

# NEWSLETTER

## Sayings from the past, "Truth is universal. Perception of truth is not" — "Buyer beware!"

These sayings perfectly describe what was presented by the County of San Diego at the October 22, 2015, Palomar Airport Association Committee (PAAC) Meeting.

After many years of studying the best way to expand McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ), the County and its consultant, Kimley-Horn, presented its recommended modified runway extension option. Per the County, this option is needed to accommodate the larger future Bombardier Global 8000, a Design Class C-III business jet.

\* Mr. Charles G. "Chuck" Collins, PAAC Chairman, stated (paraphrasing his statement) - the runway expansion will be constructed with concrete that has a 125,000 lbs. limitation. That will rule out the Boeing class of jets.

A believable statement until you review the Bombardier Global 8000 Specifications — the future plane given as the reason CRQ needs to expand.

### The Bombardier Global 8000 Specifications:

- **5,800 ft. Takeoff Distance** • **Maximum Takeoff Weight (MTOW) 104,800 lbs.**
- **Maximum Landing Weight (MLW) 85,800 lbs.**

**The fact is**, if you compare the specifications of Boeing's "Small Urban Airport" configured planes, there are a number of Boeing models already landing at airports meeting the Bombardier Global 8000 specifications, including the Boeing 717 with up to 134-seats and a MLW of 100,089 lbs.

**\*\*The Simple Truth**, whether Boeing planes will or will not land at CRQ is no longer the issue. Boeing is moving out of the 100-seat plane market. Mr. Hourigan, Program Manager, nor the PAAC chose to emphasize other large planes would be able to use the future airport, leaving the public with the impression large commercial jets will not be using CRQ.

Based on the Global 8000 specifications, the below planes can use CRQ's new expanded runway!



Bombardier CRJ900 up to 80-seats  
MTOW 84,500 lbs.  
MLW 73,502 lbs.  
Runway Takeoff Length 5,833 ft.



Embraer E-170 up to 80-seats  
MTOW 85,100 lbs.  
MLW 72,310 lbs.  
Runway Takeoff Length 5,710 ft.



Mitsubishi up to 92-seats  
MTOW 94,358 lbs.  
MLW 83,776 lbs.  
Runway Takeoff Length 5,710 ft.



The NEW Bombardier CS100 up to 133-seats  
MTOW 133,999 lbs.  
MLW 115,500 lbs.  
Runway Takeoff Length 3,999 ft.



Inside of the Bombardier CRJ 900

**Half the truth** — "Boeing planes will never be landing at McClellan-Palomar."

**Fact** — Dependant on the final length of the runway extension, Bombardier and other plane manufacturers are producing planes carrying 70 to 133 passengers capable of landing on CRQ's future runway. A fact the County knows and is not telling its citizens. **WHY?**

\* Revised 11/3/2015 - Mr. Collins not Mr. Hourigan made the comment on runway limitation. \*\* Reworded

With the above and other misleading statements that, **at best, can be described as only half-truths**, the PAAC unanimously approved the motion to send the San Diego County Airport Department's (SDAD) recommended motion to the San Diego Board of Supervisors for approval in their December 2015 meeting:

*"Palomar Airport Advisory Committee recommends that the Board of Supervisors direct staff to proceed with the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan focusing on the modified C/D-III classification as the preferred option, subject to the preparation of a Program-Level Environmental Impact Report."*

The approval was given despite a number of additional unanswered questions by the PAAC to the SDAD Director, Peter Drinkwater, and his consultant Project Manager, Vince Hourigan, e.g., were asked how much would this recommended option cost. The answer - \$100M not including the runway extension. Shockingly, there was no follow-up inquiry to what is going to cost \$100M if the runway extension is not included.

Also, the approval came after the tolerated public comment session that was restricted to three (3) minutes per person. It must be mentioned the three (3) minutes were strongly enforced for those pointing out the flaws in what had been presented or asked about conditions that have been unresolved/ignored for years. The following are just some of what was pointed out needing answers before any vote should have been taken;

1. There was not a definition in the Modified C/D-III preferred option on how long the runway would be extended. It was asked - was it 800, 900 or 1,200 feet? The answer from SDAD was 800 feet would be added. It was then pointed out, 800 feet added to the existing 4,897 feet runway was 5,697 feet. The Bombardier Global 8000 (the plane used to justify the need for a runway extension) specifications states — a fully loaded plane requires "5,800 feet takeoff distance." After more than two years of study, **the recommended modified C/D-III runway will be too short. OOPS!**
2. In 1999, McClellan-Palomar had 270,000 operations (takeoffs and landings), today, it is projected this years operations will be approximately 120,000. Why is the county going to spend more than One-Hundred Million Dollars **(\$100M) on an airport that has lost more than half it of its operations since 1999. OOPS!**
3. Other than serving a few corporate interest who are flying planes larger than the airport is currently certified to accommodate, is this airport expansion even needed? Surly, more the \$100M can be spent on more productive projects in North County and not destroy the airport's surrounding communities!
4. Today's airport noise has increased year after year and now is destroying the quality of life in communities surrounding the airport. With the larger jets will there be more or less noise? The answer given was there will be less noise.

This answer is not supported by factual 2015 FAA/Metroplex data! **That data shows the FAA predicts the noise will increase. OOPS!**

With all the above left unanswered or better put, ignored — true to form, the PAAC only thanked the public for their comments and promptly and unanimously approved the SDAD recommended motion.

**One last fact** - the approval was not surprising or unexpected after an article appeared in the San Diego Union Tribune on October 21, 2015, **one day prior to the meeting**, quoting Mr. Charles G. "Chuck" Collins,

*"The biggest improvement is safety," said Chuck Collins, chairman of the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee. "This would make a safer airport. A longer runway gives us more room to address things that aren't expected."*

Based on SDAD now recommending converting from a B-II airport to a [C/D-III Airport](#) (click for definition), Mr. Collins' reported statement and the lack of concerns about obvious non answers from SDAD and its consultant, it has to be asked:

1. As they used to say in the old gangster movies - "Is the fix in?"
2. Who's protecting the health, safety, property values and quality of life of the hundreds of thousands voters and residents of North County?
3. Unlike San Diego's Mayor Faulconer, when will Carlsbad's City Council stop its "Deafening Sound of Silence" and step-up to protect its citizens. The City Council can stop the County from turning Carlsbad into another Point Loma, Newport Beach, Santa Cruz, Santa Monica and numerous other cities around America.