

NEWSLETTER

Based on your emails, a number of readers were and are confused by the lack of instructional information regarding what San Diego County was asking to be completed during the current comment phase in the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan CEQA process. This was especially true since most had not been made aware the airport redesign was in the works. Therefore, we decided to publish our response to the County to educate the reader as this process advances.

Hope the following is informative and helps keeps you up-to-date on the County's seemingly secretive attempt to communicate its future plans for McClellan-Palomar Airport.

Our Response to San Diego County CEQA March 29th Comment Deadline.

Department of Public Works

March 28, 2016

Attn: Cynthia Curtis, Environmental Planning Manager
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 410
San Diego, CA 92123

Email: Cynthia.Curtis@sdcounty.ca.gov

Reference: Additional responses needed to be included in the
McClellan-Palomar Airport CEQA Initial Study

Dear Ms. Curtis:

At this time, I think it is premature for the County of San Diego (County) to ask for Public comments on the CEQA process regarding the McClellan-Palomar Airport (Palomar) Next Twenty (20) Year Master Plan. In all four (4) past workshops the County has not presented one concise future plan for Palomar, only numerous possibilities or as was presented in Workshop #4 only a proposed airport redesign with no real details or an open forum to allow the Public to ask questions of the presenters.

That being said, since the County has asked for help on what may be overlooked in its CEQA document, hopefully the following will help. To date, the only firm reasons the County has expressed for the expansion of the airport is to accommodate the larger Bombardier Global 8000 business jets that will be in production starting as early as 2017 and/or to allow the present Design Class C/D-III aircraft to fly nonstop from the certified Design Class B-II airport to China or Europe. Fact, the County is proposing spending One to Three Hundred Million Dollars on an airport to accommodate .003% of today's airport traffic. Something is not adding up.

Maybe that something is as Benjamin Franklin first published in 1758 - "*Half truth is often a great lie*".

Page 4 of the CEQA document list "**Environmental Factors Potentially Affected**" sections of the document that has "Potential Significant Impact or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated"

Page 5 of the CEQA has the following box checked "*On the basis of this Initial Study, Department of Public Works finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.*"

In reviewing Page 4's checked boxes listed sections, it is obvious the County is downplaying the potential impact and effects of a number of the checked boxes.

In today's world, it is impossible for the ecological impacts of airports to be hidden. With all the worldwide studies published about airport noise and pollution and the impact they have on the health of the airport's surrounding communities, it is most interesting the following is missing from any information thus far presented to the Public:

1. Supervisor Bill Horn
 - **December 16, 2015**, County Board Meeting, to paraphrase — *We are planning a very, very viable commercial operation for the next 50 years if not 100. It's time to move the small recreational pilots out.*
 - **March 7, 2016**, interview with KUSI News on the new Palomar Airport Master Plan — *"...you will be able to get to Palomar from the east coast even Europe; it allow planes to leave and go all the way to Japan and China so it makes it almost an international airport..."*
2. The County's own "*Feasibility Study for Potential IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDATION to McClellan-Palomar Airport Runway — Final Report August 1, 2013*" — **Page 0-1** "*Although the footprint of the overall airport is able to handle a runway extension to reclassify the airport as a C-III, the change would involve extensive reconfiguration of the entire airfield including tenant improvements, airplane parking loss and/or relocation, impacts to buildings, and the relocation of NAVAIDS, fuel tank/station and the airfield lights and signs systems. Therefore any extension alternative that would reclassify the airport would be considered not feasible.*"

What has now changed to allow Palomar to be reclassified as a Design Class C/D-III airport?

3. As airports grow, the FAA has reported the surrounding communities property will be lose value. Where is that FAA projection?
Additionally, why are there no projections for lower rental or property tax revenues as a result of a less than desirable area to live?
4. Because of airport noise and greenhouse gas pollution, more and more United States and worldwide health studies are now stating some of the following — living within a 10 mile radius of a commercial jet airport is showing higher incidences of cancer, cardiovascular disease and 10 to 20 years earlier onset of dementia than previously found in the normal population. Why is there no mention of that fact?
5. In 2002, the Airport, FAA and the surrounding communities had a number of meetings to discuss the growing aircraft noise. Those meetings concluded with a promise from The Airport and FAA to solve the noise issue. A promise made, but never kept. From 2000 to 2015, Palomar has received approximately 45,050 noise complaints. Using the United States Commerce Department statistics — for each complaint, 26 do not complain or 45,050 times 26 = more than 1,171,300 households around Palomar airport have been negatively impacted by airport noise. Given that statistically, the average household equals 2.3 occupants, that means 2,693,990 citizens have be impacted over the last fifteen (15) years from mostly small recreational aircraft. Now compound the fact that Design Class C/D-III aircraft generate a lot more noise than recreational aircraft, where are the increased noise projections from the larger jet traffic?

History Matters - The airport has proven it is a bad neighbor. The last 15 years of complaints reported to Palomar has resulted in no action taken to resolve the complaints. No action by Palomar, the FAA nor the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee (PAAC) who's Charter from the County under DUTIES states:

- *"To review and make recommendations on issues pertaining to noise control at Palomar Airport."*
- *"To provide an open forum between the Communities and the County on matters pertaining to Palomar Airport."*

The FACT is, neither of the above duties have been complied with. The PAAC refuses to have an open forum with the public. Additionally, numerous complaints have been recorded and ignored by the County, Airport and the PAAC. The PAAC has been asked "What do you do with the complaints? Do you ever follow-up on a complaint to get more details? The answer was no, the complaints are archived. We are only interested in the trending of the complaints.

6. The County never divulged to the Public any statistics it has in its possession and how they will impact the surrounding communities, e.g.,:
 - a. What is the projected Palomar increased passenger load?
 - b. What is the projected increase in ground traffic required to support Item a.?
 - c. What is the increase in air pollution?
 - d. What is the increase in noise pollution?
 - e. What is the projected increase in more and more aborted approaches (Go Arounds) over public and private schools?
 - f. What exactly did the County's SCS Engineering Study state on the potential of disaster with the landfill directly under an airport servicing Design Class C/D-III aircraft?
7. In 1996, the County is on record it was concerned about the fact that Carlsbad's Conditional Use Permit (CUP 172) and Ordinance 21.53.015 require Carlsbad residents vote on changes to the airport. That same concern was expressed on Page 2-11 of the County's Palomar 1997 Master Plan.

Therefore, WHY is the County's new massive redesign Palomar Airport Master Plan not in violation of Carlsbad's CUP 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015?

8. TODAY it has been recorded more than 50% of the aircraft traffic are not on an approach path and are flying below FAA regulated minimums. Given that fact, what percentage of the new airport air traffic will be flying over surrounding communities below FAA minimums?
9. Fact, John Wayne Airport (SNA), a Design Class C/D-III airport, has mandatory curfews. With the tens-of-thousands of noise complaints over the years, WHY is there no plans for Palomar implement any form of mandatory curfews?
10. With all the pollution generated from commercial jet airports, why does the County feel the public health and lifestyle would benefit from the increased noise and pollution the Palomar airport redesign would create?
11. Given the demonstrations and lawsuits caused by the rollout of the FAA NextGEN system all over the county, what impact (noise, pollution, decreased health, quality of life, property values and tax revenues) will NextGEN have on the more than 800,000 citizens of North County?
12. What about security issues both from flight schools and larger commercial jets?
13. What is the percentages of foreign nationals being trained in the Palomar flight schools?
14. In 2013, the EPA released the final report on its four year lead air quality compliance testing of 17 airports. According to the report, Palomar and San Carlos airports failed the testing. San Carlos has corrected the conditions that caused it to fail, but according to the County, it disagreed with the way the EPA conducted the test and refused to correct the situation causing Palomar to fail the EPA testing. Is Palomar still not complying with the EPA lead testing requirement? If not, why not?
15. According to the Palomar Workshop #3, the airport's runway must be extended to accommodate the new class of future jets, e.g., Bombardier Global 8000 business jet that will be in production by 2017/18. According to the Bombardier Global 8000 specification sheet, this plane will require a runway length of 5,950 feet at Maximum Takeoff Weight. Yet the now planned 800 feet extension to today's 4,897 foot Palomar runway will only lengthen the runway to 5,697 feet. This leaves the new runway 253 feet short and still will not accommodate a fully loaded Bombardier Global 8000 business jet flying to China or Europe. After more than three years of studying the design criteria/options, the recommended Modified C/D-III runway will be too short. **OOPS!** What is the real reason the County is pushing to completely redesign Palomar?
16. In Workshop #4 it was stated the County sent out 250 emails and placed a notice in the newspaper about the upcoming workshop. Given the tens-of-thousands North County citizens that will be impacted by the Palomar redesign, does the County think it fulfilled its fiduciary responsibility to the more than 800,000 North County citizens? Or did the County just check another government required box?

The above are just a few of the reasons why it must be asked - why is the County of San Diego not protecting its citizens quality of life, health, property values and children's safety?

WHY are the needs of the few business interests outweighing the needs of the residents/voters to pursue a better quality and healthy lifestyle?

For all the facts go to SaveCarlsbad.com

In the words of President Ronald Reagan,
"Government's first duty is to protect the people, not run their lives."

Palomar airport started its life with the promise of not growing beyond a "General Aviation Basic Transportation Airport". Rather than the airport looking at expanding into a Modified C/D-III airport it needs first to get permission from the voters as described in Carlsbad's CUP 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015. Only the voters of Carlsbad can decide if they would like to have their quality of life destroyed, for the sake of the few business interests.

As first stated, *" At this time, I think it is premature for the County of San Diego to ask for Public comment on the CEQA process regarding the McClellan-Palomar Airport Next Twenty (20) Year Master Plan."*

Lastly, I am reminded of a quote by Mr. Jamie Dimon, Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of JPMorgan Chase at the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting in Davos-Kiosters, Switzerland, January, 2016, when he was asked *"Today what worries you most?"* Mr. Dimond's answer was, *"The thing that worries me most, honestly is bad, badly designed public policy that has adverse consequences that really hurts us."*

Converting Palomar from a Design Class B-II to a Design Class C/D-III airport directly in the middle of San Diego County's eleventh (11th) and twelfth (12th) most affluent zip codes, is definitely contradictory to President Reagan statement and most definitely meets Mr. Jamie Dimon's definition of bad, badly designed public policy that has adverse consequences that really hurts us, the hundreds of thousands of North County Citizens who will be adversely impacted by the pollution, noise and increased health issues a Design Class C/D-III airport is guaranteed to generate. Look no further than the surrounding communities of John Wayne, Long Beach, Santa Monica and many more airports all over the country and see how the lives of the communities surrounding airport serving jet aircraft have and are adversely impacted.

I sincerely hope the above helps in finally allowing the County to address all the issues McClellan-Palomar Airport redesign will create for the cities who are already on record of complaining about aircraft noise - Carlsbad, Del Mar, Encinitas, Escondido, Oceanside, San Marcos, Solana Beach and Vista.

SaveCarlsbad.com

Become involved - Sign-up with the **County** to receive future McClellan-Palomar Airport's Public notifications:
Click Here - https://public.govdelivery.com/accounts/CASAND/subscriber/new?topic_id=CASAND_214

KUSI's Coverage of October 24, 2015, Point Loma Protest regarding flight path changes:
Click here - <https://youtu.be/RG2L-EaGUGg>

The public is protesting and demonstrating all over the country and the world because the FAA's NextGEN system is destroying their quality of life:
Click here - <http://www.nextgennoise.org/>

According to the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee (PAAC), NexGEN is scheduled to be installed at McClellan-Palomar Airport early 2017. Additionally, the FAA is requiring ALL aircraft install the NextGEN communication equipment by 2020.

Click here for FAA's NEXGEN Promise - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fadkl4JJfoE>

Click here for NexGEN's Broken Promise - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-lxcA2W9T7Y>

The NextGEN Broken Promise is what The County of San Diego knows is happen all over the County, but still this is what the County is planning for Carlsbad and other communities surrounding McClellan-Palomar Airport.