

NEWSLETTER

This month's Newsletter is somewhat late because we needed:

1. To quickly analyze the County of San Diego's (County) February 29th McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ) Workshop #4.
2. Time to digest how the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee (PAAC) in its February 18th meeting was unresponsive to a request originally made in the November PAAC meeting and followed up again in the January PAAC meeting.

Workshop #4 Takeaway - Still no open conversation with the citizens who will be adversely impacted.

Another interesting meeting with no real answers. Missing from any County's discussion is:

1. What is the projected property devaluation and lost tax revenues for the surrounding communities?
2. What is the projected increase in the noise and pollution for the citizens of North County, including Carlsbad, Cardiff, Del Mar, Encinitas, Escondido, Fairbanks Ranch, Oceanside, Rancho Santa Fe, San Marcos, Solana Beach and Vista?
3. With the County's passenger projections, how can the following statement be close to fact? March 2nd the UT reported "County Supervisor Bill Horn and Carlsbad Mayor Matt Hall have said the improvements will make the airport safer, quieter and more economically viable without significantly contributing to increased traffic."

In the 2013 Airport Master Plan, the County ONLY wanted to extend the runway to allow a small minority (less than .003%) of the aircraft that used CRQ to fly nonstop to China. That plan gave no consideration to the increased pollution or noise a heavier jet taking off would create. The County's plan only gave consideration to the benefits for the minority of the airport's customers.

With the new plan presented in Workshop #4, the County has changed its direction and proposes not just a runway extension, but a complete redesign of CRQ's airfield to allow the larger Design Class C/D III aircraft, projected to be in production by 2017. Part of the new plan includes completely removing the \$7,900,000 runway, recently built in 2010.

Millions have been spent and hundreds of more millions are planned to be spent. However, this workshop, like all previous workshops, presented the County's incomplete presentation with no ability for the audience to challenge or ask any questions during or at the end of the presentation. Rather, if the audience had any questions, they were directed to talk to County employees situated around the room by the presentation boards.

Following the direction, it soon became obvious a number of the County employees did not have the knowledge to answer a number of the questions. In those cases, all the employees could do was take notes, but they never asked for the name of the questioner so they could follow up.

That said, the County stated per California law, all (Public, Organization and Government Agency) comments must be submitted to the County by March 29, 2016, thirty (30) days after Workshop #4. In order to allow this to be accomplished the County asked the audience to fill out the comments forms or go to <http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/sdc/dpw/airports/palomar/masterplan.html> where all the needed information will be found. After the County completes this phase, there will be one more public workshop in early 2017.

During the presentation, the County presented one of the main reasons for the need to expand the airport is because the FAA suggests if 500 or more larger aircraft are using an airport not designed for that type of aircraft, the airport can start the planning process to accommodate the larger aircraft. According to the County, in 2015, CRQ "surprisingly" had 6,000 Design Class C/D-III aircraft use the Design Class B-II CRQ airport.

Let's see, the County was shocked to "surprisingly" find out that many Design Class C/D-III were using CRQ. How can that be after more than five years of building/leasing hangars on airport property to accommodate that type of aircraft?

That said, according to the County, the FAA guideline is only a suggestion. The County can also elect to not plan for Design Class C/D-III aircraft and encourage that these type of aircraft move and use more appropriate airports. Just like Supervisor Horn stated in the December 16, 2015, Board of Supervisors Meeting regarding the majority of the Design Class B-II aircraft presently using CRQ, to paraphrase — it's time they relocate and fly out of other airports.

Frankly, all that can be said about the whole process thus far is — all the government boxes are being checked, but the public is definitely not receiving all the facts or any consideration in this process.

PAAC February 28th was Unresponsive — Who's looking out for the public's safety?

The facts - in the November 2015 PAAC meeting, the PAAC was asked to include in the airport's monthly statistics the number of aborted landings/go arounds at the airport. In the January PAAC meeting, the airport statistics were given, but did not include any statistics of aborted landings. Therefore, the request was resubmitted, especially with "drones " now becoming more prevalent around airports. But, before we continue the following must be understood:

1. It is illegal to fly drones within a 5 mile radius of an airport. That said, the reality is the public is flying drones within the 5 mile radius.
2. Definition of "Go Around." According to Flight Training website, "Go Around" is "... a wave-off, an aborted landing, a missed approach, a rejected landing, ..."

Whatever you choose to call it, an aborted landing most likely happens because the pilot feels it is not safe to land and has to go around for a second or more attempts. Not only does this create a dangerous situation for the people on the ground, but produces more noise and pollution because of the second or more attempts to land.

3. Why the request for the statistics was requested in the first place:
A number of aborted landings have been observed with only some being recorded by people on the ground. Of the ones recorded, a number of the large aircraft are aborting and flying 300 ft. to 600 ft. over Carrillo Elementary, Poinsettia Elementary or Pacific Ridge schools with populations of 1,900 plus.

Back to the February PAAC meeting. Chairman Charles G. "Chuck" Collins announced the Committee, the Airport and the FAA had met to discuss the request for including the aborted landing statistics in the monthly airport report, but it was decided this was not necessary because:

1. There are no records kept of aborted landings/go arounds
2. The FAA tower has the best vantage point for any danger
3. Only 5% of aborted landings/go arounds are unplanned (aviation speak). *Guess the other 95% were planned.*

As a result of the PAAC's announcement, a heated discussion was held on why the outside meeting was held without the public being invited and why the PAAC was not looking out for the public's safety and failing to protect the children in the three schools where most of the large aborting jets (up to 60,000 lbs.) flight paths are forced to take.

As has been seen and documented over the last two years, the PAAC politely listens to public comments, but takes no action to correct the public's concerns or protect the public interest, only the airport's interest. Given the Airport and the FAA admit they do not record or investigate any aborted landings, the following attached document presents why it is becoming more and more obvious some preventative action needs to take place. By the lack of action, it is obvious nobody at the airport or the FAA is worried that more and more Design Class C/D-III jet aircraft are coming in at faster and faster approach speeds (121 to 165 Knots) to an airport designed and certified for ONLY slower aircraft with approach speed of 90 to 120 Knots.

[See the Attached "When Will NC Citizens Luck Run OUT.PDF" document for more details.](#)

Note: the above attached document records a limited time period and many, many, many more incidences have occurred before and since. Again, no records are kept and nobody at the FAA, the airport nor the PAAC believe these incidences are important or there is a safety concern over our densely populated area. If they did — they would act and investigate.

| NTSB* Aircraft Incidents for Calendar Years 2000 - 2015 | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Location | Incidents | Fatalities | Approx. Annual Operations ** | Runway Length | Mandatory Fly Friendly *** |
| McClellan-Palomar (CRQ), Carlsbad, CA | 19 | 15 | 215,000 | 4,897 | NO |
| John Wayne (SNA), Santa Ana, CA | 8 | 0 | 334,000 | 5,701 | YES |
| Lindberg Field (SAN), San Diego, CA | 10 | 1 | 223,000 | 9,401 | YES |
| Los Angeles (LAX), Los Angeles, CA | 26 | 8 | 506,000 | 12,091 | YES |

* NTSB - National Transportation Safety Board ** Operations = Takeoffs and Landings *** Curfews/Rules

"Every close call, every near miss is an accident that did not happen and an opportunity to prevent the next one. There are always things that will come up, it is how we respond and react to those that make the aviation system safe."

~ Deborah Hersman - President and CEO, National Safety Council — Retired NTSB Chairman ~

When will Carlsbad and/or North County citizens luck run out!