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“In the early day of the development on the air transportation system, the sound of the aircraft was considered a sound of progress and was recognized as an indication of affluence by the nation favoured with an air transportation system. This view was shared by the individuals who were fortunate enough to fly on the nation’s airlines. As time progressed, and particularly with the introduction of turbojet aircraft in the late 1950’s, the noise generated by an aircraft was no longer viewed with pleasure.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Airline Capacity Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATA</td>
<td>Air Transportation of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALUC</td>
<td>Airport Land Use Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCA</td>
<td>Airport Noise and Capacity Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AQMD</td>
<td>South Coast Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWG</td>
<td>Airport Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAB</td>
<td>Federal Civil Aeronautics Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
<td>Federal Aviation Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATA</td>
<td>International Air Transport Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JWA</td>
<td>John Wayne Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMS</td>
<td>Noise Monitoring Stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEURUS</td>
<td>Network of European and United States Regional and Urban Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPB</td>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>Orange County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Political Action Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAG</td>
<td>Southern California Association of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAQA</td>
<td>Southern California Air Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNA</td>
<td>Official Airport Code of John Wayne Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPON</td>
<td>Stop Polluting Our Newport</td>
</tr>
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1. Introduction - Motivation

John Wayne Airport ("JWA") is a unique example of the success of powerful stakeholder influence. Those stakeholders were able to achieve a Settlement Agreement between the County of Orange, which owns and runs the airport, the City of Newport Beach, and citizen groups, which strongly restricts JWA. There is no other such Settlement Agreement anywhere else across the United States and there is no airport in the United States that is as strongly restricted as JWA. However, this situation does make the investigation of stakeholder participation, its organizations, and the different types of instruments they use interesting. Further, there are the geographical aspects of the airport itself as it is a dominating factor within the region concerning economic, transportation, traffic, and planning issues and of course the stakeholders themselves. Who are these stakeholders, how do they work, what is their social background, and how are they were able to be so influential.

John Wayne Airport is located in Orange County, Southern California within a highly economically developed, high density suburban area south of Los Angeles County. There is virtually no open space around the 500 acre airfield, which greatly limits JWA's prospective development. The airport is surrounded by mostly residential areas and many people are directly affected by the airport business as it creates noise, pollution, and traffic. Because of the proximity of the airport to residential areas, many citizen groups arose demanding influence on the development of the airport. First there were citizen groups which focused on environmental aspects in general, and these later evolved to focus only on JWA. Industries or economical stakeholders that are proponents of growth of the airport, as well as statistics of economical impact by JWA, were not readily available or it was not able to get an interview. So focus is on the three major citizen groups that are opposing JWA: SPON, AWG and “AirFair”.

The major goal of these citizen groups have been and still are to limit the growth of JWA. Therefore they are using different kind of instruments, such as jurisdictional or political influence, different resources, and organizing citizen participation.

The following essay will focus on citizen participation concerning the influence of JWA future plans. It will discuss the general history of protests against JWA, the development of participating groups, the arguments and instruments used, as well as the political and legal framework of these groups.
2. John Wayne Airport, Orange County, California

John Wayne Airport, which is owned and operated by the County of Orange, is located on unincorporated land 35 miles (56 kilometres) south of Los Angeles County, surrounded by the cities of Irvine, Newport Beach, Costa Mesa and Irvine. The area served by John Wayne has a population of more than three million people, living in 34 cities and unincorporated areas of Orange County. The airport encompasses 500 acres, which includes about two square kilometres of airfield with one runway for commercial use and another for general and private aviation use. The current number of annual passengers served by JWA was almost ten million in 2007. Until 2015, the date when the Amended Settlement Agreement is going to expire, the total number of annual passengers is limited to 10.8 million (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/factsataglance.htm).

Currently, John Wayne is served by eleven commercial and two cargo air carriers which fly to 22 direct destinations in the USA. There are approximately 300 daily take-off and landings at the airport (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/factsataglance.htm).

Tab. 1: Diagram: John Wayne Airport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>John Wayne Airport, Orange County</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IATA Code</td>
<td>SNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operator</td>
<td>County of Orange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>173*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passengers</td>
<td>9,979,699*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight/Cargo</td>
<td>22,062* t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft Movement</td>
<td>333,452*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination (non-Stop)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlines</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runways</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>5,700 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Aviation¹</td>
<td>2,887 feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*data 2007

Table: own design

¹ "general Aviation" – private, small-business air traffic ; "commercial Aviation" – air traffic by commercial airlines.
2.1. History and Development of John Wayne Airport

In 1920, the first private runway was installed by Edie Martin, a pioneer of aviation. He founded a flight school in 1923. The area surrounding John Wayne Airport is owned by the Irvine Company, a corporation that owns much of Orange County. During the Second World War, John Wayne Airport was used as a military base and in 1939, it changed to a public airport. A land swap between the Irvine Company and Orange County turned JWA to County property (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/airporthistory.htm).

The rapid development of Orange County was closely linked to the growth of John Wayne Airport. In 1963 John Wayne Airport “was an asphalt island in a sea of scrubby fields stretching from the ocean to what is now the San Diego Freeway and beyond”. The following picture (fig. 1) is of John Wayne Airport in the year 1966, which shows that unlike today, the airport was surrounded by mostly open space. Today it is nestled between mostly residential and some industrial areas.

Fig.1: John Wayne Airport, 1966

In the course of “urbanization […]. (followed) transformation of Orange County from a semi-rural satellite of Los Angeles into a sophisticated community in its own right […] it is central to develop, the airport, the university and yet it is still close to where decision makers want to live” (Los Angeles Times: Office Space: Nowhere to Go But Up. March 8, 1981). Further, there is written that John Wayne Airport continues its development in an area “that is not heavily residential but heavily oriented toward business and recreation” (Los Angeles Times: FAA orders County to open up Airport. April 5, 1980).

In 1967, the Eddie Martin Terminal was built, named after the founder of John Wayne Airport. The terminal was designed to handle approximately 400,000 annual passengers with a size of 22,500
square feet, about 2090 square meters. There are two runways, one for commercial and one for general aviation (Los Angeles Times: Board Again to take Up Wayne Airport Expansion. January 28, 1985). Also in 1967 the Orange County Board of Supervisors admitted the first jet operations out of John Wayne Airport. At this time 95% of the residential area in the sphere of influence of John Wayne Airport already existed (data related on 1981) (Los Angeles Times: Wayne Airport. September 27, 1981). The former Orange County Airport was renamed in 1979 after actor John Wayne² who lived in Newport Beach.

Addition of capacity took place in 1974 and 1982 and a new waiting area and baggage claim were built. The Airport Master Plan from 1985 claimed an increase of annual passenger numbers from 3,68 million in 1970 to 7,14 million in 1980, which then grew to 14,13 million in 1995. In the years 1982/83, John Wayne Airport handled about 2.5 million passengers per year but demand was actually about two and a half times larger (Los Angeles Times: John Wayne Airport Tries to Hold fort Against Growth, Regulators. June 6, 1983).

In 1972, Orange County limited the number of daily takeoff procedures to 41 (Los Angeles Times: John Wayne Airport Tries to Hold fort Against Growth, Regulators. June 6, 1983). By 1979, the terminal that was built to accommodate 400,000 passengers per year was actually serving about 2,4 million passengers annually (Los Angeles Times: Airport Study Encounters a Bumpy Landing. January 24, 1980). Hence John Wayne Airport turned to be the third busiest airport in the country by numbers of takeoff and landing procedures (Los Angeles Times: FAA orders County to open up Airport. April 5, 1980).

The following article from Los Angeles Times does describe the situation at John Wayne Airport pretty well: “The conflicts leading to development of the current master plan are by no means unique. The airport […] has become hopelessly out of step with the growth that has occurred around it. Yet, it is locked in by the very urbanization that has brought the county’s needs for modern air transportation into sharp focus. […] 22 million potential passengers in 2005 - no way to meet that demand at John Wayne without bringing deviations to the communities that have grown up along its borders […] The ultimate solution will consist of a delicate balance between the dozens of interests – airlines, airport, neighbors, business - who have a stake in the future of John Wayne Airport” (Los Angeles Times: Board Again to Take Up Wayne Airport Expansion. January 28, 1985).

The Settlement Agreement from 1985 defined the following requirements: number of daily departures should rise from 41 to 55, rather 73 by substituting noisy aircrafts by quieter ones. Stepwise increase of annual passenger numbers from 4,75 million up to 8,5 million in 2005. Further a new parking structure

² The actor John Wayne was a big opponent of John Wayne Airport (http://www.aerovintage.com/ksna.htm).
should be built but limited up to 8,400 spots. A new terminal is going to be constructed and the total number of gates will be 14. The already existing Curfew will be continued (Los Angeles Times: Airport Growth Compromise Reached. August 28, 1985).

The Amended Settlement Agreement 2003 makes arrangements for a third terminal and six additional gates. Total number of gates after completed construction is 20. Car parking structure will be enlarged and exceeding spot for aircrafts’ over-night-parking. An extinction of the existing runway is not intended (cf.: http://www.ocair.com/improvements).

2.2. Influences on John Wayne Airport, an overview

During the period from 1980 to 1985 a various number of law suits against John Wayne Airport’s future plans were made by different stakeholders. The events of these years shaped the decisions and direction of growth of the airport. The following chapter explains the time from 1980 to 1985 affected the airport.

Because of the Airport Master Plan as well as plans for additional capacity at John Wayne Airport, residents who lived in the sphere of influence of the airport became active, especially people who lived in Newport Beach. The residents complained about unacceptable changes to their neighborhood as well as their quality of live. The main arguments against an expansion of John Wayne Airport were „increased traffic congestion, property devaluation and even physical and mental health problems“ (cf.: Los Angeles Times: John Wayne Airport Plan OKd Amid Angry Protests. February 19, 1981).

In order to represent their point of view and their goals, the residents founded citizen groups like „Stop Polluting Our Newport“ (SPON) and „Airport Working Group“ (AWG). This groups filed different law suits against the County of Orange to influence John Wayne Airport’s future plans. Finally in 1985 “Attorneys from Newport Beach and Orange County have reached a tentative settlement in the long term running litigation over expansion of John Wayne Airport. […] a resolution of nearly 15 years of discord” (Los Angeles Times: Tentative Accord May End Wayne Airport Battle. July 23, 1985). Negotiations between two citizen groups, „Stop Polluting Our Newport“ and „Airport Working Group“, the County of Orange, and the City of Newport Beach eventually came to an end. The Settlement Agreement was signed and it was valid until 2005. This agreement is a compromise for reduced expansion of John Wayne Airport. “There will be more expansion than Newport Beach or neighborhood organizations wanted but less than the county and business interests demanded” (Los Angeles Times: Airport Growth compromise Reached. August 28, 1985).
In 2002 negotiations for amending the existing agreement began. Engaged parties were the same as in 1985. The Amended Settlement Agreement is valid until 2015.

Although slightly less active, today there is still considerable interest in relation to John Wayne Airport’s future plans. Citizen Groups like the grassroots-organization „AirFair“ have already started to prepare for 2015 negotiations.

In summary three phases of influence by Citizens Groups can be identified:

1. Until 1980: non-structured, non-organized protest and law suits by individual citizens
2. From 1980 to 2002/2003: Citizens Groups are founded to act collectively against John Wayne Airport’s future plans or expansion.
3. Since 2002: Preparation for influencing the next settlement agreement in 2015 (founding of grassroots-organization „AirFair“)

2.3. Laws and Agreements regarding John Wayne Airport

„Federal, state and local laws, agreements and regulations govern operations“ (John Wayne Airport, Annual Report 2006) at John Wayne Airport. The following abstract provides a summary of the most important laws and regulations concerning to John Wayne Airport, like the Settlement Agreement.

The given regulations on different political and jurisdictional levels imply “increase county liability for noise impact as airport proprietor, while at the same time decreasing county control of noise abatement programs” (Los Angeles Times: Supervisors Voice Alarm Over New FAA Noise Rule. November 1, 1979). This shows a conflict between state and federal laws.

Settlement Agreement

The Settlement Agreement is the main framework through which John Wayne Airport operates. The Settlement Agreement was signed by four participating parties in 1985: the City of Newport Beach, the County of Orange, and the two citizen groups “Stop Polluting Our Newport” and “Airport Working Group”. It was in effect until 2005. The first Settlement Agreement was then amended in 2002 and is valid until 2015, thereafter called Amended Settlement Agreement. This agreement is unique in the USA.
Table 2 compares the main regulations of the 1985 Settlement Agreement and 2002 Amended Settlement Agreement.

Tab. 2: Settlement Agreement, 1985 and Amended Settlement Agreement 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1985 Agreement</th>
<th>2003 Amendments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Signators</strong></td>
<td>County of Orange</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Newport Beach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Airport Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stop Polluting Our Newport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1: April 1, 1985 through September 30, 1990</td>
<td>January 1, 2003 through December 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: October 1, 1990* through December 31, 2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Daily Departures (ADDs)</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1:*** Maximum of 55 Class A &amp; AA ADDs</td>
<td>Maximum of 85*** Class A ADDs for passenger service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 39 Class A departures</td>
<td>Additional four (4) ADDs for all-cargo service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2:*** Maximum of 73 Class A &amp; AA ADDs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No more than 39 Class A departures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passengers</strong></td>
<td>Phase 1: 4.75 MAP</td>
<td>10.3 MAP (through 12/31/10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2: 8.4 MAP</td>
<td>10.8 MAP (through 12/31/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Terminal</strong></td>
<td>Not to exceed 337,900 sq. ft</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Departure Lounge</strong></td>
<td>Not to exceed 37,000 sq. ft, ea.</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>Not to exceed 8,400 spaces</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No parking structure to have more than four levels</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loading Bridges</strong></td>
<td>Not to exceed 14 total</td>
<td>Not to exceed 20 total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Settlement Agreement defined the start of Phase 2 as April 1, 1990 or the date of the opening of the new passenger terminal, whichever came later. As a result of the mid-September 1990 terminal completion, Phase 2 began on October 1, 1990.

** Three noise-based “classes” of departures were defined: Class A, AA and E with Class E departures being the most restrictive. The million annual passenger (MAP) limitation applies to the combination of passengers served in all classes of departures (“MAP Cap”).

*** Under the amendments to the Settlement Agreement, Class A and Class AA departures were condensed into one Class A category.

Source: http://www.ocair.com/Improvements/History/settlement_agreement.htm
The John Wayne Airport Annual Report shows a number of "nearly 345,000 total air operations at JWA in fiscal year 2006-07, about 69% were general aviation." This means an average number of more than 930 daily operations. "According to data published by the FAA, JWA was the 22nd busiest airport in the country in 2006 in terms of total aircraft operations" (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/reports/2008-09JWABusinessPlan.pdf).

If you have a look on the Amended Settlement Agreement, a provision is made for 85 daily operations out of John Wayne Airport. This limitation only covers noisy aircrafts, according to a classification can be found in the Settlement Agreement. The categories are: "Class A", "Class AA" and "Class E". "Class E" is the category of the noisiest airplanes and the limitation of 85 daily operations is related to that kind of aircraft. However, this does imply that the total number of daily departures is higher.

Federal Aviation Administration

The Federal Aviation Administration is an agency of the United States Department of Transportation. The responsibilities are to regulate and oversee all aspects of civil aviation. In this context, different important settlements can be found like the Federal Aviation Act (1958), the Airline Deregulation Act (1978), and Airport Noise and Capacity Act (1990).

These rules influence negotiations at JWA concerning expansions in a direct way. Further, these settlements influence the air traffic in general as well as existing local settlements.

Federal Aviation Act, 1958

An Abstract of the Federal Aviation Act of the year 1958 says: "An Act: To continue the Civil Aeronautics Board as an agency of the United States, to create a Federal Aviation Agency, to provide for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation in such manner as to best foster its development and safety, and to provide for the safe and efficient use of the airspace by both civil and military aircraft, and for other purposes" (http://www.enotes.com/major-acts-congress/federal-aviation-act/print).

This law does give the authority to the Federal Aviation Agency, later renamed to Federal Aviation Administration, to enforce rules of aviation safety. This law should provide better safety, coordination and overview of the American airspace.
Airline Deregulation Act (ADA), 1978

“The 1978 Airline Deregulation Act partially shifted control over air travel from the political to the market sphere. The Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB), which had previously controlled entry, exit, and the pricing of airline services, as well as intercarrier agreements, mergers, and consumer issues, was phased out under the CAB Sunset Act and expired officially on December 31, 1984. The economic liberalization of air travel was part of a series of “deregulation” moves based on the growing realization that a politically controlled economy served no continuing public interest. U.S. deregulation has been part of a greater global airline liberalization trend, especially in Asia, Latin America, and the European Union” (http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/AirlineDeregulation.html).

This law is for a liberalization of the American aviation. It should reduce the federal influence and power of the air traffic market: “there shall no exclusive right for the use of any landing area or air navigation facility upon which federal funds have been expended” (Airline Deregulation Act, 1978).

Airport Noise and Capacity Act (ANCA), 1990

The Airport Noise and Capacity Act is a rule that should find a balance between needs of local noise abatement and national aviation. The law was adopted in 1990 by the FAA and prohibits, among other things, a curfew under which JWA operates by a local settlement. The curfew at JWA was adopted by the Orange County Board of Supervisor on a local level before the national rule became effective. The local settlement is still in effect by the grandfather clause.

Until the passage of ANCA, the FAA did not agree to extend such local agreements because they can have a direct effect on air traffic and operations. In the special case of JWA, it was possible to extend the curfew because the City of Newport Beach declared possible actions at JWA as an extension. According to this statement Newport Beach, it was possible to retrain the curfew (Los Angeles Times: Plan would Raise Capacity at John Wayne. May 5, 2001).

Curfew

The curfew at JWA was enacted by the County of Orange in 1968 and is part of the General Aviation Noise Ordinance. The curfew regulates times of operations: “The County’s General Aviation Noise Ordinance (“GANO”) prohibits commercial departures between 22:00 and 07:00 (08:00 on Sundays) and commercial arrivals between 23:00 and 07:00 (08:00 on Sundays). The Airport Director or his designee may authorize a departure or arrival outside of the commercial operations hours for an emergency, mechanical, air traffic control or weather delay, which is substantially beyond the control of
the air carrier. All curfew exemption requests are reviewed by JWA and must receive express approval in advance of the specific arrival or departure” (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/reports/CurfewOperations/02-February.htm).

Noise Abatement
Within the „General Aviation Noise Ordinance“ various measures can be found that aim to reduce noise generated by aviation. The regulations have been adopted by the County of Orange and they regulate operation hours of JWA and the maximum noise limit caused by air traffic. Some actions within the „General Aviation Noise Ordinance“ implemented at JWA are a noise abatement take off procedure and the installation of an „Noise Monitor Station (NMS)-System“ (http://www.ocair.com/generalaviation/ganoise.htm).

Abb.2: Noise Abatement Takeoff Procedure

Settlement with the City of Newport Beach concerning a possible second Runway at JWA
“A deal between Orange County and Newport Beach officials could allow the city to block John Wayne Airport from building a second runway for commercial jets” (Los Angeles Times. Deal would ban a 2nd Runway at O.C.’s Airport; Supervisors must OK the pact with Newport Beach. Oct. 11, 2006). This Settlement allows the City of Newport Beach a kind veto right, opposing possible plans of a southern expansion of John Wayne Airport south by building a second runway. This contract is signed by the City Council of Newport Beach and the County of Orange. At the time when the Settlement was adopted, officials from Los Angeles were requesting that airports in South California handle more passengers. Through the conduct of Orange County, so mayor Antonio Villaraigosa of Los Angeles, “L.A County, LAX and Ontario are going to pushed and pushed […] to bear the burden of Southern California’s air travel needs” (Los Angeles Times. Deal would ban a 2nd Runway at O.C.’s Airport; Supervisors must OK the pact with Newport Beach. Oct. 11, 2006).
**Grandfathering**

"A provision in a statute that exempts those already involved in a regulated activity or business from the new regulations established by the statute" (http://www.answers.com/topic/grandfather-clause).

“The term grandfather clause in its current application refers to a legislative provision that permits an exemption based upon a preexisting condition” (http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/grandfather+clause).

The “Airport Noise and Capacity Act” (ANCA), adopted by the FAA in 1990, prohibits local agreements such as the Settlement Agreement for John Wayne Airport (Los Angeles Times: John Wayne’s Noise Curfew Faces Threat. October 07, 2000). However, different stakeholder groups where able to achieve the extension of the existing agreements at the airport because the agreements, which existed before the passage of ANCA, were protected under the Grandfather Clause. Therefore, even though the FAA did not allow new local agreements, the amendment of the Settlement Agreement of 1985 as well as the extension of the curfew were protected.

3. **Explanations**

The development of both John Wayne Airport and the County of Orange are closely linked. There are implications to the population, economy, and social networks. Even the general rise and development of aviation is affected by the growth of John Wayne Airport.

A detailed analysis of all these implications would go beyond the scope of this work. Hence the explanations are confined to the County of Orange, the local political system, as well as socioeconomic aspects known as community indicators.

The following abstract should provide the main facts at a glance in order to get a better understanding.

3.1. **County of Orange**

The County of Orange is an administration unit of the State of California, located on the west coast of the USA. Orange County itself is divided into political districts. Each district has its own supervisor (see chapter 3.2), who is elected for a four year period.

As of 2006, three million people live in Orange County, which encompasses approximately 798 square miles (about 2067 square kilometers). The population has grown quickly since the County’s foundation in 1889 as has the local economy. “Orange County, once known as a bedroom community with beautiful
beaches, has grown into a powerful economic engine with a population that ranks it as the third largest county in California and sixth largest in the nation" (http://www.ocair.com/newsandfacts/reports/2008-09JWABusinessPlan.pdf).

Tab. 3: Population Orange County, 1960 to 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Increase in relation to previous year, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>703 925</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>1 420 386</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1 932 709</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2 410 556</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2 828 425</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3 072 336</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: own design
Source: County of Orange. Facts and Figures, 2007

Population has more than quadrupled since 1960. Also different kinds of research, development, and service businesses settled in Orange County. By the year 2035, the population of the County is forecasted to grow to 3,65 million inhabitants, which is about 600,000 more people. The process of the past years is going to slow down.

3.2. Orange County Board of Supervisor

Orange County is divided into five districts. Each district has its own supervisor. The area of each district are different but they are split into sections with approximately the same number of inhabitants. Each district represents about 600,000 people.
"The Orange County Board of Supervisors as authorized under California law, functions as both a legislative and executive body. In its legislative duties the Board adopts ordinances, resolutions and minute orders within the limits prescribed by State law". The Orange County Board of Supervisors has to:

- Establishes policy
- Approves the annual budget
- Appoints a County Executive Officer, County Counsel, Clerk of the Board, Internal Auditor, Public Defender and Public Guardian
- Approves contracts for projects and services
- Conducts public hearings on land-use and other matters
- Makes an appointments to boards, committees and commissions”
(http://egov.ocgov.com).

John Wayne Airport is under scope of responsibility of the Orange County Board of Supervisors (See appendix: „County of Orange Organizational Chart“). The airport is owned and run by the County of Orange.

Fig. 3: County of Orange, Districts

Source: http://www.ocwatersheds.com/images/map_super_districts.gif
Tab. 4: Supervisorial Districts of Orange County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Supervisor</th>
<th>Cities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Janet Nguyen</td>
<td>Garden Grove (Portions of), Santa Ana, Westminster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John M. W. Moorlach</td>
<td>Costa Mesa, Cypress, Fountain Valley, Garden Grove (Portions of), Huntington Beach, La Palma, Los Alamitos, Newport Beach, Seal Beach, Stanton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bill Campbell</td>
<td>Anaheim (Portions of), Brea, Irvine, Orange, Tustin, Villa Park, Yorba Linda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Chris Norby</td>
<td>Anaheim (Portions of), Buena Park, Fullerton, La Habra, Placentia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Patricia C. Bates</td>
<td>Aliso Viejo, Dana Point, Laguna Beach, Laguna Hills, Laguna Niguel, Laguna Woods, Lake Forest, Mission Viejo, community of Newport Coast, Rancho Santa Margarita, San Clemente, San Juan Capistrano</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab.: Own design
(see: http://egov.ocgov.com; County Executive Office 2007)

The above figures should provide a picture of Orange County and the supervisorial districts. Each Supervisor is elected directly by the voters of the particular district for a four year term. Through the election of the supervisors, people are able to influence decisions and politics as well as John Wayne Airport.

3.3. Socio-Economic Aspects of Orange County

A difference is shown by a comparison of selected cities of Orange County across socio-economic aspects. The chosen cities are located in the area of influence of John Wayne Airport.

*Per Capita Income* varies from $12,152 in Tustin to $63,015 in Newport Beach. This difference is more than fivefold. The *Per Capita Income* of the whole County is $46,292 (Orange County. Fact and Figures 2007) based on the year 2006. This is an increase of almost 80% within six years.

Tab. 5: Per Capita Income, Orange County and selected Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Per Capita Income $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>25 826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>63 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>12 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>25 932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab.: Own design (Census tracks 2000)
Source: http://www.fullerton.edu/cdr/city.asp

---

3 "Per capita income is the mean income computed for every man, woman, and child in a geographic area. It is derived by dividing the total income of all people 15 years old and over in a geographic area by the total population in that area. [...] income is not collected for people under 15 years old even though those people are included in the denominator of per capita income. This measure is rounded to the nearest whole dollar" (http://www.fedstats.gov/qf/meta/long_101615.htm).
There is also a mentionable difference within ethni cal aspects of different cities.

Tab. 6: Ethnicity, Orange County and selected Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>32,5%</td>
<td>16,3%</td>
<td>1,9%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport Beach</td>
<td>89,0%</td>
<td>4,7%</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
<td>0,5%</td>
<td>1,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Ana</td>
<td>12,4%</td>
<td>76,1%</td>
<td>9,0%</td>
<td>1,3%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tustin</td>
<td>44,8%</td>
<td>34,2%</td>
<td>15,1%</td>
<td>2,6%</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tab.: Own design (Census tracks 2000)
Source: http://www.fullerton.edu/cdr/city.asp

4. Theory: Approaches on Influence and Participation

There are different theories of stakeholder participation. The following chapter contains a summary of the main theories concerning stakeholder influence on John Wayne Airport.

4.1. Citizen Participation

A definition by SIMONIS of citizen participation is: any kind of activity taken by citizen voluntarily in order to influence decisions on all levels of the political system (cf.: SIMONIS 2003, p. 156). JÄNIKE, KUNIK and STITZEL describe citizen participation as additional participation in the process of political design of deficient interests (cf.: JÄNIKE; KUNIK; STITZEL 1999, p. 89). Participation mostly is political based in order to achieve influence on political decisions (VERBA; NIE 1972, p. 2 f.). Forms of participation are varied. Some examples are participation through the election process, through being active member of a political party or civil disobedience (except from activities like protest), through attending expert workshops, and through serving as governmental officials (RENN; WEBLER; WIEDEMANN in: MUMPOWER; RENN 1995, p. 2). Other kind of participation are referendums or law suits.

Requirements for citizen participation are understanding, motivation, personal engagement, decision making, and competence (SIMONIS 2003, p. 156). Filing a law suit is a special kind of participation. Particularly in the United States of America, this approach is very common and is very significant (JÄNIKE, KUNIK and STITZEL 1999, p. 90).

In the United States citizen participation should protect against intervention of the state into the right of third (WEBER; RENN 1995, p. 17-20, in: TROJA 2001, p.147).
Citizen participation is not spread out to society uniformly. TROJA calls such active citizens “Elites”. They are elites because of their privileged income, education, social status, or simply because their time is valuable. VERBA and NIE share this opinion: “it is just those with higher income, higher education, and higher status-occupation who participate”. By these means, there is bigger skill of decision making and ability to realize decisions. Availability of „greater resources, skill, and psychological commitment“ does make the difference (VERBA; NIE 1972, p. 12).

Strategies of American citizen participation are described by MILLER, REIN and LEVITT as „community-based organizations, sharing progressive/populist outlooks, pursuing a political and electoral strategy, influencing legislative decisions and electing like-minded people to political office” (MILLER, REIN, LEVITT in: GRAIG; MAYO 1995, p. 113).

VERBA and NIE differentiate four kinds of citizen participation: „voting, campaign activity, citizen-initiated contact, and cooperative participation“ (VERBA, NIE 1972, p 46 f.; 52 f.).

4.2. Lobbying

Most common, the term lobbying is used in a political context. Actors who are intent on influencing decisions, so called lobbyists, try to become in favor of policy makers by specific measures. One explanation of the term is: „lobbying often refers […] specifically to the work of private companies known as lobbyists which are employed by organizations to represent their views to Parliament (or Government in general) in a variety of ways - by arranging meetings, organizing protests or providing briefing material“ (http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/82529.stm).

4.3. Grassroots Organization

MILLER; REIN and LEVITT describe grassroots organization as voluntary association of individuals living in a common geographical municipality or similar prospective. Further this approach does implicate „closeness of ordinary people and the distance from elite power groups“. Grassroots organization is different from citizen participation in that way - it „mobilizes individuals into some form of collective action“.

This form of citizen activity is class based, which means that there is similar point of origin amongst participants such as a neighborhood, people with similar incomes and household characteristics, or employees of the same status. „Grassroots organizing does not occur only in lower-income neighborhoods, nor is it necessarily progressive. Those with higher incomes protect themselves against
what they view as threats to their way of life”. Grassroots activity is voluntary and democratic in a basic way, following a so called bottom-up approach (cf.: MILLER; REIN; LEVITT in: GRAIG; MAYO 1995, p. 113).

„AirFair“ calls itself a grassroots-group, and in some way SPON is that way, too.

4.4. Advocacy Organizing

Advocacy organizing is an important kind of citizen participation. Usually it is shown separately from citizen participation. An organization or group is represented by a lawyer, who argues for their interests in court. The power of advocacy organizing is based on the ability to collect proof of projects, for example impact on the environment, and effective lobbying at political levels (MILLER; REIN; LEVITT in GRAIG; MAYO 1995, p. 117).

„Airport Working Group“ can be described as an organization using advocacy organizing. Their main way of influence is filing law suits and taking other legal action concerning John Wayne Airport’s future plans.

5. Stakeholder, involved in John Wayne Airport’s development

The definition of the term stakeholder used in the following abstract is based on a memo of Stanford Research Institute in 1963:

„those groups without whose support the organization would cease to exist“.

(FRIEDMAN 2006, p. 4)

In the following, a definition by FREEMANN is going to be used because that definition does not only mean economic actors:

Stakeholder „can affect the achievements of an organization’s objectives to who is affected by the achievement of an organization’s objectives“. A modification by FREEMAN himself is “those groups are vital to the survival and success of the organization“ (FREEMAN; REED 1983, p. 91, in: FRIEDMAN 2006, p. 4).
Stakeholders involved at John Wayne Airport’s future plans can be assigned to the following categories:

- Environmental organizations, citizen groups (SPON, AWG, „AirFair“, groups like Community- and Homeowner Associations)
- Political institutions (County of Orange, City of Newport Beach and Irvine)
- Economical groups („Blue Ribbon Action Committee“ or single firms).

In the following chapter the main stakeholders which are involved in John Wayne Airport’s plans according to the three groups above, are going to be briefly described.

5.1. Political Stakeholder

*County of Orange*

The County of Orange is a political institution as well as the owner and operator of John Wayne Airport. The County is represented by the “Orange County Board of Supervisors”. Their duties and responsibilities include the development and oversight of projects and political contracts (http://egov.ocgov.com/portal/site/ocgov/).

The County of Orange is represented by five Supervisors, each responsible for a certain district. They have to take into account the demands that can be found in the County while still being legally compliant.

*John Wayne Airport*

John Wayne Airport can be described as stakeholder. The airport itself has no authority or power of decisions because it is operated and owned by the County of Orange. Policies made by the County have to be implied at the airport. Further, there is no profit generated at JWA.

*City of Newport Beach*

Newport Beach has a powerful influence on John Wayne Airport because, on the one hand the city directly borders the airport, and on the other hand the city has a history of fighting its existence. „Residential and commercial uses are located directly below the airport’s primary departure pattern for commercial and general aviation aircraft“ (http://www.city.newport-beach.ca.us/Airport/). In this way, Newport Beach is directly affected by noise generated by air traffic out of JWA. This gives the City the
grounds and motivation to fight. But, according to most interview partners, the City also has the willingness and knowledge to influence John Wayne Airport’s future plans.

Newport Beach is one of the signatories of the Settlement Agreement, achieved through a lawsuit against the County. The arguments used against John Wayne Airport were that „expansion […] exacerbated surface and air traffic problems […] (like) noise, particulate grime from jet exhaust, safety hazards, compulsory relocation of families living under the flight pattern and increased surface traffic” (Los Angeles Times: Plainly, the Airport Hurts Newport. June 29, 1980).

Newport Beach is described with regard to JWA in the Los Angeles Times: „Location, economic vigor and, to an extent, it needs makes growth inevitable. But it is not growing gracefully. […] expansion (of Newport Beach) which includes hotels and office buildings, would result in added pressure for the growth of John Wayne Airport” (Los Angeles Times: Editorial - Growing plans. October 4, 1981). Further there is written: “Newport Beach […] with its principle of opposing airport expansion or improvements that could induce more air travel […] lose a lot of their sting in light of facts that, while less than 4% of the county’s population lives in Newport Beach, it accounted for more than 17% of the 2.5 million passengers last year (1979). That is far more than any other city in the County” (Los Angeles Times: A Double Standard. November 16, 1980).

Corridor Cities
The term „Corridor Cities“ means, with respect to John Wayne Airport, all cities that are affected by the noise and pollution generated from its operations. These cities are: Anaheim, Newport Beach, Tustin, Santa Ana, Irvine, Orange, and Costa Mesa. Together, they also represent the „JWA Coalition“, which works together with the „Orange County Board of Supervisors“ (http://www.ci.costamesa.ca.us/council/agenda/2007-08-07/JWA%20ATTACH%2001.pdf).
Currently the „Corridor Cities“ do not have legal standing in regard to John Wayne Airport’s future plans and are not signatories of the „Settlement Agreement“.

Federal Aviation Administration/FAA
The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is a federal agency of the USA, founded by the Federal Aviation Act in 1958. In 1967, the FAA was incorporated into the „Department of Transportation“.
The main duties are:

- „Regulating civil aviation to promote safety
- Encouraging and developing civil aeronautics, including new aviation technology
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- Developing and operating a system of air traffic control and navigation for both civil and military aircraft
- Researching and developing the National Airspace System and civil aeronautics
- Developing and carrying out programs to control aircraft noise and other environmental effects of civil aviation
- Regulating U.S. commercial space transportation”

(http://www.faa.gov/about/mission/activities/).

In relation to John Wayne Airport’s future plans, the FAA asked to open up the airport for additional air carriers. It was also the first time that the FAA has threatened to go to court to enforce the provisions of the “Airline Deregulation Act” (Los Angeles Times: FAA orders County to open up Airport. April 5, 1980).

**Southern California Association of Governments**

The “Southern California Association of Governments” (SCAG) is an agency which represents six counties and 163 cities of California (Los Angeles Times: Doubts Cast on Alternate Airport Plans. November 29, 1984). One of their duties is to find an alternate airport site for John Wayne Airport. SCAG develops regional plans and recommends: „additional (airport) capacity especially in the OC area” (Los Angeles Times: Letters: January 27, 1985). According to SCAG, plans made by economic groups are fair. However, it admitted that the “Board (of Supervisors) has a very, very difficult task” (Los Angeles Times: Airport Committee Reportedly Asks 2nd Site, 55-flight Limit. January 17, 1985).

5.2. Citizen Groups

**Stop Polluting Our Newport - SPON**

„Stop Polluting Our Newport“ (SPON) was founded in 1974 by Claudia Hirsch and Jean Watt as „non-profit Organization“ and is a group of „concerned citizens in the City of Newport Beach, California […] protecting the City’s charm and beauty“. The goal of “Stop Polluting our Newport“ is: „to promote the protection and preservation of Newport Beach’s environment“. SPON is one of the four signatories of the Settlement Agreement and the group has legal standing in relation with John Wayne Airport’s future plans. Originally SPON became active after a storm that destroyed and polluted parts of the Newport Bay. The group was seeking better and faster disposal of pollution in general, not specifically focusing only on pollution from John Wayne Airport. Today SPON is
involved in environmental issues in general, preservation of open space and parks e.g. (http://www.spon-newport.org).

**Airport Working Group**

“As a signatory of the John Wayne Settlement Agreement the Airport Working group has the legal authority and takes the responsibility to advocate your rights by defending and working to ensure its continuation in perpetuity” (http://airportworkinggroup.org/Root.cfm).

The “Airport Working Group” (AWG) is an organization consisting of 22 Homeowners Associations, who represent 9,306 families (Los Angeles Times: Newport’s Fear of Larger Air Terminal Spurs Debate. February 25, 1984), and, according to AWG, 20,000 citizens of Newport Beach who are affected by John Wayne Airport (Los Angeles Times: Airport Problems: Proposed Airport Act Draws Criticism. November 24, 1983).

The Airport Working Group is specialized on uses legal instruments to have influence on John Wayne Airport. The group is an umbrella group of SPON (Los Angeles Times: City Won’t Challenge 55 Flights. April, 20, 1985). In order to achieve act for its goal to minimize JWA expansion, AWG has hired the law firm Shute, Mihaly & Wineberg of San Francisco “to seek an injunction against the county“ (Los Angeles Times: Politics. Airport Lawsuit Weighed. February 2, 1985). AWG’s main case against JWA expansion is in attacking the “Environmental Impact Report”, which the AWG believes is inadequate.

**AirFair**

“AirFair” calls themselves a “Grassroots Organization”. The group was founded by Evelyn Hard, a former mayor of Newport Beach, in May 2002. The organization is officially registered at the State of California as a „Political Action Committee“ (PAC).

“AirFair” wants to stop John Wayne Airport’s expansion plans by using the power of people“. The group claims to represent 50,000 people and mentions helpful contacts to political institutions (http://www.jwairfair.com/).
Other Citizen Groups

Other citizen groups involved in opposing John Wayne Airport's future plans are: “Dover Shores Homeowner Ass,” “Bluffs Homeowners Community Assn,” “Airport Action Assn.,” “Balboa Island Improvement Assn.,” “Concerned Citizens from Santa Ana Heights,” and “Mariners Community Assn.” This shows just how many groups have been involved in actively opposing John Wayne Airport. Those groups used instruments like letters to the editor (see: Los Angeles Times: Airport’s real costs. June 15, 1980) or organized demonstrations (Los Angeles Times: 300 Protest Jet Noise, Airport Growth. May 1, 1980).

Another group opposing John Wayne Airport’s future plans is the „Airport Coalition“. This group argues that „noise is the tip of the iceberg, it is 10% of the problem […] the other 90% is the hazards” (Los Angeles Times: Airport Problems: Proposed Airport Act Draws Criticism. November 24, 1983). Its members also doubt “the need to spend nearly $200 million on a facility, and that the master plan itself indicates will serve only 30% of the air-travel market in OC in the year 2000” (Los Angeles Times: Newport’s Fear of Larger Air Terminal Spurs Debate. February 25, 1984).

5.3. Business Groups

Orange County Chamber of Commerce

The “Orange County Chamber of Commerce” is a platform for Orange County businesses. The goal is to develop local economic infrastructure. According to a survey of 1000 firms, 28% stated that John Wayne Airport was important to them for choosing to locate in Orange County. The organization proposes an improvement or expansion of John Wayne Airport. The „Greater Irvine Industrial League” shares that point of view. Representatives of that group say that the airport contributes to the vitality of their businesses (Los Angeles Times: Noise OK tied to Jet Flight Limits. February 27, 1981).

Industrial League of Orange County

The “Industrial League of Orange County” has 650 member firms of which 181 are located in Newport Beach. In total, the „Industrial League of Orange County“ represents 100,000 employees. The point of view of that organization is “(to) take an active role in pushing for improvement services at John Wayne” (Los Angeles Times: 2 Business Groups Launch a Drive for Airport Expansion. November 3, 1982).
Together, with other business groups, they defend an expansion of John Wayne Airport and „began lobbying for 55 daily flights out of JWA and renewed search for new airport site“ (Los Angeles Times: Board Again to Take Up Wayne Airport Expansion. January 28, 1985). One argument used by that group is the economic effect of that airport. An analysis claims that an expansion of John Wayne Airport will create 5,600 jobs and will generate an annual profit of 200 million Dollar (Los Angeles Times: Airport Expansion Report Cities Added Noise, Traffic. July 14, 1984).

Community Airport Council
The „Community Airport Council“ also supports expansion of John Wayne Airport. The non-profit organization is a fusion of businesses (Los Angeles Times: Doubts Cast on Alternate Airport Plans. November 29, 1984). Though the group does admit that „operations create noise problems for some county residents,“ it insists „the economic benefit would out weight the problems“ (Los Angeles Times: Noise OK tied to Jet Flight Limits. February 27, 1981). Furthermore, the members opposes a mixed use of civilian and military operations at El-Toro Marine Base, the reason being of political and ecological considerations.

Blue Ribbon Regional Action Committee, or Blue Ribbon Alumni
The “Blue Ribbon Regional Action Committee” renamed to “Blue Ribbon Alumni“ was founded in March 1981. The main tasks of that group have been to evaluate the proposals by the „Southern California Association of Governments“ concerning John Wayne Airport’s future plans and finding an alternate site to John Wayne Airport (Los Angeles Times: Businessmen Plan Airport Site Efforts. July 17, 1981). The „Blue Ribbon Regional Action Committee“, which can be seen as “brain-child“ of Supervisor Riley (Los Angeles Times: Businessmen Plan Airport Site Efforts. July 17, 1981) consists of executives of Orange County’s leading businesses. The group opposes the „Master Plan“ of John Wayne Airport expansion. One claim of the committee, which is described as influential, is to curb the intent of the Board of Supervisors on John Wayne Airport and limit expansion of the airport (Los Angeles Times: Orange County Airport Group to Offer Advice. January 17, 1985).

4 Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) is an “umbrella planning agency, representing 6 counties and 163 cities” (Los Angeles Times: Doubts Cast on Alternate Airport Plans. November 29, 1984).
**Airlines**

Different airlines take the position of expanding John Wayne Airport. The location in Orange County is, according to Frontier Airlines „one of the airlines most profitable destinations“ (Los Angeles Times: They Topped County Waiting List. Airlines Rejoice at Being Allowed Into John Wayne. January 31, 1985). Through the „Airline Deregulation Act,” it should be easier for airlines to access the airport. John Wayne Airport only allows six companies. According to the “Airline Deregulation Act”, different airlines may try to get access to John Wayne Airport by going to court and enforcing their right, for example „Trans World Airlines”, “Jet America Airlines” and “Continental” and “Pacific Express” (Los Angeles Times: More Airlines Interested in County. June 10, 1983).

**McDonnell Douglas Corporation**

The „McDonnell Douglas Corporation“ is an Orange County company, which has 10,000 employees, 6,000 of whom live in the County. The firm builds aircrafts, for example the DC-9 Super 80. This aircraft is the most common one at John Wayne Airport at the time of negotiations for expanding the airport by substituting noisy jets with quieter ones.

Even the DC-9 is now one of the noisiest and the „Mc Donnell Douglas Corporation“ declares that „exchange policy would illegally discriminate against the company in favor of the Boeing 737 model 300 […] that Boeing &Co. claims is quieter” (Los Angeles Times: Wayne Departures Could hit 62 Under Jet Exchange Plan. January 25, 1985). Another argument by the company is that the discrimination would have a negative effect on its sales and consequently on the number of employees (Los Angeles Times: Compromise Reached on John Wayne Airport Plan. August 28, 1985).

6. **Method: Qualitative Research**

The investigation on stakeholder influence on John Wayne Airport will be an analysis of individual cases. Qualitative research provides the procedural manner: idiographic descriptions, non-analytic, qualitative methods, including the expert-interview.

One claim of qualitative research is to describe and understand the point of view of acting persons. Certain developments, interpretation patterns and structures can be elaborated (cf. FLICK; VON KARDOF; STEINKE 2004, p.14).
There are two main principles of qualitative research: openness and communication to the research objective. To accomplish this, a guided interview is going to be used in the investigation of John Wayne Airport. There are 18 open-ended questions with no predefined answers. This should provide an answer by the interview partners that is as open as possible. Aspects which are not yet known can be missed by predefined answers. The central theme of the questionnaire guides the conversation. The same basic questionnaire is going to be used so it is possible to compare the interviews.

The chosen experts are representatives of an organization or group and can been seen in an institutional context and not as individual person (MEUSER; NAGEL 2002, p. 72 f.; NOHL 2006, p. 21).

It was not possible to do a so called pretest because of the small available number of interview partners. In advance the questionnaire was reviewed by Scott A. Bollens, Professor at University of California, Irvine, who oversaw the research.

Every interview partner was asked to sign a letter of consent (see appendix) with following contents:

- Consent to tape the interview
- Consent to use the name of the interview partner and institution
- Decline to use any name, or name of institution.

Every interview partner did agree to tape the interview and to publish their name.

The interviews were conducted in November and December 2007. The length of the interviews vary from 35 to 120 minutes and the average time of an interview is about one hour.

6.1. Selection and Introduction of Experts

In order to get a closer and more precise focus on John Wayne Airport’s development and influencing groups, six interviews with nine expert were conducted. The choice of interview partners tried to cover the whole spectrum of stakeholder groups from political, business and citizen groups. It was not possible to get interviews with other affected cities, like Santa Ana or representatives from business groups. The six interviews were conducted with the following people:

1. Prof. Dr. Mario Mainero, who is working for Supervisor John Moorlach of the second district, which includes the City of Newport Beach.
2. Courtney E. Wiercioch, „Deputy Airport Director“, Edward G. Blankenship („Landrum & Brown“)

5 Landrum & Brown: an airport planning agency, which got charged by the city of Newport Beach in 1980 to investigate possible impact on the community by an expansion of John Wayne Airport (http://www.eltoroairport.org/issues/JWA.htm#closure).
and Jenny Wedge, „Public Relations“ - who are employees of John Wayne Airport.

3. Homer L. Bludau, who is City Manager of Newport Beach.

4. Charles E. Griffin, who is part of “AirFair” and is a specialist in „Aeronautical Engineering“.

5. Jean Watt, who is founder of „Stop Polluting Our Newport“.

6. Nancy Alston, who supports and works for „AirFair“.

6.2. Processing and evaluation of the interviews

The interviews have been taped digitally and transcribed word by word. After transcribing the interview, they have been summarized and analyzed according to the key messages and aspects. Because of a technical problem, the interview of John Wayne Airport employees was not been taped. The interview was written by memory and rechecked by Miss Courtney Wiercioch.

Newspaper articles have also been used for the research. Articles from 1979 to 2007 should complete and round out the states of the interview partners. Most of the articles are from 1980 to 1985, which is the period of time that can be identified as the most important in the negotiations for the Settlement Agreement and represented the main phase of influence stakeholders on John Wayne Airport.
7. Empiricism: Evaluation of Interviews and Newspaper Articles

The evaluation of the interview and newspaper material is made by the following scheme:

- Stakeholder
- Instruments
- Argumentation
- Resources
- Communication
- Results
- Objectives
- The City of Newport Beach.

Newport Beach has a separate paragraph because that city is one of the most important actors in influencing John Wayne Airport’s future plans.

Stakeholder

Three major groups influencing John Wayne Airport can be identified: political, economical, and citizen groups.

The political group aims to get a balance of all interests by promoting a lawful solution or compromise that can be accepted by everyone. Members of the economical group support the development of John Wayne Airport which will to have a positive effect on their business. Participating citizens want their rights to be enforced. They oppose expansion of John Wayne Airport because they worry about negative influence on their life and living space by aviation.

Every major group can be subdivided into individual groups with similar goals but that use different strategies and instruments to achieve their aims. There are many parties involved influencing John Wayne Airport. According to TROJA this can be called a manifold conflict of interests (ct. TROJA 2001, p. 46).

Instruments

According to the major categories of stakeholders, different kinds of instruments are used by the actors. Negotiation and consensus building are instruments used by the political groups. Laws, settlements, and other rules arose from these negotiations. A notable instrument used by the City of Newport Beach is the annexing of Santa Ana Heights area. That area was formerly unincorporated county territory.

Through the annexation, Newport Beach was able to influence John Wayne Airport because the Santa Ana heights area borders the airport directly to the south (Los Angeles Times: Santa Ana Heights Annexation Asked. November 15, 1984).

Business groups try to get involved by influencing the creation of law through lobbying tactics.
Citizen groups use the instrument of participation. With focus on John Wayne Airport, four ways of participation, as described by VERBA and NIE, can be found: “voting, campaign activity, citizen-initiated contact, and cooperative participation” (VERBA; NIE 1972, p. 46 f.). Additional use of the power of people reinforces that method. A member of Orange County Board of Supervisor was himself surprised as to how many people have been involved by Newport Beach initiated actions (Los Angeles Times: Politics. Airport Lawsuit Weighed. February 2, 1985).

Another kind of participation is advocacy organizing. „Airport Working Group“ filed law suits at Federal Court and State Court (Los Angeles Times: New Orange County flights. Amid Pomp and Protest, Airport Expansion Begins. April 2, 1985). The power of Advocacy organizing is the ability to collect evidence on the effects of projects, as well as effectively lobbying on a political level (MILLER; REIN; LEVITT in GRAIG; MAYO 1995, p. 117).

The taking of legal action by the City of Newport Beach against the County of Orange can be described as a pressure tactic aimed to achieve a binding settlement and for the selection of an alternate site for John Wayne Airport.

**Argumentation**

“All kinds of competing values and interests there is no longer one solution that could satisfy business, residential, economic environmental and political interests” (Los Angeles Times: A 12 Year Flight to Nowhere. September 9, 1979). The political authority has to find a solution that is supported by all interest groups. Further they have to find a long term solution that also satisfies the future demands of the County. The arguments used by the political authority are prognoses of economic and population development and associated demand on traffic infrastructure, including John Wayne Airport. Existing laws and settlements at local and federal level have to be adhered to in planning any expansion of the airport.

The impact of John Wayne Airport on the local economy is one argument used by business groups proposing expansion. A statement by a member of „Orange County Chamber of Commerce“: „we need this thing (John Wayne Airport) desperately […] and we think this is the beginning of allowing our business community to progress“ (Los Angeles Times: New Orange County flights. Amid Pomp and Protest, Airport Expansion Begins. April 2, 1985). They base their arguments by the generation of jobs and positive impact of John Wayne Airport on Orange County’s economy. “Direct economic impact on OC would jump from $648 million to $1,98 billion a year, if 73 daily departures would be permitted. Airport would triple the total economic activity and would move from 1,5% to 4,5%” (Los Angeles Times: New Orange County flights. Amid Pomp and Protest, Airport Expansion Begins. April 2, 1985).
Airport Expansion Report Cities Added Noise, Traffic. July 14, 1984). In addition, John Wayne Airport is mentioned by businesses as an important reason for choosing to locate in Orange County. Citizen groups are using three main arguments against John Wayne Airport expansion: noise, pollution, and the danger of an airplane crash. Miss Alston added that noise generated by John Wayne Airport lowers property values. A survey by NELSON confirms that statement (NELSON 1980, in: FORSYTH; KENNETH; NIJKAMP 2002, p.615).

Resources
One resource of the political authority is the ability to create law. Another is the ability to solve conflicts through hearings or intermediation. In the case of John Wayne Airport’s expansion, the conflict was solved by taking legal action. The judiciary has the authority of decision making. The implementation and adoption of those decisions, like the Settlement Agreement, is the authority of the County.
The resources of business groups are connected with the location of business in Orange County. The companies create profit, provide jobs, and are an indicator of vitality and attractiveness of a business location.
Capital, knowledge, and time are resources of citizen groups. Additionally, there is the power of people, by involving a wide part of the community in order to create influence.

Communication
A common tactic of communication used by all stakeholders is the holding of meetings. These meeting are used to present information, determine objectives, or hold ballots to decide strategies. Another medium of communication is the usage of internet. Political, business, and citizen groups all have their own web pages.
Another important tool of communication used by citizen groups is the regular production of newsletters. They want to give information to the community and win favor for the citizen group. “AirFair” uses their newsletter in order to raise donations.
Newspapers and other print media are further means of communication as well as having a good relationship to the press in general.
Results

The main outcome of the long-winded and conflict-riddled negotiations over John Wayne Airport’s future plans is the Settlement Agreement. It was signed by the County of Orange, the City of Newport Beach and two citizen groups, “Stop Polluting Our Newport” and “Airport Working Group”. The first Settlement Agreement was signed in 1985 and was good until 2005. The Amended Settlement Agreement was resolved in 2003 and is valid until December 31st, 2015.

Other settlements concerning the operations of John Wayne Airport are the curfew and a separate arrangement with Newport Beach and Orange County about annexing land south of John Wayne Airport in order to expand to the south.

John Wayne Airport is one of the most regulated airports in the United States or maybe even the world. This can be seen as a result of stakeholder influence as well.

The populace supports the calls of the citizen groups opposing John Wayne Airport expansion, which is an outcome of the work and participation of those groups. According to their own account, 200,000 citizens of Newport Beach and the corridor cities support “AirFair” and have signed the resolution of “AirFair” (http://www.jwairfair.com/news/airportwebsite.html).

“Airport Working Group” represents more than 9,300 airport area families that are effected by John Wayne Airport (Los Angeles Times: Newport’s Fear of Larger Air Terminal Spurs Debate. 25.02.1984).

Objectives

The objective of politics is promote the expansion of John Wayne Airport according to the needs and demands in relation to future development of Orange County while also seeing to the needs of the citizens and applicable law.

Business groups call for (limited) expansion of John Wayne Airport. A well working infrastructure is a basic necessity for economic development and the location of businesses in Orange County.

The citizen groups oppose expansion of John Wayne Airport or as limited expansion as possible. The objectives of those groups have changed during the process of influencing John Wayne Airport, as exemplified by the attempt to limit the maximum number of daily departures. One major objective was finding an alternate site for John Wayne Airport, but after the failure of using El Toro Marine Base, that is not possible anymore. According to studies conducted at the end of 1970’s, there is no space available in Orange County to build another airport (Los Angeles Times: A 12 Year Flight to Nowhere. 09.06.1979).
City of Newport Beach

The position of Newport Beach is in some ways separate from the positions of citizen groups located there. For example, the City approved of raising the average number of daily departures to 55 whereas the citizen groups did not. This is the reason they failed to find a solution other than filing a law suit (Los Angeles Times: Supervisors held in Contempt by Judge. April 24, 1985).

It was Newport Beach, and not the other corridor cities, that filed a law suit. The reasons for that are that Newport Beach directly borders John Wayne Airport and that there were many committed citizens of its community that were involved.

Newport Beach is affected in a special way by the operations of John Wayne Airport because of the limited size of the airport area and the characteristics and position of John Wayne Airport's runway (ct: Letter of Fraport AG), which determines the directions of the takeoff and landing procedures. The runway at John Wayne Airport is relatively short and there is not much airport land to fly over after takeoff before being in Newport Beach. So immediately after leaving John Wayne Airport the airplane does go over a residential area. The common take off procedure at John Wayne goes south bound, over parts of Newport Beach and the Newport Bay. The landing procedure is from the north, above Santa Ana and Tustin (see Fig. 4). Areas affected by landing are mostly industrial.

Fig. 4: Takeoff (blue) and landing (pink) procedure at John Wayne Airport (red) (Flight track maps)
8. Results of research in relation to participation theory

After the evaluation of interviews and newspaper articles it can be said that the influencing John Wayne Airport was a (successful) form of citizen participation. There are four ways of participation according to a description by VERBA and NIE: voting, campaign activity, citizen-initiated contact, and cooperative participation" (VERBA; NIE 1972, p. 46 f.). Those four forms of citizen participation can be found during the development of John Wayne Airport.

"Voting" is participation in the sense of an election. Citizens elect a representative by an election, who will act according to their point of view. In the case of John Wayne Airport, this is the election of Supervisors or a member of the City Council, who oppose John Wayne Airport's expansion plans.

"Campaign Activity" is practiced by AirFair. "Campaigning" in this case does not mean in a political way, for a party for example, but for the citizen group and its objectives. The members actively promote their interests and try to mobilize other people to join them.

"Citizen-initiated Contact" is another form of participation that can be found by influencing John Wayne Airport's future plans. In that case it was not individuals who tried to contact a political official in a direct way, but a group as a whole. For example, the groups have a close relationship to some Supervisors. Another way is well directed fund-raising for politicians (cf.: statement by Nancy Alston relative to Senator Tom Harman).

The citizen groups "Stop Polluting Our Newport" and "Airport Working Group" pursued the same goal, which was to limit the expansion of John Wayne Airport. You can call this "cooperative participation". Influencing John Wayne Airport by participation takes place in various ways. The statement by Jean Watt: "if we would do a law suit, we would do it through AWG or SPON, but if we would go and be involved in an election, it would be "AirFair"", shows that each citizen group has its special role. In whole, it is a mixture of instruments that were used. In addition there is also "advocacy organizing", used by AWG. This is taking legal action by filing a law suit, a common practice in the United States (cf. JANIKE, KUNIKE, STITZEL 1999, p. 90) and has a more important significance than in Germany (cf. WEBER, RENN 1995, in: TROJA 2001, p. 147).

Legality is a main part of political legitimacy. The legitimization of made decisions, in that case concerning to John Wayne Airport's expansion and future plans, need legal integration. Chapter two shows the different levels of rules, settlements, laws and so on, related to an airport and especially John Wayne Airport. Expansion of John Wayne Airport was and is controversial because federal law and state law overlap. Mr. Bludau characterizes the situation in regard to John Wayne Airport as difficult and very complex: "It is an issue that the county owns the property, the FAA really has a lot of say, on the
operations what happens when the plane leaves the ground, the FAA is in control of them. And we have agreements that say: what happens to them on the ground”.

Several interviewees give the high socio-economic status of Newport Beach as reason for a preferred initial point of participation, as opposed to lower income or status communities. This statement is supported by several authors. In the USA, in general, there is a close relationship between socio-economic aspects and the success of participation. Participation in the United States can be called „class-based“ because of the preferred position of wealthier communities and the existence of „time, the money, and the knowledge to be effective in politics“ (cf.: VERBA, NIE 1972, p. 132 f. and ct.: TROJA 2001, p. 152). The resources that were most important to influence John Wayne Airport, named by interviewees were money, knowledge, and legal expertise.

MILLE, REIN and LEVITT write: “higher incomes protect themselves against what they view as threats to their way of life” (MILLER, REIN, LEVITT in: GRAIG, MAYO 1995, p. 113). Newport Beach is, according to several interview partners, a rich community. Mr. Bludau describes Newport Beach by using the words „quality of life“. By this, he means a high standard of life. Citizens of Newport Beach expect everything „close to perfect. And if they are listening to planes going over them […] they say: we need to do something”.

A thesis by MILLER, REIN and LEVITT claims: “groups which started with higher socio-economic and white groups may move down the class ladder to expand support if they emphasize […] issues which affect more directly lower-income persons” (MILLER, REIN, LEVITT in: GRAIG, MAYO 1995, p. 124). Newport Beach is a wealthy community. In order to get additional support, the City and citizen groups located there, tried to involve the „Corridor Cities“. Those cities, like Santa Ana or Tustin differ from Newport Beach. Differences concerning income or ethnicity can clearly be found (cf. cap. 3.).

The basic requirement for hiring lawyers and contracting a firm to make a survey is to have money. This requirement was easily fulfilled with Newport Beach. The city hired a well know law firm from San Francisco to represent their position (Los Angeles Times: Politics. Airport Lawsuit Weighed. February 2, 1985). Further Newport Beach contracted „Landrum & Brown“, an airport planning firm, to investigate possible effects of an expansion of John Wayne Airport on the community. Jean Watt describes the situation in the following words: “To gain that kind of power, you have to have money. And it costs a lot to be able to hire attorneys to fail a law suit and that sort of thing”.

In a statement of “Airport Policy,” the City of Newport Beach said: “The City and community groups have achieved some success in controlling airport impacts by understanding, and working within, the complex legal, economic and political factors that are relevant to adverse airport impacts such as the type and level of aircraft operations” (http://www.city.newport-beach.ca.us/Cmo/airport/CouncilPolicyA-17.asp).
That citation confirms that knowledge and collaboration are key elements in claiming and enforcing objectives.

Some citizen groups have been in existence for a long time and have been involved with the whole process of influencing John Wayne Airport. Members of newer groups like “AirFair” already have experience in participation, because they are members of the older groups, too. Therefore, there is a history of influencing John Wayne Airport and it is possible to collect experiences during that process and learn about participation. MILLER, REIN and LEVITT write: „places where organizing took place in the past, […] are easier to deal with a current difficulty than are communities with lack an earlier experience” (MILLER, REIN, LEVITT in: GRAIG, MAYO 1995, p. 119).
9. Conclusion

The development of John Wayne Airport is closely connected with the economic development and the growth in population of Orange County. A dynamic process of economic and demographic growth pushes demand on the traffic infrastructure, including the airport infrastructure like John Wayne Airport. Different stakeholder groups are involved in the development of that airport in Orange County: political, economical, and citizen groups. They all tried to influence John Wayne Airport’s future plans according to their point of view.

“The conflicts leading to development of the current master plan are by no means unique. The airport […] has become hopelessly out of step with the growth that has occurred around it. Yet, it is locked in by the very urbanization that has brought the county’s needs for modern air transportation into sharp focus. […] 22 million potential passengers in 2005 - no way to meet that demand at John Wayne without bringing deviations to the communities that have grown up along its borders […] The ultimate solution will consist of a delicate balance between the dozens of interests – airlines, airport, neighbors, business - who have a stake in the future of John Wayne Airport” (Los Angeles Times: Board Again to Take Up Wayne Airport Expansion. January 28, 1985).

The major goal was and still is to bring together all these groups and find a solution that will consolidate the needs of every group. The way to find this solution in the case of John Wayne Airport is in some ways unique and mentionable, in particular by citizen groups. The power of fighting that airport by citizen groups and by the City of Newport Beach was well organized and marked by a deep understanding of using different instruments, especially legal ones, in order to influence the expansion of John Wayne Airport. The reasons for this successful involvement are the social-economic infrastructure of Newport Beach and its citizens, as well as their willingness to get involved and their knowledge of organizing citizen protests.
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- Questionnaire (Guided Interview)

Organisation:
Date:
Name of Interviewer: Julia Wolf
Name of Interview Partner:

Guided Interview

1. What is your position in relation to John Wayne Airport’s future plans or expansion?
   What are pros and cons? How is your County/City affected by JWA-future plans?
   *Wie ist Ihre Position zur Flughafenerweiterung? Was sind Vorteil/Nachteile des Flughafenausbaus?*
   *Wie ist Ihre County/Stadt davon betroffen*

2. How is your organisation structured?
   *Wie ist Ihre Organisation aufgebaut?*

3. Are you collaborating with other organisations/groups, if yes, how does the collaboration work?
   *Arbeiten sie mit anderen Gruppen/Organisationen zusammen- wenn ja, auf welche Art und Weise erfolgt die Zusammenarbeit?*

4. How do you influence JWA-future plans/expansion?
   *Wie üben sie Einfluss auf die Ausbaupläne aus?*

5. What initiatives do/did/are you going to take concerning JWA-future plans?
   *Welche Initiativen haben sie hinsichtlich JWA ergriffen?*

6. What kinds of resources are available to influence JWA?
   *Welche Mittel stehen ihnen zur Einflussnahme zur Verfügung?*

7. How do you reason, concerning JWA-future plans/expansion? What kind of arguments do you use?
   *Welche Argumente/Punkte führen sie als Befürworter/Gegner des Ausbaus an?*

8. How do you get through to people? How do find support? (Communication policy)
   *Wie erreichen sie Menschen, wie finden Unterstützung (Informationspolitik: Zeitungen, Online…)?*

9. What did you achieve so far concerning to JWA?
   *Was haben sie bisher erreicht?*

10. What is the current point of discussion concerning to JWA?
    *Was ist der augenblickliche Stand der Diskussion?*

11. What are your future plans concerning to JWA?
    *Was möchten sie für die Zukunft erreichen?*

12. Are there differences/distinctions between the different groups, influencing JWA future plans?
    *Gibt es Unterschiede im Protests/Befürwortung hinsichtlich der einzelnen Gruppen, wenn ja womit würden sie diese begründen?*

13. Does the City of Newport Beach (and stakeholder located there) have a special position, how would
    you describe this?
    *Hat Newport Beach eine besondere Stellung hinsichtlich der Einflussnahme, wie würden sie diese Begründen?*

14. Which alternatives do you see for JWA future plans/expansion? Which solution do you prefer?
    *Welche Alternativen sehen sie? Welche Lösung/Alternative sehen sie?*

15. What do you think about the need of travel in the future and how do you see JWA in this?

16. What do you think of the JWA-expansion plans economy wise?

17. What else do you want to ad?

18. What other people should I talk to?
- Letter of Consent

Prof. Dr. Mario Mainero, „Chief Executive Officer“, Office of John Moorlach, Supervisor 2nd District

Letter of Consent

Date: November 15th, 2007
Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf
Institution: OC Board of Supervisors, Chief of Staff
Name of interview partner: Prof. Mario Mainero

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name of name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
- Letter of Consent

Courtney E. Wiercioch, „Deputy Airport Director“, John Wayne Airport

Letter of Consent

Date: November 16th 2007
Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf
Institution: John Wayne Airport
Name of interview partner: Courtney Wiercioch

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
Letter of Consent

Date: November 16th, 2007
Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf
Institution: Landrum & Brown, Senior Vice President
Name of interview partner: Gary Blankenship

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
Letter of Consent

Jenny Wedge, „Public Relations“, John Wayne Airport

Date: November 16th 2007
Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf
Institution: John Wayne Airport, Manager Public Relations
Name of interview partner: Jenny Wedge

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
Letter of Consent

Homer L. Bludau, *City Manager of Newport Beach*

Letter of Consent

Date: *Nov. 26* +12

Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf

Institution: City Manager of Newport Beach

Name of interview partner: Mr. Homer Bludau

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Mr. Homer Bludau

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

Mr. Homer Bludau

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
- Letter of Consent

Charles E. Griffin, “AirFair”

Letter of Consent

Date: Friday, December 7th, 2007

Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf

Institution: AirFair

Name of interview partner: Mr. Charles E. Griffin

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

[Signature]

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

[Signature] DEC 3, 2008 CHARLES E. GRIFFIN

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
- Letter of Consent

Jean Watt, “Stop Polluting Our Newport”

Letter of Consent

Date: Dec. 14th, 2007
Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf
Institution:
Name of interview partner: Jean Watt

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature Jean Watt

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature Jean Watt

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
Letter of Consent

Nancy Alston, “AirFair”

Date: Dec. 13th 2007

Name of interviewer: Julia Wolf

Institution: "JW AirFair"

Name of interview partner: Nancy Alston

The interview or parts of the interview are going to be published at NEURUS-website (Network for European and US-American Regional and Urban Studies). The interview is going to be used for my final examination in Germany, which is not going to be published.

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to record the interview.

Signature

Herewith I allow Julia Wolf to make public my name and/or the name of the institution.

Signature

I do not want Julia Wolf to use any name or name of institution and keep it anonymous.

Signature
THE AIRPORT NOISE AND CAPACITY ACT OF 1990 ("ANCA")

United States Code Annotated Currentness
Title 49, Transportation (Refs & Annos)
Subtitle VII. Aviation Programs
Part B. Airport Development and Noise
Chapter 475. Noise (Refs & Annos)
Subchapter II. National Aviation Noise Policy

§ 47521. Findings

Congress finds that--

(1) aviation noise management is crucial to the continued increase in airport capacity;
(2) community noise concerns have led to uncoordinated and inconsistent restrictions on aviation that could impede the national air transportation system;
(3) a noise policy must be carried out at the national level;
(4) local interest in aviation noise management shall be considered in determining the national interest;

(5) community concerns can be alleviated through the use of new technology aircraft and the use of revenues, including those available from passenger facility fees, for noise management;
(6) revenues controlled by the United States Government can help resolve noise problems and carry with them a responsibility to the national airport system;
(7) revenues derived from a passenger facility fee may be applied to noise management and increased airport capacity; and
(8) a precondition to the establishment and collection of a passenger facility fee is the prescribing by the Secretary of Transportation of a regulation establishing procedures for reviewing airport noise and access restrictions on operations of stage 2 and stage 3 aircraft.

Ihre Email-Anfrage vom 22.07.2008

Sehr geehrte Frau Wolf,

vielen Dank für Ihre oben bezeichnete Anfrage, in der Sie im Zusammenhang mit Ihrer Diplomarbeit um Informationen zu der Frage bitten, ob ein Flugzeug beim Start mehr Lärm verursacht als beim Landeanflug.

In erster Annäherung kann man diese Frage bejahen, da die sogenannten „Footprints“ von Verkehrsflugzeugen, das sind die Flächen am Boden, auf denen bei Landung bzw. Start ein bestimmter Geräuschpegel erreicht bzw. überschritten ist, beim Start i. d. R. größer sind als bei der Landung.

Hinsichtlich der Bedeutung für das Flughafenumfeld muss man jedoch berücksichtigen, dass diese Footprints sich auf ein Koordinatensystem beziehen, dessen Nulllinie beim Aufsetzpunkt bzw. beim Starttroll startet. Dies hat zur Folge, dass i. d. R. an den Flughäfen ein großer Teil des (allerdings insgesamt kürzeren) Lande-Footprints außerhalb des Flughafengeländes liegt, während beim Start ein großer Teil des Footprints auf dem Flughafengelände verläuft, da ja zunächst die gesamte Startbahnlinie überrollt bzw. überflogen wird. Je länger die Startbahn, desto größer ist also der Teil des Abflug-Footprints, der auf dem Flughafengelände verbleibt. Für Flughäfen, auf denen überwiegend gut steigende Kurz- und Mittelstreckenmaschinen zum Einsatz kommen, kann daher die außerhalb des Flughafengeländes durch den Lande-Footprint beanspruchte Fläche größer sein als die durch den Start-Footprint beanspruchte Fläche.

Als Anlage erhalten Sie einen kombiniert für Anflug und Abflug dargestellten 85 dB-Footprint eines Airbus A 320, der dies verdeutlicht (dem Start ist ein Abfluggewicht von
66 t unterstellt und volle Triebwerksleistung. Angaben des Koordinatensystems in Metern).


Wir hoffen, dass wir Ihnen mit diesen Hinweisen helfen konnten.

Mit freundlichen Grüßen

Fraport AG

[Unterschrift]

H. Amann

Anlage

i.A.

M. Brendle
Footprint $L(A, \text{max}) = 85$ dB

A320-211, TOW = 66 t, Full Power
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