

**CITY OF BLAINE
CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

**Monday, October 9th, 2006
7:00 P.M.**

A. CALL TO ORDER – 7:00 p.m.

- **MOMENT OF SILENCE**
- **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- **ROLL CALL:** Ken Ely, Charlie Hawkins, John Liebert, Bonnie Onyon, Jason Overstreet, Bruce Wolf, Mike Myers.
- **EXCUSED:**
- **STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Banham Public Works Director; Sheri Sanchez, City Clerk; Meredith Riley Finance Director; Jon Sitkin, City Attorney.

B. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION (Sign-up Sheet at Entrance Door to Community Center).

NOTE: PLEASE RESERVE ALL AIRPORT RELATED COMMENTS UNTIL AFTER COUNCIL ACTION ITEM 3 UNDER ‘I’ AT WHICH TIME PERSONS REQUESTING TO SPEAK WILL BE ALLOWED THREE (3) MINUTES EACH.

1. David Gallion, 1455 Madison Avenue – comments regarding the traffic intersection at Boblett and Mitchell. He was concerned about the visibility issues. He felt that that area should be 20 mph at all times. John Liebert commented that perhaps the school could help by using crossing guards. Steve Banham will look at the intersection for posting ‘limited vision’ signage.
2. Greg Booth, 5482 Canvasback Road – addressed the Carnoustie project. He requested that some of the language be amended in the Planning Commission’s report – ‘land use and housing,’ section 10.C, page 7 of the Planning Commission revisions to the staff report. He suggested that the first 20 feet add, maintain and preserve natural environment.
3. Doug Scarlet, 815 Bentgrass Way, Lynden – he is representing the owners of the Silver Maple Development on Adelia Street. He wanted to thank Terry and staff for their good job on working on this project.
4. Christina Alexander, 9351 Owl Lane – she commented on the trade publication “Concrete Producer.” There is an advertisement on the Blaine Peace Arch monument.

C. COUNCIL MEMBERS AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE REPORTS - None

D. PUBLIC HEARING (MEETING)

***PLEASE NOTE:** Persons speaking on any issue will be allowed three (3) minutes. An additional two (2) minutes of non-repetitive testimony will be allowed after all testimonies have been heard.

E. CITY MANAGER AND STAFF REPORT

1. Lighthouse Point Update – Steve Banham reported – Two of the WWTP plant employees and Steve Banham went to Toronto to check on their membrane system. We are in design now and anticipate construction in early 2007.
2. State and Federal Projects Update – Steve Banham reported. The truck route is the project at this time. They are instituting a single lane north bound.
3. D Street Closure at Truck Route – Steve Banham reported. There will be a partial closure on 10/23/06. The west side of D Street will be closed to the truck route and the detour will be H Street and 8th Street.
4. Semiahmoo Parkway Asphalt Overlay – Steve Banham reported. This is complete.
5. Cherry Street – Steve Banham reported. Paving has been completed and the cherry trees will be put in after the first frost.
6. Marine Drive –Steve Banham reported – The asphalt paving will be done later this month and remains on schedule. They are continuing to work on the pouring of the walls in the tank structure.
7. Major Projects Update – Terry Galvin reported. He talked about the proposed PUD development on Adelia Street. He would like more discussion with the Council and have a worksession. The Council suggested that he set this up.
8. Quiet Zones – Gary Tomsic reported. He noted that the City has officially notified the State Utility Transportation Commission, BNSF, Department of Highways and the Federal Rail Administration of our attempt to create the quiet zone between the Hughes Road and Bell Road crossing.

F. MAYOR’S REPORT - None

G. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

1. Faxed letter from Barb Douglas received Sept. 28, 2006
2. Two faxes from Joel Douglas dated September 29, 2006
3. Letter from Bob Christianson dated October 1, 2006
4. Letter from Pac West Aviation dated October 2, 2006
5. E-mail from John Greenough dated October 5, 2006
6. E-mail from Cal Leenstra dated October 9, 2006
7. E-mail from John Dill dated October 9, 2006

H. CONSENT AGENDA

Items listed below have been distributed to Council members in advance for study and will be enacted by one motion. If separate discussion is desired on an item,

that item may be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the regular Agenda at the request of a Council Member.

Approval of Bills – amount \$359,309.46

Approval of September Payroll – amount \$399,427.38

Approval of September 25, 2006 City Council Minutes

MOTION MADE BY BONNIE ONYON TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY KEN ELY AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).

I. COUNCIL ACTION ITEMS

1. Plover Title Transfer – presented by Gary Tomsic.

MOTION MADE BY CHARLIE HAWKINS FOR THE CITY MANAGER TO ACCEPT TITLE OF THE PLOVER ON BEHALF OF THE CITY. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE WOLF AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).

2. Approval of Carnoustie Development – presented by Terry Galvin and Elizabeth Anderson. Elizabeth Anderson gave a brief overview of the project and Trillium was there to answer questions as well. Planning Commission is requesting City Council's approval on the PUD and the preliminary plat.

MOTION MADE BY BRUCE WOLF TO APPROVE THE CARNOUSTIE DEVELOPMENT AS OUTLINED. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY KEN ELY AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0).

3. Approval of Planned Unit Development on 2.5 Acre Parcel off Adelia – moved to 'staff reports'.
4. Decision on Future of the Airport –

Billy Borden Rowell, 4142 Sweet Road and sister Diana Borden at 1086 Peace Portal Drive – My reason for speaking here tonight is to inform the City that if Council votes down the airport, we the remaining children of the airport founder, George Rome Borden, Jr., plan to begin litigation to sue the City for \$25,000 plus interest which our father spent to build the airport. From 1945 to present that's 61 years. Dad began work in 1943 and when the airport was officially opened in 1945 it had an 1,800 foot runway, 5 airplane hangars, tie-downs, an underground gas tank, gas pump, wind sock and a maintenance shop and snack bar. Dad had a gentleman's agreement with Mr. Dierks, Sr., that included leasing the land for the airport and later buying it. The City waited until more improvements were made to the airport through Federal Grants our father received and then in 1947 they bought the land from Mr. Dierks. Dad was asked to remain on as City Manager

and did so until 1955. He tried repeatedly to buy back his airport from the City. We feel that since the City actually stole real property from my father in the form of building structures and money spent, we would have no choice but to seek justice for the way he was treated. No company, individual or City just takes away an airport from someone without financial restitution. If the airport is gone, then the fight is on. Thank you.

Colleen Turner, 15205 140th Way, SE, Renton, WA – I'm the Communications Director for the Washington Pilot's Association. Washington Pilot's Association has been serving the use of general aviation in the State of Washington since 1960. I'm here tonight to urge you to support the Blaine Airport and adopt the Blaine Airport Master Plan. Blaine has a very valuable economic asset – namely an airport. Thousands of communities across America can only dream of building but you don't have just any old airport. You have an airport in which the FAA is willing to invest 15 million dollars to revitalize it and that's going to enable you to attract the types of jobs, types of well-paying professional jobs that Blaine wants to attract here. Do you realize that these types of businesses that provide professional well paying jobs rely heavily on general aviation to communicate quickly with their suppliers and customers? I would send it to you that if you close the airport, you're going to have a much more difficult time recruiting these types of businesses. Another thing you should consider – due to emerging technology in aviation we are on the threshold of revolution in air travel in this country that will enable on demand, point to point, high speed, personal, affordable air transportation between communities served by over 3,000 under utilized airports throughout America, including Blaine airport. In the very near future, a much larger percentage of the population is going to be able to afford the convenience and flexibility of air taxi, which means that more people are going to be using their community airport to get where they need to go. What does this mean to you? With a revitalized airport, if your destination is within a 1,000 miles from here you're going to be able to go down to the airport and hail an air taxi. And that air taxi due to emerging aviation technologies is going to probably be in the form of a 4-passenger, very light jet. And that very light jet is going to be cleaner and quieter than anything, any single engine power driven airplane that flies out of Blaine today. So, you're going to be able to go to Blaine airport, hail an air taxi, fly directly to a community airport which is very close to your ultimate destination far faster than if you could drive there or fly through Seatac. Blaine is one of the luckiest communities in America. You have an airport that provides a gateway to economic prosperity, an on-ramp to the national air transportation system. And you have the financial backing to get the projects done that you need to get done for Blaine airport to be all it could be. So, please revitalize the Blaine airport, adopt the master plan and get the Blaine airport improvements projects clear for take-off. I will tell you, if you opt to close this airport, you're never, never going to get it back. Thank you.

Don Nelson, 925 Ludwick, Blaine – Thank you. Thank you for listening one more time. I know you've heard it all before, most of it anyway. But I'm here

because one thing is very clear to me. Airports are economic engines. Airports bring wealth and prosperity to communities that support and, in fact, promote them. Airports also provide amenities such as transportation by air, emergency services, recreational and educational opportunities and they provide open space. Nothing in the alternative use study will do more for Blaine than an improved airport will. Even the Makers Study said the alternative uses will likely develop around an airport anyway, as is happening right now, in fact. Moving the airport south and opening Boblett Street will do as much for Blaine as all of the Makers Study would. The citizens of Blaine have voted three times to keep and not to abolish our airport. One of those times was specifically to improve it for aviation uses. We have made limited improvements with only State funds. The master plan, with it's 14 million in federal funds, finally improve it to be a really viable business use airport. Last fall, after realtors, developers and their friends circulated petitions while spouting lies and innuendos that people did narrowly vote to study the feasibility of closing the airport. However, the study shows, in my humble opinion, it isn't feasible, it isn't practical, however you put it, closing the airport does nothing for Blaine except to put that asset into the hands of those few greedy realtors and developers so that they can line their own pockets at the expense of the rest of us. Well, the decision is yours. I'll leave you to it while fervently hoping for the good of all the Blaine community, hoping that you make the right decision to keep and improve our Blaine Municipal Airport. And just ad lib, I heard you say one minute, so can't be two yet, this airport does bring people to Blaine. There's nobody that doesn't come to Blaine because we have an airport and nobody will – well, that's good enough. Thank you.

Jim West, 8837 Goshawk, Blaine – My wife and I moved here about 16 months ago. We have no interest in private aviation, we're not pilots, we're not interested in becoming pilots, nor are we real estate developers. We have no interest in that side of it. So, I've tried to look at this as more of an issue for the City of Blaine – what is it's future going to do. I've attended meetings for the consultants report, tried to follow the issues. It seems to me that we've framed this issue more complicated than it has to be. It keeps getting framed as 'we can close the airport and enjoy economic growth or we can keep the airport open and forego economic growth.' And I don't see that as the issue at all. According to the consultants report, we can have, the growth will occur whether we close the airport or not. The consultant and some people would argue that perhaps it's a little more difficult to accumulate the land. Perhaps the airport is a little more amenable to developers but I don't think we've seen anything or heard anything that said if we keep the airport open that we will forego the economic growth that we can have in Blaine. It seems to me the difficulty of the decision you face is, that if you close the airport it's gone forever. You cannot reverse that decision. On the other hand, even in the consultants report, which goes out to the year 2025 and then beyond, we do not need the land from the airport for the next 20 years to enjoy the economic growth he talks about. So I would submit that an easier decision for you to make and a better decision for the future of Blaine is to keep the airport open and then monitor the growth. If at some point in the future we exceed even

the consultants forecast for growth it would be possible in the future to then re-claim the land if that's the way it turns out. So that would be my decision on the airport. Thank you.

Mike Jones, 614 11th Street, Blaine – Good evening. Apparently I was in some different meetings where some different studies were done because the meetings that I attended – it was obvious to me and anybody who would really look at this is that the advantages of not having the airport are overwhelming. What I really wanted to say here, I want to get up here because there's been a lot of name calling and it seems to me it's Dennis Hill, Dennis Hill against the airport. Dennis Hill is the real estate agent. The realtors, the greedy realtors from the City of Blaine. I'm with the Genesis group. There's a lot of people here from Blaine that are in this committee to try to bring to the Council's attention why we don't want an airport. Again, they mentioned, this is the 4th time now the citizens in this town have come together to try to tell the Council that we do not want an airport. We don't begrudge these gentlemen – they're hobby. We don't begrudge them the airport at all. It's just it's where it is located and it's city land and it can be better used as the Maker Study has proven. Alma Wagner, at the last meeting, said you gentleman and ladies were voted to represent us and I hope that you looked at the Makers report and you've seen the facts here and you'll do that. Thank you.

Dennis Hill, 3997 Hoier Road, Blaine – And there's no way I can get through this in 3 minutes. Just kidding. A little history on us. It's good to see so many people. A little over a year ago I found out the Master Plan was going to happen. I called Jim Jorgensen and another Jim back there and a few other people and said 'what do you think about that'. It was like we needed to get together and talk about it. We formed a group and got together and you know, we decided to come down to City Hall and I was amazed to hear the FAA say, you know what, there's not an airport out there that's worth closing. And I asked that question and they really feel that way. I kind of said okay. I need to study this. From there I sent out a survey, a local business guy paid for it, I'll try to not make a mess up here, 200 of these, 150 said do you want the airport closed, do you want leave this for the site, yes. 50 said no. And I got a lot of crap that it wasn't a subjective survey. So, me being pretty compulsive, I decided to call Shirley Forslof and say, how long do I have to get this on the ballot. She said, you've got a week. So I went around town with my group and we got 500 signatures in 3 days. This petition we got signed said "Shall City of Blaine permanently abolish the Blaine Municipal Airport as a municipal function?" We didn't ask for a study. Judge Murah asked Jon to tell you guys to put it back on the ballot and Bonnie, I think it was great, in a sense, that you decided or you all decided to do a study. Because if we would have won and this airport would have been closed, that realtor that used to be a bar owner, I wish I was still a bar owner – this is sh.. – but anyways, my point is that we did not get the petition that we wanted up there. We were upset. A lot of people wanted me to go, let's go in and change the form of government, that's a bunch of crap. I said no, no. A study is going to show everybody – who is the

professional. None of us are capable of making this decision on the airport although the 500 people that signed up – we looked pretty dang smart when the results are about 100 to 200% better in favor of closing the airport. Should the city spend another 50 grand to do it, again. I'm asking. From there, this became an issue of name throwing back and forth and all this kind of stuff. The feasibility study was done – 57% of the people voted for a study. Some of them might not have voted because they didn't want to get involved. That's a number we'll always wonder about. The big question, this is a big deal, I've got 2 minutes

Sheri Sanchez: When I say 1 minute that's all you have left.

Dennis Hill: I didn't hear that. But right at the end here I want to get to the meat and potatoes of this. We have a huge decision that everybody thinks 14 or 15 million dollars. I, Dennis Hill, went to the FAA headquarters in Renton on Friday. I talked to the Director of Airports. He told me area airports were safe but he also told me that next year there's 7 million dollars for 64 airports. That money is not there.

Sheri Sanchez: You're out of time.

Dennis Hill: That's a good way to end. I've got a better chance of winning the lottery.

Wayne Landis, 4158 Bridgewood Avenue, Bellingham – I'm the president of the North Sound Chapter of the Washington Pilot's Association and I promise not to use profanity during my period. And Colleen Turner already gave a great talk about the future of aviation. So often we talk about aviation, we don't talk about the people involved and how important those people are. As part of our chapter we have people who fly to China on a regular basis. Why do they live in this area – because of airports. We have a dentist who has a practice over on the east side, a periodontal practice doing transplants. Why does he have an airplane and fly out of this area? Well, a practice over there can't support what he does. He can have a practice in Bellingham, fly to Okanogan and do that kind of work. Why? Because of aircraft and transportation. So there are a lot of people that live here and business are here because of aviation. And it's not just a few hobbyists. People earn a living off of aviation. People are trained that now fly all around the world. They're trained here. And Donnie Nelson was my instructor for my multi-engine commercial license. They're not just private pilots. Most of us have ratings that go way beyond that. So, we're real people involved in the community all the time. We just don't look like Tom Cruise and fly around in F14's. The other thing is national security. What happened in the south when the hurricanes came through? Where do they supply their supplies into. What was the open lines of communication? Trucks couldn't get in there. They had to fly them in helicopters or aircrafts designed for that. Where do you fly that kind of stuff into? Airports. Airports have lots of federal mandates and so forth and so it's very difficult to get rid of and we are in earthquake zone and there's no telling what

can happen in these particular areas. The third thing is the environment. There's a permanent green space. In order to have an airport it has to be somewhat green. Just to keep the obstacles and so forth out of the way. So you have an excellent report talking about economic benefits – these are real people bringing in a lot of business into this region and also the national security issue. Thank you very much.

Jim Jorgensen, 4434 Boblett Road, Blaine – It's just a great community that we have and I'm really sorry to see all the divisiveness that has happened as a result of this issue. It really is sad and I hope friendships do not disappear and I have a lot of them with people that have airplanes. But I also have some really strong opinions about what I think this community can look forward to and see 20 or 30 years down the road. Gerald Makers and Company came and gave you a \$45,000 study to show you what some of the possibilities are for alternative uses of the Blaine airport site. When I went to that meeting and the study took place, it was a regiment of people who spoke afterwards and I heard nothing but slam dunk, this is just absolutely incredible and look at the increased revenues that are coming from the possibility of building other things at the airport site and not having an airport there and it went on and on and on. I know all of you had this and I'm sure all of you read it page for page. I would assume that's been the case. In looking at that consultant study, it was so positive I thought in vision, in looking at what could happen with that piece of property and what positive things could develop there that would be something for the economy of Blaine, the economics of Blaine and also for job opportunities. Percentages for the economy of Blaine was, as I recall, was 160 or 170% higher with making that into a light industrial park and developing it into an area not being an airport and those percentages were that much better and the same for job opportunities. There was a lot more job opportunities available. The Makers report said a couple of things that I think are really important and you got an e-mail on an update from a Makers report that I asked for from them. One of those spoke to noise. I don't know how many of you have been around airplanes, I'm not a pilot, but I've been around airports enough to know that when a turbo jet or a turbo prop comes in and winds up its engines and sitting there warming up, or whatever you call it, it's going to be an incredible factor at Blaine High School and Elementary School and Middle School and also for residences around the community. So in looking at that part of it I think we really need to be concerned. Also, I think you need to look at wetlands and what it's going to cost to do the wetland mitigation. They're talking \$3 million for 15 acres of wetlands. That's something that's going to be a big factor that's not paid for by the FAA. And looking through all my notes that I'm not going to have time to talk about, I just hope you had a chance to read Hal Hoffer's email dated October 8th. He had some excellent points that he made regarding the airport and that we need to look at our future.

James Robert Aitken, 4672 Birch Bay Lynden Road, Birch Bay – I'm an outside agitator. I'm a thoroughly biased person also. I'm also a private pilot. I won't speak to the broad subject why I think you should keep the airport. I, naturally,

want you to keep the airport. There are a few points that I was curious about with the Maker report, especially industrial development in this area. I've just moved up here about 2 ½ years ago from Lafayette, LA. It has been hard to find work around here. My first job as an auto mechanic had me driving to and from Burlington, WA. From what I see, and right now I'm working in Nugents Corner, which is still a long drive, but an improvement. Work is where you can find it around here and from what I can see it probably will be for quite some time. Whatever industrial projections or economic projections may be diverging from rising interest rates, other things. I also noted that they took a 3 or 4 county area and projected industrial and economic growth by combining numbers from the entire area, might be a homogeneous sample of and I know that Skagit County is quite diverse from Whatcom County, geographically and demographically. Also, even how industry locates itself is dependent on several things. If you fly around here you'll notice that I-5 forms a border east and west. To the west of I-5 there is rail access. There is much more industrial development on that side. To the east of I-5 there is much less industrial development. That's a fact that should be taken in context. The light industrial even will sit there and develop around rail spurs and stuff more readily. The only, I think I've had it, thank you very much.

Jim Smith, 870 Adelia Street, Blaine, home address 19306 74th Avenue, Lynwood – I definitely have roots up here. Ironically, my father who retired from the military and had Smitty's Cabins in Birch Bay, also sat on this Council almost 30 years ago. I don't know if you remember Smitty or not, but that was my dad. Ironically, he also ran the Pastime Tavern for Dolph Hill, wonderful gentleman. My mom is Norma Smith, who sits over here 2 or 3 days a week here at the Senior Center and my brother still lives here in Blaine. I am a City Councilman in Lynwood almost 20 years with Lynwood City Council and I've got to hand it to you, especially the newly elected ones, that it's a love/hate thing after awhile and we like to do good things and it's always not all that clear to us. I'm also the State President for the Washington Pilot's Association. I've been flying up here for 33 years. I use the airport for, to come up here to see mom, it's a transportation system. I've also read thoroughly the reports. I want to really hand it to the Airport Commission. That report was very much a realistic report. What reality is out there? The other report it was quite obvious, and rightly so, the other report – it's job, it's directed to, if we close the airport what can we do. That's what it was supposed to do. But I give to you the same premise of the same report could apply to every park. Every park that is Blaine could be turned over for economic development. We don't do that because we don't have to make money on everything that we do. But we do have to give services to everybody. Not just people that don't go to parks. We have a golf course. How many people do you think – we don't have, not everybody in Lynnwood are going to be golfers. But we provide that service. We have several parks in Lynnwood and here in Blaine you have services to hit the entire community, not just a little bit. Why keep the airport? Well, first of all, if Mr. Hill is correct and there is no money available, if that's just a joke or a rumor, then they'll do it. But if the money is available, take advantage of it. You're not going to be able to do this

again. You are not going to be able to have this airport again, economic driver if you get rid of the airport. The airport is also, for anyone that is in public safety would know, that to airlift people, anyone who is a senior should be concerned that the airport is a facility if they had to them or their grandchild to Harborview, this is an airport that we can get medi-vac service to. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Bruce Hansen, 8835 Osprey Road, Blaine – I'm pleased to be here tonight because it looked like here for awhile this might be the end of the airport issue. I don't have to appear before you and you don't think too much longer. I was on the municipal airport committee and I thought it was one of the worst committees I'd been on in terms of gathering data to give to you to make a decision. The information that was missing was a lot of the economic information. As the last two meetings of that Commission, finally we had a chance to request again some more economic information and finally something came. That wasn't enough. So basically, what were we missing. Why did I come up to you in another month and request an economic study and you came through with something. The reason was the FAA data wasn't being presented to you. So the question you have to answer tonight, what are the actual costs to expand the airport under the FAA regulations. The difficulty that you face is that some of the information you weren't aware of. I've heard the term wetlands tonight. In the report from the Master Plan is suggested 20 acres of wetlands as a minimum. A consultant said 40 acres. The cost that was given in there was very minimal per acreage. The development costs would be extremely high but I'm sure you didn't see that. Another thing you might have overlooked, another thing the FAA doesn't include is administration costs, except for paper clips. I called them. That's about it – copies and paper clips, but we have \$45,000 administration costs starting in 5 years. We have \$95,000 in administration costs starting in 10 years. We have added security costs that our community will have to take care of. We have litigation – our poor community has been under litigation costs for a long time now and when you get an airport this size, they're going to go up. So I figure the cost in about 7-8 years might go up to \$180,000 a year. So the actual cost to citizens is great and the real cost is the citizens didn't get to vote on this because you know what they would say in terms of having these costs if they have to defer instead of a library, instead of a park, instead of a community hall.

Scott Dodd, 1083 Blaine Avenue – By the way Steve that road up Cherry Street looks excellent. Thank you very much. Really quick. I have nothing against airports. I was in the military. I was an aviation electrician, I worked on aircrafts for 9 years. Love planes – actually thought about becoming a pilot at one time. But it's just where that airport is located. I would have no problem if that airport was out on Badger Road, Sweet Road or over there anywhere. I would have no problem with that. That airport and where it sits, to this City, is very vital. We're talking about money and economic development, that airport is the key. First of all, Federal money, this Federal money that's \$15 million, \$20 million, whatever, not guaranteed. Every day in the paper there is something that's being cut

federally in this country for money. We can't count on this money to be there when it's time for us to take it. If we accept this, FAA bill, we're stuck with that airport even if they don't give us any money. If it's ½ done, ¼ done, what are we going to do with it, then. Where's the money going to come from to finish it if the FAA backs out on money. About 20 years ago there was a vote in this city to get rid of the airport. My dad was on that bench up there. That vote barely, barely, passed to keep it open even though they gagged the members that had opponents of getting rid of the airport. At that time the Airport Commission and their proponents came out in the paper with the same kinds of things were seeing now of what the airport could be for the City, how much money it was going to bring and still after those 20 years, what have we seen out at the airport. Absolutely nothing. Okay. Nothing has changed in that time frame. Next point – if something isn't making any money or doing any good for something, or the City I know it's helping some people and I don't criticize the airports for wanting the airport. But you don't come and say it's not doing enough, it's not generating enough, let's make it bigger and then it will generate something. As a banker if someone comes to me and says my business isn't making money, I need to expand can you help me, I'm not going to say yes. I can't say yes. You have to make money and do something to want to expand it to something greater. And as far as keeping the airport open and building around it, I understand that's a pretty good concept, except for the fact that there are restrictions around airports for what can be built – height restrictions and such. My dad personally has had to go over to Burger King and cut down height posts because they were too high for the pilots to come in and out of there – by the way, he works for the City. The City sent him over there to do that on his time. In closing, I'm against the airport. I think I've made some pretty good points, especially the Makers presentation, they made some very good points about what the airport could be for this City. Please make the right decision and close the airport. Thank you.

Art Lawrenson, 240 Martin Street, Blaine – I've been around Blaine for 55 years or too long, I'll put it that way. I've been in this town for the last 46 years, I'm an old timer in a way. The problem that you fellows and ladies are dealing with tonight will probably be the most important decision you make all the time you're on the Blaine City Council. I have just got actively into talking and thinking about the airport in the last 2 or 3 months. I'm glad I did. I was up at the meeting about 2 weeks ago, Monday night here, and then the following Tuesday at the City Hall. I was quite surprised at some of the figures you were exposed to. They were projections, educated projections, but all they were was guess work. To my knowledge, they cannot, and I cannot, I don't know about you guys and ladies, if you got a crystal ball and we could totally see into the future. I don't think we can. I think we have to deal with what you know personally, what you can envision personally – is it good or bad to have that airport. I'd like to make one or two statements. Years and years ago, way before my time, and other people's time around here, Blaine at one time owned the Blaine Harbor. They gave it, I might be wrong it some of these details, but basically they gave it to Bellingham, Bellingham took over the management of the Blaine Harbor, look at it now. How

would Blaine feel if they had that harbor now. It would be pretty nice. At the time they said there was a little question of money, this and that, and they couldn't afford it and they made a huge mistake. Thank you. Now is not the time to give away any city owned property. If you watch the Port of Bellingham, they do not give away property, they acquire property. Blaine should have the same attitude, to hang onto what we've got and we'll go down the road with it 15, 20, 30 years and see if we made the right decision. Thank You.

Bob Dales, 9495 Semiahmoo Parkway, Blaine – Relative new comer here. I would just like to point out that you have a valuable asset in this airport. You get rid of it, you don't have an airport, you'll never have an airport. It can be a catalyst for future development, just like putting up a bunch of warehouses could be a catalysts for future development. Development is going to happen. You don't have to unload your land. The developers will come when it's economically feasible for them to get here and do something. You don't have to help them. And if you dump your 30-40 acres you're now getting into the real estate business and competition with our neighbors – the same people who could sell to developers. So, I think there is some conflicts here that you really have to think through very carefully. I really would like to see you keep the airport in Blaine. Thanks.

Trevor Hoskins, 8686 Great Horned Owl Lane, Blaine – Mr. Mayor and members of the Council, as most of you know during the last three years, I did everything I could to influence the decision about building on the spit. I lost that battle, but I hope what is going to be built down there is much better than I expect. Nevertheless, I will always believe that Blaine gave up one of its most important assets. I don't know if the airport is another of Blaine's important assets. And the reason I don't know that is despite reading all the information that has been provided by both proponent and counter proponents I still can't understand all the details. For example, I don't know how anyone can promise a certain number of jobs over the next 25 years with the airport open or closed. And I don't know how many of us are going to be around to see if anyone from either side was correct. Equally, creative accounting appears to be used by both sides. As I found out, petitions are not worth the paper they are printed on. However, what is much more important, what I know or do not know, is what you as a Council know. I spoke to several of you and while I've received different answers, all have agreed that there are still unknowns on both sides of this decision. I know that my next comment is going to be greeted with groans, but I still plan to make it. In my opinion something as important as this decision should not be made because some people believe it is time. I understand that the FAA has promised funding. I understand that some people believe the land to be more valuable as real estate. But I don't think time is going to alter either of those situations. So I'm here this evening, to ask you not to make this decision in an emotional atmosphere and just because you think it is time. Several of you have told me that the decision tonight, either way, will not be the end of this issue. There is information that you cannot obtain and that lawsuits may be filed from either side.

This already has been mentioned this evening. Those lawsuits and lack of information. I have nothing against lawyers, but I hate to see them getting richer and Blaine getting poorer because you made a decision without being sure you understood every aspect of this situation completely. Right now, I don't believe any of us do so I'm asking you to take a deep breath – delay this decision for 4-6 months and satisfy yourselves and us that all questions have been properly answered. I can hear the groans. I know some of these vampires will be disappointed, but I ask you to take your time. Thank you.

Peter Terry, 5238 Drayton Harbor Road, Birch Bay – Ask the question, if Blaine airport expands, as some of the projections are, will we be in competition as an airport with the Port of Bellingham airport. Is that a good deal? And I have a question I'd like to ask a previous speaker, Mr. Jorgensen Did he make a statement that making the airport into a light industrial park instead of an airport? The question I have; is that already a light industrial park? Maybe Mr. Jorgensen or somebody else could answer that. Thank you.

Dave Kriener, 362 E Street, Blaine – I don't live there, I live between here and Bellingham. But I am a pilot and I fly into the airport quite often. I enjoy your airport and I enjoy this community. I think it's a great community. I'd like to live here and maybe someday I'll move into that house and kick the renter out. In any event, I hope you make the decision to retain the airport. The gentleman said over here that the airport is in the wrong location. Airports seem to be in the wrong location wherever they are. When I was in King County, I know King County tried to re-locate their airport and nimbby is the word that is used and you just can't re-locate. The only that I'm familiar with is Ocean Shores. They had an airport that ran right through the golf course and center of town and they decided they didn't want to lose their airport. They decided before they closed the airport down they'd build another airport, so they still have an airport. When they're gone, they're gone forever. They are an important asset. They provide space just like your parks. You can take a look at the city park, perhaps, and there's 10% or less in the city that use the park, but we all love the parks and we vote to retain the parks so that everybody enjoys the open space and has that facility available when they do decide to use them. So, you can argue that, but once the airport is gone, it's gone forever, and I hope that decision is not made. The one gentleman said he doesn't fly and doesn't have an interest in it, but he said you can study this thing another 5 years and take a look at it another 5 years or so and perhaps you'll find a better location and maybe somehow or other you can come up with an airport. I would probably move my airplane over here because I'm halfway between the airport in Bellingham and here. Bellingham is beginning to get more and more commercial aviation in there and sometimes a smaller airport, small flyers like myself would just as soon be in an airport like this and bring the revenues to the City. I hope you make the decision not to close the airport. Thank you.

Charlie Hawkins: Is it time to make a motion?

Mike Myers: Anybody can make a motion any time they want.

MOTION MADE BY CHARLIE HAWKINS TO KEEP THE AIRPORT AND ACCEPT THE MASTER PLAN AS PRESENTED BY THE AIRPORT COMMISSION. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY BRUCE WOLF.

Mike Myers: Any discussion on the motion.

John Liebert: Good evening. It is wonderful to be a Borderite. For all of you people who are here this evening, I commend you for your interest in this very interesting topic that we're dealing with, as mentioned, and I'm going to be longer than 3 minutes. That's one of the privileges you get for being up here, I guess. For many of you, you know that I have been a school teacher and a history teacher and so for some of the things I'm going to be commenting on this evening, they pertain to the history and as a teacher, often times I've had to simplify my lesson so that somebody in the third grade could understand what I was talking about. That way I was guaranteed that most of them would get the lesson that particular day and so some of this I have tried to simplify it down to look at it from the most simplest of views. Last time we met, a speaker started off by saying 'to be or not to be'. That's kind of the crux of the whole issue this evening. We've had a long simmering debate in our community over this airport. The reasons for that long, simmering debate – location, noise, location, used by only a few, location, cost to the city, location. It took leadership and courage to stand up before the Council and the citizens to propose a study of alternative land uses for that piece of property, other than the normal airport use. It cost me my position as Mayor of the City. I have been vilified by some as an anti-airport person, not true. Before I ran for office back in 1999, a citizen of our community called me and asked, directly, "are you for the airport?" I said "yes." "Well, I'll support you, then." I wonder what would have happened if I had said "no." I voted for the FAA master plan. I helped select open minded citizens to be on that committee, some of which did not agree with the facts and the figures used in the final master plan program. They, too, were vilified as being anti-airport because they didn't fully agree with the Airport Commission or the master plan's study committee and the FAA consultant. It's interesting. Those three people who weren't in full agreement with the master plan program said not all of the information was correct. If you look at the master plan and we have studied it thoroughly, a lot of that is based on false information. There are not that many landings and take-offs and they use that for the projection of the future. That's a gross error. But we continued forward with our alternative study. A group of people with expertise and no agenda but using data from the county, the city and the national standards, remembering that they had no dog in this fight. Their recommendations, suggestions and analysis were incredibly insightful. Most of the community people did not read or analyze this all impossibilities. And remember that's what these are – possibilities and probabilities, for both of these programs. There is no guarantee in Makers program as well as this one. There

are no guarantees. The Makers report came out and then within the last week, we get an e-mail saying Makers is crazy. This is the worst thing I've ever seen. I've got expertise. So we go through that again and then we get a final report again from Makers answering all those questions that Mr. Rosen presented to us. We as a Council were to study, analyze and vision all of this information. It's going to take leadership and courage tonight on this issue. If we vote one way, the controversy does not vanish, it only simmers and it's going to come back to haunt us again. For how many different times has this been brought before the Council. If we continue to operate the airport as a City, it will come back again, but we will be in debt even more from the grants that we were going to apply for because they've got to be paid back. That's the easy vote. Stay the same course, the status quo. Bigger, but with more risks to the City. You have to understand that, there is a risk. The other way, that to close the airport takes courage. But the controversy dies a slower death. The litigation, and so on. That takes decisive action and the city moves forward without this controversy that will continue on for years as long as that airport is in that location. We will have other controversies though. Doing research on this project, I spoke with all of the former City Managers that we've had in our city. Called them, spoke with them, also visited with many of the former Mayors and Department Heads. I spoke with the Finance department people, Planning, Public Works, City Clerks, Public Safety people. The ones who have regularly wrestled with this day- by-day operations of the City and by an overwhelming percentage 80% to 20 have all indicated that the airport issue has caused financial difficulty and proved to be the most divisive issue within the City. There was very little debate to how this vote would be given that opportunity. I purposely did not ask the present staff to be included in this research but have talked to each and know their feelings. I talked to 100% of the City Manager's Department Heads, six out of the 10 Mayors and all said you're making the wrong decision if you continue on with the airport. That history has proven itself. And again as a history teacher, history does repeat itself. In this whole process we all have received many letters from valued citizens of our community. Questions were asked – do you want to sell. One particular letter that I would like just to share a part of. I don't know whose that is but, by God, you'd better turn it off. The thing I distrust the most is selling our souls again to the Federal and State governments by accepting money with strings attached. Attaching strings to money changes it from an asset to a liability no matter how you account for it. To me this has got to be a business decision and not an emotional one – as an economics teacher, I can do nothing but agree with that. A way to bring jobs and industry to our town. We've got too many young people who leave our community. This use of this land would give them more opportunities to work. This letter write said the Council is down to 2 options. Both involve selling the property one way or another. Either we sell it to entrepreneurs who are willing to risk their own capital to bring growth to Blaine through commercial and industrial development or we sell it to the Federal and State governments by accepting their money with strings attached and let it be run by the same people who have run it for the past 50 years and have done such a wonderful job. The other day I received another piece of paper, believe me folks,

I have done my homework. The border crossing for July and August for just the truck highway, right where that land is, there are 240,000 cars that pass that piece of property. Those are 2 months. And 60,000 additional trucks. Now that's a piece of property that has to be utilized to try to get those people into our community to spend some money and make our tax base less stressful on you, the people. That's the main thing. We need to get tax relief. I'm looking at what can be provided for the young people and new families that are going to be moving to our community. Remember, this is a hobby airport that has approximately 27 planes there. If we expand that airport, according to the Master Plan and according to its timetable, there will be 35 more hobby planes. Not 35 more than 27, but another 8. For \$16 million. With strings. As you can tell, I have done my work and I have some real – to me, I'm thinking, my goodness gracious, the opportunities that are provided for you as citizens of this community, not guaranteed, not guaranteed, but the opportunities for an entrepreneur to get in there and develop that 40 some acres into something that would be a very conducive thing for the future of our city. To me this issue is not a difficult one but makes the most sense for the most people and that is to sell that land and close this disviceness, free the city of this financial burden. Because the next time we meet to discuss the closure of the airport, this room will not be big enough and we'll end up having to meet in the PAC because it's just not going to go away. Thank you.

Bruce Wolf: Thanks John. I know you have done your homework and I appreciate that. I think I've done my homework, too. Actually, I've been on the Council for 5 years now and I've pretty much been on the airport issue since I first came on the Council. I was appointed to be on the Ketchum study of the airport back in 2001, an 8-hour charette, and I learned a lot. Customs was there, the border patrol was there, the State Department of Trade and Economic Development was there and certainly the Customs and Border Patrol said if you had an expanded FAA airport, we would move the services to Blaine if we could at all possible because of the tremendous efficiency there. Then the Mayor pointed me to stand on the FAA Master Plan committee. I'm getting a feedback here. I think that was an excellent committee. It was an excellent committee. We had people on both sides of the issue and we agreed on one thing. If we were going to expand the airport there were a couple of things that had to happen. 1- the airport must move south. It's too close to the school, it's too close to H Street, it concerns the citizens – there's too much noise in the population areas. The 2nd thing was – we got that. The airport was moved south on the master plan. In fact it's completely moved south if we go with the master plan. That means that the north end of the new runway is south of the south end of the present runway. The airport will not, if we expand it, will be where it is now. It's moved south. That's the first thing. The 2nd thing was tougher. If you move the airport south, we must connect Boblett Street. We have to connect Boblett Street through. The citizens will demand it because it would disconnect the school from the ball fields and it also would improve the Odell Street access. Those were very important. So the thing about that committee, and we had some really good people – Bruce Hansen

was on that committee. He was on the opposite side than I am on this issue and I respect Bruce Hansen a lot, like I respect many people on the opposite side of this issue. What Jim Jorgensen said was great. But, we all agreed unanimously on that committee, that if we decided to expand the airport, this was an excellent plan and was the one we should adopt. That was a unanimous vote. We didn't decide that that was what should be done, we just decided that if we did it that would be why. The next reason, I'm going to give 4 reasons that I think we should go with the FAA master plan. One has been said quite a bit tonight so I'll stay really short on that. It's the issue of essential public facilities. Some are essential, some of them are not. Blaine has a lot of them. We have a skate park that's a new one. That's a new one, that's a good one. We have a marina, thank God, the marina is a great asset to this town. We have a number of parks, we have this senior center, it's a fabulous center to serve our seniors. We have an airport, you know, an essential public service. We have a new one tonight, we have a Plover. Looks like the Plover is going to be a service, we're researching that. That's one of the things that communities are about. It's to provide services for their citizens, whenever possible. Everything isn't always about making money. You need to provide services. We've lost some services. We've lost the train station, that was a big hit. We've lost the Greyhound bus service. Now we're talking about losing the airport. In an age of transportation, this is an age of transportation. The next thing is my expectations of the future of aviation. We had a respected member of our citizenry – spoke at the council a few times ago, and he talked about Orville Wright. One hundred years ago Orville Wright flew, what, 200 feet – there's a lot of pilots, I'm not a pilot. Two hundred feet he flew. Seventy years later we are on the move. Aviation has expanded. You have to be brain dead to not think it will continue to expand in the 21st century. It's going to be more and more a part of our transportation needs. Giving away this airport will be something we will always regret because we will never get another one. Twenty-five, 50 years from now, do you think we'll regret having voted down the airport. I think we will. I think it's something that the town will regret. I really think that. Ancillary services, emergency services – quite a bit has been said about that tonight but it's an important issue. And again with the very light jets, Jim Jorgensen was saying how noisy that would be, well, as a matter of fact they are less noisy than the present prop planes. It's the new technology. There could be 1500 of these in the next ten years. They could take passengers and they can be used in emergencies. Who knows what kind of emergency can happen, they happen all the time. What would have Katrina been like if they didn't have that airport in the center of town. It was a huge asset to New Orleans at that time. Last, well, economic reasons. I want to say a few things about economic reasons. Economic reasons are very important. Certainly the Makers study was an excellent study. One of my concerns has been from the start – the City of Blaine cannot afford something bleeding it's general fund. Now in the last 10 years, in fact for quite awhile, the airport has been pretty much neutral. It hadn't made money, it hadn't lost money. I checked with Meredith just to make sure my figures were right because I didn't want to say something that was in error. In the last 3 years, however, things have changed around a bit. We spent \$610 thousand, Meredith can answer that,

somewhere in that range, the Carruthers suit, contentious suit over first cutting the trees and then condemnation of the property. That was a big hit to our general fund – difficult. Of course, we acquired an asset worth approximately that amount. But, an asset doesn't do you much good when the City sees the general fund going down – that's really tough when you're a City Councilor and you're watching the general reserve. So that has to stop. I'm very concerned about that. I spent a huge amount of time looking into that. I talked to literally every airport manager of small airports that I could find and the vast majority of these in FAA expanded airports, NIPSIA airports, airports considered on the national stage of significance, those airports have done well. They have not bled into the general fund. Almost all of those airports have made money. Now Bonnie set up a meeting with Art Choate in Bellingham, the manager of the Bellingham Airport, a well respected man, and he was very helpful. At the end of the meeting he said, you know, Bruce and Bonnie, there's an interesting airport in Vancouver, WA that is very similar to Blaine's. It's probably the most similar. He said over the last 15 years or so there's been a lot of contention in Vancouver. It got an FAA expanded airport to a B-1 airport which is slightly smaller than ours. It's in the center of town. It only has 6 acres of land around the airport. It's in a bad situation. The town was not happy with this airport. It never took to a vote but it was a contentious issue. He says I don't know what's happened. I called Sean Dogherty, who is the manager of that airport, and talked to him a couple of times. He said, well, it's been a real success story in Vancouver. He said we have now 54 based aircraft and he said we did a study last year on why those people had those aircraft. They did a survey – and much to their surprise over 55% of them – and most of them are not close to the airport – 55% of them said, because of the airport – that's why they located their business and that's why they flew their plane, because of business reasons. He was quite astounded, he thought it would be 10 or 15%. So, I feel that if we do expand the airport, I think we can eventually make money on the airport – it's not going to be a big money maker. I also agree with the Makers report. If we close the airport it's definitely going to be an economic plus for Blaine. It definitely will. I think we're in a good situation here. If the vote goes to close the airport it's not going to hurt Blaine economically. If the vote goes to expand the airport, maybe we won't do as well economically but we'll have an essential public facility that will serve us well into the 21st century. And it will expand and it will eventually make money. I'm confident of that. I've talked to so many people and I've done so much research in that. There are a lot of airports, Dennis Hill has brought this up. And he's right. There's a lot of airports closing. They're closing every day in the United States. Are they FAA airports. No. They're airports are privately owned and the way it works now it's virtually impossible to keep a privately owned airport open – no matter how much money you have. The system works against you. They have to have an FAA approved airport. And that's been the big problem in Blaine. We haven't been an FAA airport. We've got the NIPSIA approval just 4 years ago. We couldn't apply for FAA funds. This is kind of long winded. I want to close though. And the last and by far the most important. We are a community. We are a really great community. We have great people. I've come

in this community, I've been involved in this community, I've helped raise the money for the VIGIL project, I've never seen a community come together. I'm really proud of this community. And the thing about is what we have to do here, is whichever way this vote goes, and I don't know how it will go, I really don't. It's going to be a close vote, I can tell you that. Whichever way it goes is going to be good for Blaine. It's going to be a Win either way. And you have to go out of this meeting with that in mind. It's a Win either way. We have to get this diviceness behind us. I've talked to Dennis Hill a lot about this. We have a lot of issues in Blaine. We have development downtown, we have to get moving ahead. Are developers going to come into our downtown. If we're a divided community and if we're suing each other and if we're having referendums, no, they don't want to come into a community like that. They want to come into a community that has a positive look ahead attitude. I just hope we can keep the contentiousness – we can come together and become whole again. I think that's really important. Thank you very much. I'm as long as John. I'm not a school teacher.

Bonnie Onyon: I don't think I'll be that long. I had something written out to read, but I want to address a few issues that Bruce brought up. Bruce says economic reasons are important for the airport. And he mentioned the Border Patrol possibly using the airport for their Homeland Security function. That's not going to bring economic security for a positive economic income for Blaine, for sure. It might possibly bring in more plane and helicopter noise which Art Choate was saying is the case in Bellingham. Art also said that the GA division, that's the General Aviation Division, which are the small planes, it barely breaks even, it never makes any money. It's there, they need to provide it. Every large airport does need to provide a place for the local pilots to have their planes, and that's the way it should be. They are going to be expanding, actually their hangar space at the Bellingham Airport because there has been a need for hangar space for private pilots. He also mentioned that only knows, he can only think of one business that has located in Bellingham because of the airport being there. So that addresses some of the things that Bruce mentioned. Now, as most of you know I put a letter to the Editor asking for people to call me. People called me. I had over 120 calls. And I felt I needed to hear from people that don't feel comfortable coming to a meeting, standing at a podium, make it non-threatening for them to call me and give me their thoughts. And it's been interesting. I've tried very hard to remain neutral up until very close until the end here. I wanted to take in all the data. I haven't been influenced by either side. There's no special interests, I've been lobbied, of course, but I have no axe to grind with anybody and told everybody that I'm going to remain open to the issue until the end. I purposely did that because I wanted to make sure I heard everything clearly and completely and the responses were very interesting. Almost everybody thanked me for being given the opportunity because they felt that they just weren't heard and they just wanted to say their piece and they felt good about that. I heard from both sides. It was weighted on the side of closure. I can't say that that alone made up my mind because it didn't. I still took in everything else. So, let me read you what I've

prepared here. It's been a long journey of study and discovery for me as I weighed the pros and cons of expanding or closing the airport. I've heard from the expert consultants. I've listened to staff's concerns and opinions and heard from many, many citizens. Well over 150 people on both sides of the controversy and from both sides of the water. I've made an independent decision based on careful thought of the facts with a dose of intuition and a gut feel thrown in. There are unknown factors on both sides and it hasn't been an altogether an easy decision for me. Much could be said, but briefly, I guess one of my main reasons is the FAA funding is uncertain. Blaine's general fund cannot afford to sustain current airport operations, let alone bind itself to a 20-year risk. Infrastructure and growth challenges facing Blaine now in the near and long-term are taxing the resources to their limits. I believe that expanding the airport carries to great a risk of compromising current resources and putting the city into greater debt that we simply cannot afford. While closing costs will be significant, I believe we can overcome this hurdle and face the obstacles as they arise and we will get past them. Re-development won't happen overnight and it will take considerable time. While economic and market forces will be the prevailing factors in the re-development of the property, the City will ensure that it is properly zoned and will only approve developer site plans that will serve the best interests and standards of the entire community. Thank you.

Jason Overstreet: There's so much I want to say, quite frankly. I'm sure everyone in the crowd feels the same way. There's so much that we want to say. I'm sure there's people out there crawling out of their skin. However, I really narrowly confine my comments. I've tried throughout this process, and especially in my presentation tonight to really steer clear of emotion, to try to deal with quite simply what's best for the City. Although my presentation is 4 pages, John, Bruce and Bonnie, I assure that it is 20 type and double space, so it will be short. I received an interesting e-mail at the end of our work session. It was received from Makers, Gerald, I don't know his last name but I believe he is a principle in Makers/BST. And it's in response to a letter that is in my understanding pulled a lot of weight as far as opinion is concerned about expanding or closing the airport. He responded to Mr. Rosen's letter. And I think it's very important. It was spoken of tonight but I think it's important that everyone, especially Council, in case someone hasn't read it that we hear it. Let me back up. I saw when Makers/BST presented their proposal an outstanding presentation. I tried to steer clear of all of the meetings and all of the discussion as best I could until that meeting and all of the subsequent documents that Council was to be exposed to, we were exposed to. I did my best to do that, to remain objective. They presented an outstanding presentation. Not only did they present an outstanding presentation but question after question was fired at them. And response after response was that is a great question and although it's not in writing we did address that. You know, that's a great question and we did take that into consideration and let us show you how. That is a great question, we've also taken that into consideration. So I think that someone read this response from Gerald at Makers about Mr. Rosen's letter. Number 1 - our task was to look at the airport

and to evaluate what alternative uses would be most appropriate if the airport no longer existed. Our research indicated retail and industrial/warehouse uses would be the highest and best alternative uses. Number 2 – the land use alternative analysis does anticipate additional development elsewhere in Blaine. Approximately 60-70% of anticipated future development is projected to occur at other non-airport locations. Number 3 – the projections for development are factored to reflect only Blaine's share of a larger market and do not borrow demand from other areas outside of Blaine. Number 4 – all of the projections presented in the land use alternative's analysis are conservative and defensible. The analysis was very careful not to prevent overly optimistic projections. Number 5 – regarding office demand. We agree with Mr. Rosen's letter. Office buildings would be better built elsewhere in the community. Office was not considered a highest and best use of the airport site. Number 6 – the retail opportunities presented in the land use alternative analysis were assumed to enhance and support the existing mall and improve it's visibility. They were directed at helping develop a better community facility and support the significant residential development expected to occur on Blaine's east side. The anticipated uses are not seen as those that would compete with downtown Blaine which, because of its waterfront location, will develop a different and more specialized business/retail atmosphere. Number 7 – the properties location. Adjacent to I-5 and the Canadian border and it's single ownership status are unique and important considerations in evaluating the properties economic potential. These factors should not be undervalued. He went out of his way to capitalize and bold those statements – should not be undervalued when analyzing alternative land use opportunities. There are several other airport issues not considered in our land use alternative analysis including number 1 – the fill in of quality wetlands for airport expansion. number 2 – increases in the number and frequency of aircraft operations and noise at an expanded facility. Number 3 – \$20 million divided by 30 planes equals \$666,000 per plane. Number 4 – timing of FAA funding and future requirements. I didn't plan on reading this tonight but when I received it I thought it was something that needed to be thrown out there especially for Council's benefit. I know that letter had a lot of pull. So now, on to my letter. Makers/BST associates with 35 and 30 years of site planning and alternative use experience respectively was contracted to produce an alternative use study as it related to the airport. The scope of that study was expanded from the start to include the already projected numbers in the airport master plan. Makers/BST let the city know that the study could not be fairly undertaken without including the other side. Council agreed with this viewpoint. What was delivered to the City was an alternative analysis of the airport property that objectively weighed both alternatives. Looked at objectively, this report paints a clear picture as to the future benefit to the people who call Blaine home. Under employment – Makers shows a 122% disparity in favor of commercial and industrial use. Total income produced shows a 173% disparity in favor of commercial and industrial use. Total sales produced shows a 164% disparity in favor of commercial and industrial use. Direct business to the City reveals a 46% disparity in favor of alternate uses which in fairness may be a few percentage points lower because of

numbers brought forward by the Airport Commission after the study was completed. All sources of tax revenue to State and local government was shown to be 173% greater under the alternative use plan. The keys to these numbers is this. These numbers represent full airport build out in 2025. Let me say that again. These numbers represent full airport build out in 2025 using airport master plan projections and a mere 1/3 commercial and industrial build out in 2025. With fully 2/3's of the alternative use plan realized by 2025, this report shows a massive divide in the direct, indirect and induced benefits not to the City. It's the smallest figure in that report - not to the City, but to the residents and business owners of the City of Blaine. I ask Council tonight to think of the community as a whole and what is truly best for all current and future residents when it comes not only to the economics of both plans, but the quality of life and impacts both plans will have on our beautiful community.

Charlie Hawkins: We've all listened and studied and have our own opinions about things and we can try and accept what the reports say from Makers is going to be true. Reality is Makers has made reports before that don't turn out the way they say. I've been around here long enough and participated in plans that Makers had done and it doesn't necessarily mean that's what it's going to be. One of the questions, I talked with one of the former City Manager's, Tony Mortillaro, and his community has a small airport right in the middle of their city and it's surrounded by houses and there in the process of spending \$5 million of their own money to expand the airport and I was talking to him just this last week and we were talking about it and he couldn't really quite understand how we would be selling off the Blaine airport. It didn't make sense to him. I feel that way too.

Ken Ely: Well, this has probably been one of the most difficult days and difficult evenings that I have ever experienced. I'd say my prevailing emotion is sadness because of the divisiveness of the question on just listening and looking at you and to you my friends and neighbors and also because after all the figures are sifted and the arguments weighed, I honestly don't know what to do. It makes me think of 3 people from history – first is Pontius Pilate. He stood with Caesar at his back and a king before him. Second is Lord Mountbatten, last viceroy of India. More than anything he wanted to avert civil war. When he went to India he was against partition, he ended up partitioning because he thought it would avert civil war, they had civil war anyway. There was no way to tell how that would turn out. The last person I think of was a British Prime Minister by the name of Lord Roseberry. He found politics so uncomfortable that he resigned and went home to Scotland. If I voted tonight, resigned and went home to Scotland, that would be a very chicken thing to do and I don't have an estate in Scotland. I'm going to vote tonight. But I vote with sadness because I hope what I am deciding is the best thing and only time will tell. A friend of mine once told me if you want to wreck half your practice, get into politics. Well, I've done that and I think tonight I will wreck the other half. So let's vote.

Mike Myers: Well, I guess it comes down to me to say something. But I'm already guilty before even being tried because everybody knows I don't say anything anyway. So, everything's been said so I think we'll do that. We'll get to the vote. The way we're going to do this, is we're going to poll the council members. We'll start from left to right, back and forth. Each council member will make a voice vote, one way or the other, and each council member will have 15-20 seconds to explain his vote if he/she so desires. The only thing that is required is that you make a vote, yes, no, or abstain. Sheri, would you repeat the question on what we're voting on.

Sheri Sanchez: The motion was to keep Blaine airport and accept Airport Commission's plan for expansion. By Hawkins and seconded by Wolf.

Jason Overstreet: I'm sorry, Sheri, can you read that again – louder.

Sheri Sanchez: The motion was to keep Blaine airport and accept Airport Commission plan for expansion. It was Hawkins motion and Wolf seconded the motion.

Mike Myers: I do think what Charlie meant by that airport master plan, he said that first.

Sheri Sanchez: Yea, he said that first but when he repeated it he said accept Airport Commission, so would you like to

Charlie Hawkins: Yea, reflect the master plan.

Mike Myers: Okay, so I think we're all set so, Charlie we'll start with you.

Charlie Hawkins: I vote yes, and I really truly think that for the long-term future of Blaine, the airport will be a really positive thing.

Jason Overstreet: I vote no.

John Liebert: I vote no.

Bonnie Onyon: I vote no, and the comments are made about other airports that have been successful. We need to think about our airport, our situation here in Blaine and my vote is no.

Ken Ely: I vote yes.

Bruce Wolf: I vote yes.

Mike Myers: Well, that certainly puts me in a heck of a position. But I think everybody knows my vote. I vote for the airport and the master plan. Is there any other business before the Council. With that we're adjourned.

- J. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
- K. COUNCIL NEW BUSINESS**
- L. EXECUTIVE SESSION**
- M. ADJOURN – 9:30 approximately**

MAYOR

CITY CLERK