airport. I am for the motion introduced by Ms. Padilla-Campos. Compared to an airport that restricts airspace contributes to pollution and serves very few, I can't think of anything more beneficial than the immediate closure of Whiteman Airport and hopefully something radical like a park that would be a free and open space that serves the entire community. I yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

Myer:

I support this motion. This whole conversation has me with a lot of questions actually hearing support for the alternate motion for keeping the airport open. I really like to ask who is actually benefiting from this airport staying open economically? Is it really the community? It sounds like most of the people benefiting are folks outside of the community. This community has been impacted by numerous sources of air pollution, water pollution for decades. This one, although there haven't been studies specifically on the airport, which is a major problem itself, we all know that these petrochemicals and other chemicals that are spewed by the airplanes, leaded fuel in particular, pose huge health impacts to youth goes, it on for generations. And it includes cancer, asthma, numerous things. I doubt that anyone speaking supporting the airport would like these in their children. Thank you.

Lisa:

Yeah, so I just want to thank everybody for bringing a lot of issues to the table. And I know it's been difficult for Pacoima Beautiful at times, but I'm willing to say I'm supportive hearing their ideas and concerns. I am the Aviation Explorer lead advisor for the Aviation Explorer Post 747. We scholarship youth and have done it for 21 years now, supporting youth in fields of aviation. We scholarship them for half of their training for whichever field that they choose to go into. I am grateful for viewpoints on both sides of the aisle here.

I'd also like to say that in considering both motions, the Padilla-Campos to me appears to be more of a special interest motion where I see the Alderson motion number four as a motion that is the best meeting of the minds and concerns of not only the airport and what's happening with all of the businesses there and the activities for the youth there as also the community and the community's concerns. So I am thrilled to hear this motion by Ms. Alderson because I think it keeps the future of the youth of in the San Fernando Valley a priority, as well as keeping the safety concerns a priority. So with that, I'll yield the rest of my time.

James:

Yeah, yeah. I just want to support it wholeheartedly. It's a beautiful motion and it covers every complaint and aspect of the airport. I really appreciate her bringing it forward. I totally support the opening of the airport, leaving the airport open and concentrating on the community and leaving all the benefits of the airport available to the community so that they can enjoy it. Thank you again.

Wanda:

Yes. My husband and I from a very poor background, but over time my husband was able to learn to fly at Whiteman Airport and my son also there. We've been participants at Whiteman since the mid 1970s. And I would like to offer that the field of aviation has really opened up the world for us. And it's possible to open up the world for other people, especially the children in Pacoima if they would benefit from a STEM education. I believe that Whiteman would be a great resource. It's a good place to learn. But the other thing I would like to make a case for is that we as people who are responsible for protecting our infrastructure, we are responsible. We should perceive our local airport as a essential infrastructure, part of a national transportation system integrated into a global system. My husband eventually flew for American Airlines, so we should protect our local airport because there aren't very many left people are going after them. It should be just like protecting housing, hospitals, schools, social gathering venues like theaters, museums, streets, freeways. And I know that the city has maybe neglected Pacoima, but then we should review what the zoning function is of the Los Angeles Charter. So now that our Los Angeles government has allowed building multifamily housing right by the airport, now they find it not safe related to a lot of health issues. But they were safe when they built all those apartments down the street on Osborne. So I think we really do need to reconsider how important is our airport, which can be a staging station in the future if there's an earthquake or there's a fire. We did summer evacuation to the airport when we had to evacuate.

California:

Yes, I agree with the Alderson proposal number four in that it's going to slow down the process and do more research. When Vice President Kamala Harris was our attorney general in California, she was negotiating with banks for wrongful foreclosures. They initially offered the state of California two to three billion dollars. Well, she waited and analyzed it more and ended up getting 25 billion dollars for the state of California. Slowing down and looking at all the process like in motion four would be what's best with the community because it's not broken. There's no hurry to do anything with it right now other than keeping it for all the reasons everyone has stated.

Fire rescue. Climate change is real. Fires are going to happen. Why would anyone want to close one of only four airports in the city of Los Angeles? Cause once it's gone, you can't go back. Anything else that could be built on that property could go anywhere else. Housing, retail, even a park could go somewhere else. But the airport is already there and it's on the side of a mountain. One of the safest places. You could have an airport, if it's less than a hundred airplanes take off and land from that Airport, but that's right now. Who knows with electric airplanes that are already being made, that are lighter and more efficient and safer. Who would've thought 30 years ago that people could have a computer on the palm of their hand and now you could. How do you know what's in the future? How do you know you're not going to need that air park in Pacoima for drone deliveries, for electric personal aircraft? You don't know. Why do something for today? The developer want to cash out on it now for today, but we need to slow down and think about the future, 20, 30, 40, 50 years from now. Thank you.

Gary:

Well, I'll be responding to the two. I find this whole process extremely supported by emotion and self-serving. You've got people who want free windows, and they want free air conditioners, and that's a gift of public funds. This was not justified over the last 70 years when this Airport was built. You've got politicians, many that are hellbent to create densification and is that going to be something they're going to be happy with when they convert all that acreage and the emergency services, there are so many benefits to the community from that Airport and of great concern is those who are pilots and students and people who are employed.

Since when does the United States of America discriminate against what I've heard referred to as a minority. It's not going to happen. Anyone who takes this to the Supreme Court I think is going to have a hell of a case. You're surrounded on three sides by freeways. You're complaining about leaded fuel by a few planes. You refer to a hundred thousand flights. How about millions of cars that are flowing around you on three freeways on three sides of you? You have not done any studies. You have not justified nor supported the position that this emotional response is taking. Thank you.

Scott:

All right, so I just wanted to say that I don't support the first motion to keep the Airport open because all the people in this community, they say that the community wants this place, but the people who are coming to these places to speak are those pilots and not the actual people who

live in that community, and they say that the youth, it's important to make programs for them, but the majority of the population in that community is mainly older residents and there's a lot of complications with the air pollution that can affect them, which is a reason why I support to close down the Airport. There's a transit line that's going to be constructed right adjacent to the Airport, which can... Being created to make transit-oriented development near that place to make maybe apartments that don't have parking lots to create affordable low-income housing for people to move into that community, so we can make empowerment for the low income who live there. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

Murry:

When an Airport is facing pressure to close, there's usually developer money behind this effort and they don't have the local residents' interest in mind. The development generally involves up-scaling and there may be a smattering of low-income housing put in. I think the forces against the Airport have maybe ulterior motives. I want to give example. San Fernando used to have an Airport, and I believe it's a flea market now. I'm not sure that is a desirable outcome. I favor keeping the Airport open, expanding the outreach to local residents, and I yield rest of my time.

Nato:

My name is Nato, and I'm a pilot. I ran a business in Sun Valley, which is not far from the Airport for 30 years. I employed 47 people. The concern regarding leaded fuel I think is going to go away because unleaded fuel for aviation is coming within the year. They've been working on it for 10 years now and it's almost here. I really believe that the Airport can work with a community and come up with a plan that is mutually beneficial to both in terms of housing, shopping and education for the kids. We just have to work on it together and I believe that can be done. Thank you very much.

Thomas:

Hi, good evening. Thank you for your time. I'd like to speak on both motions. So I'd like to encourage keeping the Airport open and if necessary, look into using proper studies, potential health issues, but consider the fact that the area is surrounded by freeways, by homelessness. There are probably many problems that could contribute to health issues in the area. Also, just don't rush through this. Don't rush through this decision to close the Airport. Take time because I've heard some fantastic comments this evening that are enlightening and agree that there should be no rushed decisions and this Airport benefits the community tremendously.

I'm also an Air Explorer participant. I'm an assistant advisor, and I see tremendous opportunity for youth. This is a great cornerstone of the community, and yet, it's unfortunate that there are some side effects of having an Airport, but I think those can be addressed. Again, long-term benefits are extremely valuable and including the unforeseen, as another gentleman suggested. In the future, 20, 30 years from now, it might be regrettable to lose this Airport in favor of more housing developments, more high-density housing and retail shops. That's what will end up there unfortunately. Thank you for your time and I'll give back the rest of it.

Crystal:

Hi. Yes. My name is Crystal, and I am a community member. I am in support of the shutdown Whiteman Airport and motion three. I do not feel like you guys have engaged the community enough, so I would like to see a lot more community engagement so that you guys can move forward with your decision. That's it. Thank you.

Raymond:

No, I just wanted to actually make a comment. I'm for keeping the Airport open and I just wanted to speak out on... My family's been in Pacoima since the forties or Pacoima, Arleta for many years. Back to when I was younger, a lot of us growing up, we didn't even think about other things, either being a police officer or a firefighter, everything else seemed out of reach. Now I got a niece that's actually going to that Airport. She's 17 years old. All her family, her father, all still live in Pacoima. She wants to be a pilot. That's something that we never even thought of coming up in the eighties and earlier ages, but I think it's important to keep it open, maybe make some adjustments to it, but I am a community member. I don't work at the Airport and honestly, I believe that a lot of these developers, they take advantage of the people in Pacoima Arleta. If they sell it to them and then the developers come, they tell them it's going to be low income.

Many times, that's not the case. I have a home, so I'm pretty sure my home will increase if they get rid of it, but I'm a people person as well, so I'm a benefit of, you know what? We got to take care of the people. If they take that place down, a lot of those places are going to go up in price and they got their rail lines going through and a lot of people are going to come back to the valley, which is good for current homeowners, but at the same time, all the rest of the people are going to be pushed out. I'm for keeping it open and keeping people here and taking care of them. Thank you.

Lea:

I just wanted to express my support for Penny Alderson and for the motion she's put forward. I think it's very important that we are addressing the needs of the community and making sure that that it is fully considered and at the same time finding a fair compromise that works for everybody. I do believe that there's a way to have everybody have some sort of way that works for them and for also the pilots and the different aviators in the community. I want to thank the committee for all their time. I know this has been very drawn out and I would really hope that you guys could consider emotion that's appeasing to both sides rather than one person winning and the other not. Thank you.

Martin:

I just want to say that I strongly support the Alderson proposal. It really hits the important points, in particular the commissioning of real studies and the space for education. These are high scale STEM jobs that will really benefit the communities, that will lead to high paying jobs. I think that will be an important aspect of re-envisioning the Airport. The other aspect, which I haven't seen quite as much but I would encourage to consider is the fact that the future of aviation is undoubtedly unleaded. As somebody mentioned, Van Nuys sells 94 unleaded fuel

today. There's no reason Whiteman shouldn't be able to do so in short order. The second aspect is that the future of aviation is electric or hybrid. I would encourage what if we could imagine a scenario where we would facilitate schools that provide electric training aircrafts as opposed to exclusively regular engines, so more advanced re-imagining of the Airport. Thank you.

Candy:

I spent quite a bit of time in my youth in Pacoima, lived in Sylmar, off of Phillippi, and I actually saw that Airport come to fruition on top of San Fernando closing. It's always been a wonderful part of the community and I am just shocked, and I'm with you Mr. Arias, that there isn't more dialogue on this. I know we've had 18 months. I happened to be out at the Airport one day when they had the fair. I believe it was this committee that they had the different ideas, and I was thrilled to think... I was trying to imagine the platform being built. They can mention the platform. I would like to see the community take an interest in making it a more viable, safer way, but that Airport is located next to a train track and it's not like that's going to be a safer place to build housing.

I can't even believe that they would take something that's viable, that's full of people's businesses, with education. You've got one of the most active civil air patrol squadrons down in the entire state in the San Fernando Valley. The amount of work that they do for safety in the San Fernando Valley is unbelievable. I haven't heard all the comments. I try to make it down to the meeting and it was really chaotic, but I also know when you go online, that it's a total different type of meeting form too. I work in education. I love to see the STEM program and what it brings to that Airport, and I strongly support the Penny Alderson one and make the improvements you need to make. We're always in the room with that, but the motion to close this Airport is just obscene. Thank you.

Connie:

I've heard both sides. I'm a new resident to San Fernando, and I see a lot of nonprofits pushing for it to close. When this idea first occurred, I remember that a lot of the comments and the committees were set up around nonprofits and they were chosen. They were never elected by the people that lived around there, and when we brought this up to council, it was never changed. With that being said, the fact that you guys want to close the Airport and not much data has shown what kind of traffic we're going to get for people that live between Van Nuys and the Burbank Airport, which will be the next closest one. We're already getting air traffic enough where people that work from home don't get enough internet signal. Now that we're going to be getting even heavier traffic, if this is closed, it's something to consider in addition to the programs they have.

Ernesto:

Yes. Okay. I just like to say that it is the community that is pushing to close this eyesore of an Airport that has been just parasitic entity in our community for over 70 years already. It's outside interest that come into our community, use this place, and then they complain that the community doesn't want it. They're very chauvinistic people that do not care about us. That site was proposed to be used as Los Angeles Mission College in the 1980s. They obviously refuted

that. They didn't want that to happen. That site could be a lot more for the community, but obviously, they don't want that. The community is the one pushing to remove this place. We need parks, we need places where we could congregate. We need places where we could do a lot more than having this place that just dirties our air. Really, nobody in the community uses it. That's just the truth. Thank you.

Ana:

Yes. I would love to see the Airport to shut down, but I would like immediate accountability if the Airport remains open, that there is lead testing, that there is the soundproof windows, that there is all the necessary things to maintain the health of the community while there's a transition to closing this Airport that is very much unnecessary. Thank you so much. My name's Ana. Gracias.

Marco:

The first motion is Pacoima Beautiful. Obviously, there's some kind of development agenda behind them, which is council district seven, Monica Rodriguez, which is a city council member, not a county supervisor. I've seen in the past in the council district seven where a lot of stuff has gone on and we can use other people as an example, like Mark Ridley-Thomas, Jose Huizar, so those are a few examples of what does go on behind closed doors. The other agenda I'd like to talk about is the Alderson. I think this Airport can stay open, should stay open, and we must teach our kids to be future aeronautics, pilots, mechanics, air traffic controllers. This would be a good place for many things to keep this Airport open. Also, they're not talking about the trains that go by, which is freight and passenger Metrolink, so that's high pollution right there. And hopefully with this new sheriff that we have, he will be investigating what's going on here to this backroom deals to this property. So let's keep this airport open. Unfortunately, somebody's going to be going to jail, won't be today, but it will be in the future. And just think of those previous council members. Thank you.

Jennifer:

Looks like aviation has taken a big part of my heart as my late husband has passed away and he has taken a liking to it. And I live here in Mission Hills and with that comes the trauma of grief. And I believe utilizing the space for aviation is a great portion to be a premier space for even incorporating military. And as I'm in martial arts and being able to know a lot of renowned people to create a space to bring up the name of Pacoima, to re-envision, to engage more community, to open up spaces for even restaurants like 94th Arrow back in Van Nuys, which is closed, allowing more community involvement. I'd love to be a part to spearhead this, re-envisioning even the monetary aspects as I'm also a CPA and have worked on aviation to somehow be able to be an asset for this community to be one of four.

I just want to share my own input of wanting to be involved in this process to really marry the community and the airport so that we can really look up to the pilots and the education as I'm also in education as teaching both trauma, tax, building equity, so that we can also build the education together. That's all I got to say. I believe the infrastructures need to be looked into.

And again, extra eyes, however we can re-distribute or work together, I'd love to just be a part of it. That's all I got to share. Thank you so much.

Trinidad:

Hola, buenos noches. Me llamo Trinidad, pertenezco a la comunidad y favorezco la moción #3 que pide cerrar el Aeropuerto Whiteman.

Hello, good night. I am Trinidad. I belong to the community, and I favor motion #3 asking for the closing of Whiteman Airport.

Cindy:

Hello, my name is Cindy, and I live in Pacoima, and I am a supporter of the shutdown Whiteman Airport. And I vote yes on Motion three. Thank you very much.

Maria:

Hola, buenas tardes, me llamo Maria. Estoy de acuerdo que cierren el aeropuerto. Hay mucho ruido y no se puede dormir. Tengo asma y cancer debido al aeropuerto. Mis vecinos también quieren cerrar el aeropuerto.

Hello, Good evening, my name is Maria. I support closing the airport. There is a lot of noise and one cannot sleep. I have asthma and cancer due to the airport been close to my house. My neighbors also favor shutting down the airport.

Judy:

Hola me llamo Judy Mena y estoy a favor del cierre del aeropuerto de la moción #3.

Hello, I am Judy Mena I am in support of motion #3 to close the airport.

Manny:

Hello, my name is Manny. I'm Connie's husband and I support the airport. I do not support its closure. And the reason I'm saying that is because it brings a lot of good stuff to the community. Honestly, I really do believe that there's lots that I can provide. It's home to numerous businesses. Glendale Community College has a pilot training program there. Various non-profit aviation organizations are there. They do the free airplane rides for kids that I enjoy taking my sons to. They love getting up close and personal with all the aircraft. And according to economic impact analysis for the county owned airports, Whiteman Airport directly supports approximately 275 jobs, representing about 22.7 million in the employee wages. Overall, the airport and surrounding communities, I believe they benefit for over 112 million in total airport related, direct, indirect, and induced in spending each year.

I just think that there's a lot that is good right there because I'm sure there's a fire station there. I think it's home to law enforcement and firefighting operations, medical services and youth programs. So they provide spaces for community events. I think it's a good thing. And really honestly, the airport has so much good to do. Closing it would be just very sad and detrimental

economically, even according to the public Information office for public works for the LA County, they even say it's an economic engine. It's part of the airports that we have around here. We have Van Nuys Airport, we have the Hollywood Airport over in Burbank, we have Whiteman Airport, we have about three, four surrounding airports. LAX down further south, they're just going to get diverted and it's going to be worse for other neighborhoods. So it's good that they spread it all out like that. Thank you.

Denise:

An airport that serves approximately, I think I saw somewhere, 600 individuals, 500 personnel and 20 businesses, yet the city has a population of over 70,000. How is it equitable that we're keeping this space open to just a few individuals? I understand the impact of businesses there or the individuals that work there, but the reality is with a population of 70,000 individuals, we should be creating a space that serves those individuals, that serves a community as a whole and truly to make it more equitable for everyone. And with that I yield my time.

Mariam:

Yes, I do support Whiteman Airport. I completely concur with Manny. He is absolutely right and if people are suggesting having space, you better come up with something to put in that space. This space is originally meant for an airport. It's not designed to have anything else in there. At that airport has a very important role for our community as far as emergency services, as far as our youth and everything else. It's not designed just for selected few. A lot of people wrongly believe that this airport belongs to selective few. It doesn't. It belongs to our community, our children. It has a role to play and there could be nothing better in its space. Thank you.

Alicia:

So, my name is actually Alicia. Adalia is my mom's name, which is the Zoom account. I'm an aviation explorer in Whiteman Airport. So, we meet at Whiteman Airport and I've been getting to learn a lot about aviation. And I'm also part of the Young Eagles program where I help about a hundred kids a month get their first free flight in an airplane, which I have to say is just one of the best experiences ever, to get to fly. And it opens us up to an entire field of careers and interests. And I'm also part of the airplane build where we're actually building a two seat airplane from a kit and we're learning a lot of mechanical skills and teamwork and it's helping a lot more kids than people realize.

Norma:

I'm just so lucky to have been able to join this meeting right now. I was at another meeting, and I was so worried about this and missing this opportunity and I just got so inspired by this young lady who spoke before me because those are the people we're fighting for. We speak of equitable, we want women in the science in the STEM programs and she's the perfect example. And I advocate for all the other children and youth who like aviation and who want to stay away from our typical jobs, retailer jobs and restaurants and so on. So I applaud this lady and everybody else who supports this airport. It's meant to be there. It helps with the traffic control

and it also provides emergency responders place to be located. And I just strongly support keeping the Whiteman open. Thank you. I yield my time.

Following Public Comment on Agenda Items #4 and #5, the CAC members discussed the motions. Their vote after the discussion is shared on page 1.

General Public Comment for the Final Meeting

Gabe:

Yes. I want to thank you for allowing us to speak, and I wanted to commend the county and what they're doing today. It's not the same county that we had as of a year ago. It relates to the county not helping out the airports today is not the same. We're seeing Paul. The chief now is very active, and it also goes both ways. The community has not reached out to the airports as well. I've noticed that in the past. I've been part of the airports all my life. I am now 64. I had a flight school for 20 years, and I've lived and breathed the airport. Anybody wants to take a test on my blood, you'll find I have no lead in my blood. So, there's no poison, as people are leading the community to believe, but with that all said, I still want to commend the community for reaching out. I want to commend the county for also reaching out the other direction. I hope we can get something good. Thank you.

Garry:

Yes. Thank you. I find it very sad that it hasn't been clearly stated that the community is not involved, they are not engaged. It is extremely easy to destroy anything. It's very hard to build something and each community working together with the airport. And by the way, those who use the airport are members of the community and to denigrate them is unjust. If the community would stand together and demand that the FAA get involved, bring in radar and federal funding and fight for unleaded fuel and the other things united, you stand, united, you'll succeed in all the things that you're complaining about, but to destroy accomplishes nothing except high densification. Thank you.

Burton:

Yes. Thank you. I just want to thank all of the Public Works and CAC members for the work you've put into this. It's commendable. In regard to the comment that Yvonne Mariajimenez made earlier regarding the noise study report given at a previous in-person CAC meeting, we asked some hard questions to the presenter of the study and his answers were that the study was done using an algorithm that was isolated, that isolated only noises that typically comes from aircraft. He stated that to us in attendance that there was no part of the study done comparing aircraft noise in relation to automobile truck noises from nearby streets, nor comparing the amount of aircraft noise compared to passing train traffic. The algorithm eliminated ... the study of all of those noises. Those noise levels will not go away even if the airport is closed.

Lea:

Okay. So my name is Lea. I am currently an aviation science major, and I am also a student pilot. I feel very discouraged by what we heard tonight. I really hope that the LA County Board of Supervisors can really come up with something that doesn't just benefit one side. I would like to state that if we could find some sort of compromise, I personally am willing to do outreach any groups. I am willing to start Women in Aviation international chapter, host a Girls in Aviation Day. There are so many scholarships and programs supporting minority groups in aviation and in STEM and to support the people of Pacoima. My concern is if we do turn this land into something else, will they really listen to the needs of the people or will this become the gentrification of Pacoima that pushes our people out into places where they no longer have a home for their own. Thank you.

Jim:

Hello. First I'd like to direct some comments towards Veronica relative to assisting in outreach from the Airport. I have asked members of Pacoima Beautiful, had discussions with them about trying to get into the schools with the civil air patrol. And they were saying, oh, we haven't seen you in the schools, and that's because we couldn't get into the schools. We've been barred because of Covid. And they were saying they were in the schools. I asked for their help, and I was told they wouldn't give it to me unequivocally and that the only way I could get help was if I did some kind of reparation to the community for damage I have not done. The other thing I'd like to comment on is I would ask that the county allow a minority report to be also forwarded to the board of supervisors relative to the use of the airport with the remaining open and the benefits of that so that they do see both sides on this. Thank you.

Wanda:

Okay. Anyway, I'm a retired nurse and university professor. I'm into education and STEM. I do not hear any positive objective goals presented by the Close the Airport people. There is no proof that anything beneficial to the people of Pacoima will be built, created, and available. There are many lots that are empty filled with trash that nobody's cleaning up, but they want to build something on Whiteman Airport. It is such a valuable resource that needs to be used by the community for a lot of different things. I don't hear any objective plans. It's just close, it's lead, it's damaged, it's this, it's that. Tell me what you're going to build and put it in writing in a stone, not 10 years from now, we're going to have another trash mall. We already have those.

Chris:

Hi. Yes. I have been attending the CAC from the beginning and they were not made accessible. These meetings were not made accessible to the community. We were not engaged, we were not present. The few people that were present that did rebuttal and did say that we want the airport closed and gave our reasons why and gave also reasons what we would want to see in the space, what we would not want to see. All I hear from those who support the Whiteman Airport staying is using fear tactics to rebuttal what we want to see, what we don't want to see. And I don't think that's fair. I don't think it's okay. I am really proud of Veronica Padilla for standing up for us. I really do believe that.

Norma:

Thank you. Yes. The outcome of this vote came out exactly as expected. The committee did not represent the community. We were not heard. We are not getting anything beneficial for the community. Nothing compares to the STEM programs provided by the airport to a shopping center mall. Several meetings were created so that they would be in-person and give the community an opportunity to get engaged, but the community was not a show except for the people who are somehow involved with Pacoima Beautiful. Pacoima Beautiful does not represent me. I don't feel sorry for myself. I don't need any money. I don't need any freebies. We need the Whiteman Airport. Thank you.

Murry:

Hi. I want to remind people that the airport is federally protected open space. In another point, I believe we had EAA, EAA has 130 kids registered for Young Eagles flights Saturday, unfortunately, will probably be rained out, but we'll try again next month. And also, our bill is probably going to try to take place despite the rain this Saturday. And we need to keep the airport open for everybody.

Matthew:

Hi. Good evening, everyone. Matthew again. It's a disappointment but not a surprise to see Monica Rodriguez's handpicked associates voting her way. That's why they were selected. Bobby Arias is laughing. I guess he thinks the truth is funny.

Public comments tonight overwhelmingly supported keeping the airport as it has throughout this process, and they ignored that because they don't care about what the community has to say. They have an agenda here. Nearly all of the anti-airport comments you've heard tonight come from Pacoima Beautiful staff and associates they rushed in. For all that support they claim to have, they had to rush people in. Now, Veronica Padilla defensively denies developer involvement with her stance, yet I have a 2020 press release from Pacoima Beautiful that says in 2019, Pacoima Beautiful sponsored a report by Aquaria Funding Solutions. Roberto Barragan, who spoke earlier tonight, advocating development is in the head of Aquaria and worked with Veronica at ICON CDC. And Veronica also interviewed in...(speaking time up)

Lisa:

Hello again. Lisa, Aviation Explorer Post 737 and also I'm a San Fernando Valley Air. I'm a '99 woman pilot. And I just want to say again, thank you to everybody for this process. Appreciate all your input. I would also like to mention that when this process started, I did also, like Jim Miller, reached out to the Pacoima Beautiful leadership and said, hey, we haven't been as active as we should have been. Help us get in the schools. And I was told, "It's too little too late. We are not going to help you now." And we do have minorities in our explorer program and we do have people from Pacoima, young youths from Pacoima and the surrounding East Valley. And we're here to open up our arms to the community. We always have been. Our PR wasn't the best, but it is good now. Our banners have been up. Some of them been taken down, stolen,

graffitied, et cetera, but we're reaching out and we want the community to be involved with our programs for the youth.

Thomas:

Frankly, this last year has been quite frustrating. Whiteman Airport is valuable infrastructure. It has wonderful programs for STEMS. I hear champions and servers saying our goal is to help youth find better careers and so forth. I've invited Pacoima Beautiful people to come to a Young Eagles Day and see the kids. We've asked people to come to the build. They say, we don't know there's anything going on for their kids. But we've been unable to get the people generally on the CAC for the most part to even come. Bobby Arias has come and visited to his credit, but is something that is really makes Pacoima special to have a facility as great as Whiteman Airport. And with as many people reaching out, helping youth, it'd be really be a shame for those programs to be forced to go away. Thank you.

Teodora:

Hi. I wanted to say thank you to everyone who has participated in this process. When I became more aware of Whiteman Airport as a Pacoima resident who grew up in the area, I was very surprised. I looked into a bit more of the history behind the airport and even remember the airport when I grew up as Whitman Airport, something that I recognized as I grew up. I'm more grown is how I never even associated with the name Whiteman Airport. And that's a demand that was actually as well included earlier in the days of the advocates who started calling for closure is the change of an airport name. The airport has continued to show that it's a generational struggle to shut down the airport and really wanted to shout out and appreciate the folks who really are standing up for the environmental justice concerns that have been amplified throughout the process.

Mariam:

Oh yes. Yes. Hi. Okay. Once again, thank you. And I just wanted to say one more time, I vote against closing Whiteman Airport. It's very, very important for our community and for some reason I have a feeling that most of the people here are just selected few who vote for closure without completely understanding the importance of such an infrastructure in our community. We should be actually proud and lucky to have an airport like Whiteman because we have nothing else in this area. Whiteman is important and I just want people to understand, Whiteman doesn't belong to Pacoima, it doesn't belong to Sun Valley, it doesn't belong to Van Nuys, it belongs to LA County and the county needs to vote on it. Just a selected few Pacoima resident or just a selected few Sun Valley residents. It belongs to all of us. Thank you.

AnnaKaren:

Hi, thank you for everyone's time this evening. I know it's really late to be putting this together, but I do appreciate everyone's time in moving forward the motion that was voted on. I do realize that the county is not really addressing targeted public comments. The CAC members, which I think was explicitly mentioned at the beginning of the call. So just wanted to make space for that, as well as acknowledging the fact that at the last LA County Aviation Commission,

there was a committee that was funded just specifically for PR, but I don't think we need to focus on tokenizing our community members or focusing on targeting a specific organization, specifically Pacoima Beautiful that everyone has kind of mentioned reaching out to, which I don't know why that's the only point of contact. So, I think it's really important to address the fact that these comments are very targeted and the county's not addressing that.

Monica:

Okay, that's fine. I just want to clarify who's part of the panel. This is a very important panel and I was hoping that I could see everyone sit up and respect the people participating. Bottom line, the Whiteman Airport land was donated. It doesn't belong to anyone in particular, especially Pacoima and personal interests that are making major decisions here. So we cannot forget that. And I think that we need to respect everyone's point of view and be careful with the decisions that we make because it could be very conflicting in the future if we're not all on the same page on this one.

Thomas:

Yes. I'm extremely disappointed with the outcome of these votes, and while I have not been actively engaged from the very beginning, my involvement thus far is really, really revealing. It's really revealing to me how these votes almost seemed like they were orchestrated in advance as if it was a foregone conclusion. And I've heard public comment after comment after comment, supporting, perhaps re-envisioning the airport as a community effort along with the pilots and the FAA, the county. And yet the way this vote outcome came through, it's as if the CAC are largely extremely biased from the beginning. Right? It's as if your minds were made up, and I'm shocked of this and I hope this information's included in the minority report that goes on to the Supervisors along with any political connections, corporate connections, developer connections, everybody on this board, we should have a full transparency of how they arrived at the position and how they arrived at their decisions.

Californio:

Yes, yes, thank you. So here's the ... Can you hear me? Yes. Here's the logic. So the logic is that only the people who live in Van Nuys, you used Van Nuys Airport, only the people that live in Westchester use the LAX Airport. Only the people who live in Burbank use the Burbank Airport. And only the people who live in Pacoima should use the Pacoima Airport. The opinion of seven people ... It's going to take more than the opinion of seven people to change something as valuable as an asset, as an air park, one of four in the city, but it was a foregone conclusion that this panel was set up just to do just that. It's laughable like you actually think you have more authority than a federal land for an airport. It's amusing. It's not going to ... It's just your opinion. Thank you.

Michael:

Oh, thank you very much. My name is Michael. My wife Lisa, as you know, is a pilot here. I just want to mention that Lisa and other pilots donate many hours per month for youth aviation activities and as has been mentioned before earlier, that they're also ... Young Eagles are

building an airplane. So, I just wanted to make that comment and I just want thank you very much for your time.

Matthew:

I was just wondering if I could reclaim five or 10 seconds since Bobby Arias has broken into my comment there. He's not supposed to be doing that as far as I know. Is that possible?

Paul Maselbas:

We'll give you four seconds, Sir.

Matthew:

Okay. I just wanted to point out since Veronica mentioned the master plan, Pacoima Beautiful opposed safety improvements. So that's kind of relevant.

John:

Thank you. Someone before me said that it's easy to destroy something. I get that it's scary to close something that's been around for 75 years, even if it's an unpopular airport. But I would implore everyone to think about the native peoples that have occupied this land for a thousand years and the Pacoima residents that have been subject to discriminatory policies and practices including displacement and redlining. And the closure of Whiteman airport doesn't benefit just one side, it benefits all of Los Angeles. We need free and open spaces and this is the time to do it. I support a community-driven process, a holistic approach that includes the communities of color in the area and denies developers. And thank you.

Candy:

Thank you. You know, it's interesting if you drive around, I mean, when I think of Pacoima Beautiful, the irony of it kind of amazes me because in order to get to the airport, you are driving down some really unsightly streets. And where's Pacoima Beautiful in that? And when Penny Allison brought up who's behind some of the things and the lady on the panel Campos says it's the students, well let me tell you, I'm in education and students can't do anything without a generating body. And they have brought up repeatedly people that are behind that. And I'm like the many people that have commented that it seemed almost like a foregone conclusion. And being in education, we don't get a lot of people participating for exactly that reason. If you want it open, it has to be open without agendas that don't work with the county. And like they said, it's owned by the county. It is not owned by Pacoima. Even people in Lancaster are interested in what's happening in the county because we're North County.

Katherine:

I just want to say, as a community, a member of the community, I have never used the airport. It's always outsiders that come into Pacoima who use the airport and I agree with the vote. I've had friends who've grown up in Pacoima and they've told me they've never gotten outreach for any programs for aviation in the Whiteman Airport. So, it's just sad to see that they're reaching

out for two younger people now that the Whiteman Airport is being threatened to be shut down. I just think we can do better for the land while keeping the fire department open by the airport. Thank you.

Public Comment concluded at 9:30 p.m.