

Folsom sues to halt air cargo expansion at Mather

By David Richie
and Cathy Locke
drichie@sacbee.com

Folsom officials filed a lawsuit Wednesday to force Sacramento County to reverse an agreement that expands DHL Express cargo operations at Mather Airport.

The lawsuit requests a tempo-

rary restraining order to halt the county's implementation of its new lease amendment with Midwest Development Co. and its sub-tenant, DHL Express, said Kerry Miller, Folsom city manager, in a telephone interview Wednesday afternoon.

The Board of Supervisors on

Order sought to reverse county pact with DHL Express; noise is key concern.

Oct. 23 approved that agreement on a 4-1 vote, with Supervisor Roberta MacClashan dissenting. Miller called the county's approval of the lease amendment "non-compliant with the required environmental review process."

County environmental offi-

cials have not finished a report assessing the environmental impacts of a proposed Mather Airport master plan.

The board's approval also came just a few days after a county environmental assessment official took heat from resi-

► MATHER, Page B3

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
EL DORADO COUNTY

2007 DEC -6 AM 11:42

LINE TODAY

TAKE TAHOE

TRIPOLI

Print Date: Wednesday, December 5, 2007

Last modified: Tuesday, December 4, 2007 9:41 AM PST

DHL, UPS deny Mather expansion equals more flights

By: Roger Phelps

Cargo shipper DHL Worldwide Express denies it would increase flights if Mather Airport capacity expanded under a Sacramento County plan.

So does United Parcel Service. And county officials deny expecting increased flights.

DHL is named as an interested party in a recent Folsom lawsuit against the county over airport plans. UPS isn't.

"DHL has no plans for expanding the number of flights or increasing air operations at Sacramento's Mather Airport," said company public relations manager Richard Gibbs. "It has been erroneously communicated that the DHL ream-lease agreement and improvements to an employee parking lot and storage will lead to additional flights at the facility. Improvements made to existing operations infrastructure at DHL facilities at Mather Airport are primarily to accommodate employee parking."

UPS airlines spokesman Mike Mangeot said the county's plan is not a trigger for more UPS flights.

"We're right now able to meet needs of customers in the Sacramento market, and I foresee it stays that way for the foreseeable future," Mangeot said.

Sacramento County officials deny counting on Mather expansion to cause a jump in flights.

"Whether the plan goes through or not, I expect (UPS) flights to increase gradually, but the percentage of increase will be market-driven," said Glen Rickelton, spokesman for the county airport system. "The same answer for DHL."

Kerry Miller, Folsom city manager, said it was hard to imagine no flight increase after expansion designed to facilitate that.

"Why would DHL invest, if not for ability to increase flights in the future?" Miller said. "The airport draft master plan identifies several scenarios for cargo expansion - level of service, number of flights. The DHL expansion project is one of those cargo-related projects. As proposed, we can only assume what the master plan assumes."

Miller said Folsom's beef is with the county, not the carriers.

"I don't know if DHL is relevant," Miller said. "The expansion project is identified in the county's draft master plan for the airport, and the county issued a Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the master plan, so the environmental work should be completed before expansion."

But, with the lawsuit filed, anti-flight fever is heating up.

El Dorado County Supervisor Ron Briggs has said he is now monitoring numbers of cargo flights passing over Coloma and Gold Hill, reportedly saying he detected a recent increase.

Briggs wrote Nov. 28 to Sacramento County officials, saying "The citizens in District 4 of El Dorado County object to an illegal taking of our peace and quiet caused by current or future aircraft noise pollution from Mather Airfield."

Briggs noted in the letter he would call Dec. 11 for a Board of Supervisors resolution supporting Folsom's lawsuit and for board consideration of joining the Folsom suit or filing a separate legal action against Mather expansion.

Sacramento County has made no estimate of revenue gains to be gotten after an expansion, Rickelton said.

"Sacramento County Airport System's enterprise fund supports all four airports in the system," Doron said. "Revenue generated by the system is reinvested in airport improvements. It is highly unlikely that revenue generated at Mather Airport in the future would be used to support Sacramento International Airport."

The Telegraph's Roger Phelps can be reached at rogerp@goldcountrymedia.com, or post a comment at folsomtelegraph.com

Close Window



"Melinda Peak "
<peakinc@sbcglobal.net>
12/05/2007 04:31 PM

To <bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bostwo@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bostthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
bcc

Subject Mather issues

Supervisor Briggs,

My husband, John Burns, and I are so happy that you have taken up this issue, and urge you to fight this one out to the bitter end. We do not believe that Sacramento County and private freight companies have the right to make a profit by destroying our lifestyle. This is not a new issue for Sacramento County: in the 1980s, the County of Sacramento had to buy out landowners in the Natomas Basin with the expansion of the Sacramento International Airport. Now the land in Natomas is sold with a warning that there are over flights and noise.

Are they looking to buy out many millions of dollars worth of homes in their flight path over our County? I think they either re-route over the undeveloped lands south of 50 or along the freeway at a higher elevation, and require informing new landowners in and near the flight path, or buy us out. They have made our life almost unbearable at times, with the 3-4 a.m. flights low over our ridge, even more noticeable in the summer with the windows open.

They do not wish to go south of the freeway because many influential developers own lands in both counties in what seemingly would be the obvious flight path. I think the public would be astounded to see the ownership of the lands in eastern Sacramento County—perhaps such a map would be useful to help illustrate why Sacramento County is so resistant to switching the flight path?

I would like to see the flight logs and see the actual elevations for some of these planes. I doubt they are all legal. Is it possible to get this information from the FAA?

We did file a long letter with Sacramento County DERA with our concerns, but I do think it will come down to a lawsuit. I am so grateful that you are willing to stand up for the citizens of this County who chose to settle here and not the Natomas area or any other part of Sacramento County. I am a native of Sacramento, and I consciously made the choice to leave the County in 1994 in part because we don't want the noise of freeways, trains, and airplanes. And now they are bringing it to our family, whether or not we like it! You have our full support.

John Burns/Melinda A. Peak
3203 Ridgeview Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762



"Mike Betts"
<michaelcbetts@comcast.net
>
12/05/2007 12:38 PM

To <bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc "Ron Briggs" <rbriggs@calweb.com>
bcc
Subject Mather Air Cargo Expansion

El Dorado County Board of Supervisors

Dear Supervisor Briggs

As a resident of El Dorado County, I am writing to publicly state my concerns over the Mather Airport expansion plans. I am requesting that the EDC Board of Supervisors support our communities efforts to require the DERA address the negative impact increased flight activity would have. More importantly I request you require Sacramento County implement solutions that are **acceptable to our residents** and not simply "*window dressing* " that have dotted the "I" s and crossed the "T"s

I live in El Dorado Hills and I am currently being wakened by low flying cargo planes over my home. This is especially true in the early morning and late hours. Any increased flight activity would not only affect my right to quiet enjoyment of my home, but ultimately will effect my property value and those around me. There are numerous residents complaining about the noise as these jets disturb our quality of life. That quiet quality was originally one of the reasons many of us have invested (many in the millions of dollars) in our homes. As you are aware, the elevation of El Dorado Hills is over 1000 feet as a result the cargo jets on their approach are extremely low as they fly over this area.

I understand from County staff that the Mather Expansion EIR will include a single event noise analysis and impact assessment in El Dorado Hills, Cameron Park and Folsom. I sincerely hope that is indeed the case. As you know, an EIR that doesn't address the significant noise and air pollution impacts in these communities would not only be incomplete and invalid, but a waste of county time and money as well.

Please note there is a significant groundswell of concerned homeowners and business owners in El Dorado Hills and Folsom, the number of which have multiplied impressively in just the last few weeks. This group is an expanding, educated, vocal mass, most of who are key business owners, executives and employers in both Sacramento and El Dorado Counties.

I strongly suggest that this is **NOT** the time for a "*wait and see* " attitude by the El Dorado County Board of Supervisor. A simple look at recent actions by the City of Folsom shows they put the best interests of their residents first! I ask you to do the same!

It is clear that many EDC residents have not been aware of the Mather Cargo Expansion plan. The local press has placed little emphasis on this development. In fact, most residents we talk to are unaware of any form of public scoping process surrounding the Mather Expansion EIR.

I urge you to require not only the appropriate studies be conducted and complete, but demand solutions acceptable to our residences from those who want to benefit at our expense.

The Mather expansion utilizing the current flight approach over our communities is not acceptable.

Thank You,

Mr. and Mrs. Michael Betts

El Dorado Hills



"Lisa Smith"
<lisa.smith@vonscott.net>
11/28/2007 02:10 PM

To <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bostwo@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bosthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
cc
bcc

Subject Mather Expansion Plan

Dear Board,

I can't say how relieved I was to wake up this morning and read the Telegraph and see that Folsom has filed suit against Mather and DHL and the expansion plan currently underway. Hooray for Folsom! As a Ridgeview resident I already live with the loud rumblings of the current cargo planes that lumber over my house. Could you please let me know what our county has done and is currently doing to protect the interests of El Dorado County residents regarding the impact of noise from Mather? I have emailed DERA with my concerns as well. Thank you.

Lisa Smith

12-4-07



"Ed Jago"
<edjago@sbcglobal.net>
12/04/2007 01:27 PM

To <bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc <bostwo@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bosthree@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
<bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us>,
bcc

Subject Mather Air Cargo Issues/Expansion/Noise at 3:00am!!!

Dear Mr. Dupray,

I am writing to ask you if you and the other board members intend to join the lawsuit which Folsom is bringing against the County of Sacramento and other county parties/agencies regarding the expansion of air cargo service to Mather Airport. We live in the Sterlingshire community off Green Valley Road and Loch Way in El Dorado Hills. We hear these jets all night long into the early morning hours!

In my reading of the issues it seems the County and Mather Airport authority are completely disregarding the environmental impact review process concerning its residents in Folsom and amazingly didn't even consider any of the affected residents in El Dorado Hills! **We hear the jets at 3:00, 4:00, 5:00 and 6:00am most every early morning!** The residents of Serrano must certainly be affected even more than us as they are closer to Highway 50 and thus near the even lower flight path.

I would urge you and the other members of the county board to join with Folsom and mitigate the expansion. **Being an airline pilot myself I love airplanes, just not all night long!** The flight path could easily be altered to the South for arrivals over much less populated areas. I fly into airports all the time which require special noise abatement procedures. Just look at Orange County, San Diego and a myriad of others. At these airports flights are not even allowed after 11:00 pm! And or require our jets to fly specific high or altered flight profiles or face serious fines!

Please take a proactive stance on this issue for the sake of your constituents.

Sincerely,

Ed Jago

916 939-7025

12-3-01



"don_liz"
<don_liz@pacbell.net>
12/02/2007 06:48 PM

To <bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc
bcc
Subject re: increased air traffic

Dear Supervisor Briggs,

I live in El Dorado Hill and find it disruptive that the large cargo jet planes are flying low over my neighborhood; especially in the early morning and late hours of the day. We moved to El Dorado Hills 2 and a half years ago because it was a quiet community. Now we can't sleep with out being awakened around 4 a.m. and again at 11 pm because of these cargo jet planes flying low over our house...these jets disturb the neighbors dogs...causing them to bark adding a greater disturbance.

I am writing in hopes you can address, stop or re-direct the flights of these big cargo jet planes to and from Mather. Why have the cargo planes been moved from the International airport, where I did not buy property, to the Mather airport? Can anything be done about this...I hope you can help us.

Thank you,
Mr. and Mrs. Don R. Hopkins
Concerned Home Owner

12-3-07



tkjackrogers@comcast.net
12/02/2007 01:56 PM

To bosone@co.el-dorado.ca.us, bostwo@co.el-dorado.ca.us,
bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us

cc

bcc

Subject noise over EDH

Dear Board of Supervisors,

As a resident of El Dorado Hills I am deeply concerned about the impact that flight noise will have, not only on our quality of life, but also on our property value when Mather Airport becomes a major air cargo hub. It is inconceivable that the Department of Environmental Review Assessment has not, to date, included noise sampling along the approach over our community, in their study.

It is my understanding that most of the flights will occur between the hours of 9 p.m. and 6 a.m. and could be every minute or less. Whether this frequency is a reality or not, DERA absolutely has an obligation to review not only the impact of noise but also alternative approaches to Mather over less densely populated areas.

Thank you for your consideration and concern for the many families who will be affected by your departments decisions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

--

Tim & Kim Rogers
256 Muse Drive
El Dorado Hills, CA 95762
916-933-4628 - home

11.30-07



"Bill & Pat"
<w.p.bryant@comcast.net>
11/30/2007 11:41 AM

To "Ron Briggs" <bosfour@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
cc "Laura Gill" <lsgill@co.el-dorado.ca.us>
bcc
Subject Sep 2007 Mather cargo operations at Mather

FYI

Bill Bryant

----- Original Message -----

From: D.J. Peterson
To: Bill & Pat
Sent: Thursday, November 29, 2007 11:02 PM
Subject: Re: Sep 2007 Mather cargo operations at Mather
Bill and Pat:

Thank you for leading the community in helping to organize us to take action. My family and I live directly under the flight path in red on your chart of flights, in El Dorado Hills. Flights with ILS are so exact, most do not vary from going exactly overhead, day after day, and night after night.

Attached are comments I sent to DERA. I also sent them to the County consultants and planners.

It would be great if you can use these findings and recommendations (attached), in communication with other community members, our board of supervisors (including District 4, District 1 and District 2), and any attorney that might want to represent us. If DERA does not insist on adequate assessments, studies, and surveys from the communities that are affected by the flights, we should file a complaint with an administrative law judge that has jurisdiction over DERA. (My neighbor is an administrative law judge for the State of California for personnel matters with state agencies and departments.) We could also file against other entities and the persons in the jobs that were negligent in fulfilling their duties. I would be happy to contribute to an attorney fund. Maybe it is time to begin such as fund, and find an attorney to represent us.

DJ



Writtencomments for EIR DERA mather noise impact}.doc

November 29, 2007

Written Comments and Statements for: Airport Planners, Consultants, DERA, and staff of Sacramento County Airport per County consultant's request at the meeting on Oct 18, 2007 in Folsom, CA: Please share this with all persons with interests in this matter.

From: DJ Peterson, 208 Muse Drive, El Dorado Hills, CA 95762. Phone 916-933-1771.

The environmental review process has 3 goals that were displayed at the public information meeting on Oct 18, 2007 in Folsom.

Goal 1 of the CEQA EIR is to learn about negative consequences of over flights. Goal 2 is to involve agencies in mitigation planning. Goal 3 is to involve the public in the planning process and preparation of documents and findings. These are goals that residents have said "should have been implemented by Sacramento county decision makers and planning staff over the last 12 years."

Below are statements, supporting data, and recommendations. These are my findings, opinions, and statements about the negative consequences due to over flights, and recommendations for Sacramento County Airport Planners, consultants, and county decision makers. Many of these statements and recommendations represent a summary of what many El Dorado Hills and City of Folsom residents have been saying for some time. Please note that I have personally heard the same information from other residents affected by the over flights to Mather Airport. These statements also summarize many of the comments you heard tonight, and I would like to see them reflected in the consultants' reports and your reports. This has been written to comply with your staff members' recommendation "to accurately and effectively place my statements and recommendations in your reports and findings by writing them down and submitting them."

1. Statement and Finding: There is a serious noise problem in El Dorado Hills due to flights to Mather. I am a resident of El Dorado Hills, with my family. The elevation at 208 Muse Drive is about 1100 ft, on a ridge (Ridgeview Village). We and my neighbors bought expensive 1/2 acre lots with peaceful and serene views of Folsom Lake and the Sacramento Valley. We bought our lots and built our houses with no notice by anyone of the impending over flight problem. (We bought our lot in 1993). We were not informed and we had no invitations to participate in any planning meetings. Problem: The flights are loud, and we can not carry on a business conversation or casual conversation outside on my deck, or even inside the house in my office, located on the top floor. People wake up at night. Pets wake up at night. An increase in flights due to an expanded runway would be irresponsible especially since mitigation measures are

not in place that are satisfactory to the residents affected by it. Also, a thorough survey of impacted residents has not yet been conducted to adequately assess the noise problem.

Recommendation #1: It is recommended that an adequate, and comprehensive effort be made to learn how bad the noise and visual problem is to those who are affected by it. A survey should be conducted via mail or door to door surveys to residents impacted by the flight path (use ILS and community mapping techniques. Contact the El Dorado County transportation Commission and planners, and El Dorado County Youth Commission for GPS assistance, and Vision Coalition of El Dorado Hills for Assistance.) In addition an online survey can be established with Zoomerang or Survey Monkey, that your office can publicize in mailers and newspaper articles, and to concerned groups such as www.keepthepeace.org **If you do not take steps such as these, any attorney would be happy to argue that your office has not acted in good faith, in keeping with your duties and responsibilities to implement goal #1 that was listed at the public meeting.**

2. Statement and finding: A study has not been done to the satisfaction of residents of Folsom and El Dorado Hills about how bad the noise decibel level is, duration, and impact on humans and animals. Locally, a short term test was done to have flights use a different path. The residents who were affected mobilized and emailed El Dorado County Supervisors indicating there was a severe noise problem with the flights. This is documented. Supervisor Rusty Dupray can be contacted to testify that residents said the noise problem was severe with negative consequences. However this was the only study that was conducted in El Dorado Hills and it was done by our own Board of Supervisors.

Recommendation #2: It is recommended that an adequate study be conducted to assess the noise levels along the direct path of the ILS system in El Dorado Hills, Folsom, and parts of Rescue. The study should go out to residential areas affected at least to Green Valley road. Equipment should be used to measure sound levels, duration of sound, etc. Analysis should be made by professionals and reported publicly. An analysis and identification of homes and businesses most directly affected should be conducted. (Example: Homes and businesses within a 500 foot wide path of the ILS should be identified as extremely negatively affected. Homes and businesses and schools that are 500-2000 feet away are moderately affected, and those who are 2000-5000 feet from the direct path are somewhat affected.) **If an adequate study is not conducted, as measured by the communities that are affected, it would be perceived that DERA did not comply with goal #1 described above, and it would be further documentation that DERA did not do its job.**

3. Statement and finding: Research has not been conducted to find out how similar county planners conducted their studies to the satisfaction of residents affected by over flights. I specifically asked this question to Sacramento county staff and consultants at the public meeting in Folsom, using South Lake Tahoe as an

example, and the answer was that they have **not** looked at the methods used to do an airport study in South Lake Tahoe. It was stated that it was not relevant.

Recommendation #3: It is recommended for county planners, or the consultant group, or DERA, to contact the Reno Airport planners and their consultant group to learn about the strategies used to assess the noise problem when the South Lake Tahoe airport was closed several years ago. This information is relevant, since it is mandated to assess the negative consequences of the noise problem, and it is required to involve the public in the process of preparing the reports and documents. It is apparent that the Reno planners and consultants did an effective job that was satisfactory to the residents affected by the problem. Furthermore, at the Folsom Public comment meeting the public felt that **Sacramento planners have not in good faith attempted to obtain an adequate assessment of the noise problem**, and that they do not have a definitive plan to do so that is satisfactory to the public. Perhaps, if the planners agreed to learn how it was done in South Lake Tahoe with the Reno Airport planners, and if they agreed to use similar methods and scope for more comprehensive study, the County Staff and consultants would be viewed as doing an effective job for the public. **If DERA does not insist on having its consultants conduct easy research like this, DERA would be perceived of not doing its job.**

4. Statement and finding: The public does not believe that they are really allowed to be part of the planning process, and they do not believe that the county planners have planned effectively to get their input into the documents and recommendations for the planners and consultants reports. I have called the airport noise complaint line too many times over several years, with no action by county planners, consultants, or decision makers. I have heard the same complaint from other residents. Many have given up on normal routes of communication, are now talking about legal action. It would appear they can make a case that they have been excluded from the real planning and input process, and were only given a minimal way for input that was never used, and is still not used today. For example, where in the County planner's and consultants assessment plan does it say they will read and analyze the complaints that were called in over the last 12 years? If the information is not used, residents feel there is lack of good faith by Sacramento County Staff and decision makers.

Recommendation #4: It is recommended that an analysis be made of the volume of complaints sent in to the Sacramento Airport Complaint phone line system by residents about the consequences of the noise problem. Records and summary statements of the 12 years of complaints should go into the report as evidence of the public's viewpoint on this issue. Further, the report needs to adequately reflect the environmental impact of the people affected by the over flights, and a summary of the findings needs to be publicized adequately in the communities that are affected by it.

5. Statement and finding: Residents most affected by the potential noise problem, were not involved in the process of preparing any documents or reports about the potential problem back in the 1980s, 1990s, or 2000 – present. There

was a lack of due process. Residents have stated in the Folsom meeting that they were not asked about their opinions, and that when they did report their opinions, their voices were not heard. (Goal 3 of the EIR was not implemented). I agree. I feel that due process was not carried out, and my opinions were not taken into account in the various planning stages of how Mather Airport would be used. For example, we were not asked or involved effectively or adequately when decisions were being made to move the expansion plans up to this point.

Recommendation #6: It is recommended that the public have ample opportunity to help write findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research and studies to be conducted, with the involvement and oversight of the Folsom City Council and Mayor of the City of Folsom, and the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors representing El Dorado Hills (district one: Rusty Dupray, and district two; Helen Bauman) (This helps with your goal #2 to involve appropriate agencies and organizations that have jurisdiction in the affected residential areas and who are affiliated with SACOG, County and City Government as elected officials.) I am a grant writer, report writer, and consultant for community and education policies and programs that affect youth and teens. I would be happy to help in the review of drafts.

5. Statement and finding: The current noise problem has not been solved, and it would be irresponsible to move forward on increasing the capability to have more flights by adopting an expansion plan at Mather Airport.

Recommendation #5: It is recommended that the current noise problem must be mitigated, to the satisfaction of residents most affected by it, before any expansion of the airport is planned. As a resident directly under the flight path to Mather, I have not observed any mitigation plans being implemented. It would be irresponsible of DERA, if DERA not state that "it is clear that expansion of the airport should not be implemented until noise mitigation plans have been implemented with the current over flights. Obviously, the public believes more mitigation strategies need to be tested, and positive results must be assessed before any airport expansion is to be considered.

6. Statement and finding: Residents do not know what mitigation strategies are possible to reduce noise and negative visual consequences of low flights over residents, schools, and businesses., and the pros and cons of using the strategies. For example some strategies that seemed to effectively mitigate the noise problem are not being used for various reasons. The public needs to know what these are and the roadblocks to using them, or why current decision makers don't prefer to use them.

Recommendation #6 : Share a brainstormed list of possible mitigation strategies that other airports have used successfully, including the step down approach, using other facilities over less densely populated areas, not expanding, and stopping flights due to noise problems. Also include strategies that may work,

but are not allowed to be used, or are not preferred to be used, and state who or what decision making group has made the policy or recommendation and when.

7. Statement and finding: It was said that there is one reason the County Board of Supervisors have consistently voted 5-0 in favor of moving forward with the continuation and expansion of the flights outlined in the proposed Mather Airport Master Plan. That reason is economics. Sacramento County will earn income and local airport businesses will earn income. In fact it was said the income will be earned by many local businesses that use UPS. However, without a viable mitigation plan for Folsom and El Dorado Hills residents, residents with low over flights will have a severe negative impact on the value of their houses, which will plummet when buyers are told about the airport expansion and potential increase in flights, with no mitigation of the noise. This negative economic impact needs to be studied by DERA. If DERA does not include an analysis of the potential decreases in home values, it will be perceived that DERA did not do its job, and residents may go the legal route argue the case. .

Recommendation #8: It is recommended that the County Planners and consultants, and DERA, conduct a thorough analysis of the potential or probable impact that increased low flights with high noise will have on property values directly under the flight path. This assessment must include Folsom, El Dorado Hills, and rescue, (at a minimum). Planners can use the ILS system, and can also conduct easy research at other airports where planes fly low flights with high noise levels over residential communities.

Recommendation #9: It is recommended that a fair "noise mitigation airport landing fee" or similar fee be established, that is paid by those businesses using and benefiting from the air traffic, and that the fees are paid into a fund for the purpose of annually compensating residents adversely affected by being directly under the flight path. Residents can use their annual share of the fund to purchase heavy drapes to block out noise, purchase extra thick window panes, and to implement other mitigation strategies. They can save the money to be compensated for the devaluation of their property due to the noise problem from over flights. The examples for a fair system of sharing a portion of the income and sharing it with others who are impacted are 1) Indian Tribal members receive a share of the income of Indian Casinos which are run by casino business professionals, 2) The Governor of California has made agreements with Indian Gaming Casinos to obtain a fair share of the gambling income even though they are on Indian land, 3) California voters passed the prop 99 cigarette tax and shared the income for funding for education, research, and treatment, 4) another cigarette tax was approved by voters to fund "first five" child development centers, and 5) voters approved a 1% tax on individuals earning over 1 million dollars, and the income is placed in a fund to be dispersed statewide to county mental health departments for new programs and services. With mitigation compensation fees going to residents who are most affected, the county could get signatures from residents to drop legal rights and lawsuits against the Sacramento County planners, consultants, staff, and county decision makers. This recommendation could be a win for everyone.

Since the County officials seem to believe that economics are important as a motivation for decision making, it may be a viable strategy to implement.

Please respond to whether these statements will go into the reports and testimony that are prepared. (The findings are identified for you to endorse as findings. The recommendations are also ready for your endorsement.)

Please also respond to the statements and findings as to whether this is new information or do you agree with the findings. Please also respond to the recommendations. If you are not prepared to make the recommendations now, can you discuss and plan what you would need to do first, in order to make these recommendations?

You may send your reply via email to djpeter99@sbcglobal.net