

That occasional convenient flight will equal a lot, lot more noise along with tons and tons more pollution - 24/7.

How to complain about aircraft noise instructions, by phone call (760) 431-4646. The full instructions can be found by clicking on the following link: http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/AIRPORTS/palomar/documents/Part150/FilingNoiseComplaints_10_2016.pdf

Additionally, if you submit a complaint to the airport, it also would be beneficial to take the time to call Carlsbad City Council (760) 434-2830 or email council@carlsbadca.gov and call 760-434-2821 Carlsbad City Mgr. or email manager@carlsbadca.gov

Carlsbad City Council March 14, 2017, Meeting

Council Member Michael Schumacher reported he spent two days attending the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) annual board retreat. He stated: There is not a lot to mention, a little bit on land use plans which effects all of the airports in San Diego County, including Palomar. ... **Council Member Schumacher**, we would think with all the aircraft noise complaints from residents of Point Loma, Pacific Beach and La Jolla, in a two day retreat, there would have been a lot of conversation about that issue, e.g., March 21, 2017, San Diego Air Route Forum, *"I have not received any comment from the Noise authority regarding my noise complaints for the last few months. I called today to file a noise complaint and the mailbox was full!"* It is obvious they, like North County citizens, are being ignored by the SDCRAA. FYI - in 2016, Palomar had 3,382 aircraft noise complaints, 20% more than 2015 and San Diego International (SAN) had more than 28,676 noise complaints in Q1, Q2 and Q3 of 2016, Q4 is still not released. In 2015, SAN had only 4,000 noise complaints. I really hope you and the other board members all enjoyed your retreat talking about, *"There is not a lot to mention."* **I would think more than 32,058 citizen complaints would have stimulated much discussion.**

NASA Study shows it is possible to reduce Jet Pollution by 50 to 70% by using biofuels

However, with the proposed budget reductions of the EPA, NASA and the FAA, these reductions may never come to fruition. The study states: *"Pollution is a major problem that is currently being addressed by scientists around the world. Air pollution and global warming arising from the gases emitted by different modes of transport are being tackled. One such cause of pollution and global warming comes from gases emitted by jet engines. In fact, jet engines release almost 800 million tonnes of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Thus, it is essential it be addressed as soon as possible."* See link for full March 16, 2017, newspaper article <http://wccftech.com/nasa-biofuel-reduce-jet-pollution-70-percent/>

McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ) fails a yearlong EPA lead environmental study in and around airports

In 2010, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), [under the direction of Dr. Marie Lynn Miranda](#), commenced on a four (4) year study of lead pollution around local airports. In 2013, the EPA released its report and found of the seventeen (17) airports studied in California, all but two (2) were below the Federal Lead Limit requirements. The two that exceeded the EPA requirement were San Carlos and CRQ.

San Carlos took corrective action, but not CRQ. As of this newsletter, unlike San Carlos, San Diego County has not informed us it has taken corrective action to comply with the EPA air quality regulations.

Environmental lawsuit succeeds against the FAA

In 2012, the FAA agrees to phase out lead aviation fuels by 2018, protecting airport neighbors from airborne lead contaminants linked to elevated levels of toxic lead in children living near airports. See link for full details <https://aviationjustice.org/2012/08/02/leaded-gas-phaseout-by-2018/>

The above is only a very small fraction of available news stories documenting health issues to people living within 10 miles of a jet airport. Given the scientific facts, why is San Diego County pushing its new CRQ Master Plan that will destroy the health of many more North County citizens?

Here are the fact as we know them today.

December 16, 2015*, presentation of the next 20 year CRQ Master Plan to the San Diego County Board of Supervisors: Supervisor Bill Horn directed Vince Hourigan, Kimley-Horn's consultant and Peter Drinkwater, Director of San Diego County Airports, to start thinking outside the box. To paraphrase Supervisor Horn's statement:

We are going to build an airport for the next 50 years, maybe the next 100 years. It's time to move the small recreational pilots out.

History of CRQ next 20 year Master Plan

Today the so called "Green" CRQ Master Plan is two (2) years behind schedule and has migrated from a simple plan to only extend the runway to allow business jets fully loaded with fuel to fly directly to China. Today's runway is not long enough to allow the larger business jets to takeoff with fully loaded tanks. Interesting fact in the original so called "Green" Runway Study, it justified the plan was environmentally friendly by allowing the .003% of CRQ business jet takeoffs capable to fly to China because those jets would not have to land and takeoff in another location to refuel. Nothing in the plan mentioned the amount of extra pollution and noise that will be created in Carlsbad and its surrounding communities to allow a fully loaded and heavier jet to takeoff.

Additionally, the original 2013 CRQ Runway Study stated:

It is not feasible to make CRQ a Class C-III Airport

THE REPORT 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 not be feasible."

But today's proposed master plan is all about reclassifying CRQ into an FAA Modified Certified Design Class C/D-III airport. Supposedly, this is to allow the airport to safely process the more than 6,000 takeoffs and landings of C/D-III business jet who routinely are using CRQ.

The key word is "routinely" using the airport. The FAA regulations allows a pilot to **decide in an emergency** to land at any airport the pilot feels he/she can safely land. However, the fact that the County of San Diego has allowed hangers constructed capable of housing large C/D-III jets at an FAA Certified B-II airport and the County stated it was surprised to find there was more than 6,000 C/D operations at CRQ in 2015, both speak volumes for the future of CRQ. Also, if that statement is true, is there no County supervision of the economics of the airport?

Lastly, in the April 30, 2015, Public Workshop #4 on why CRQ needs to be expanded, Vince Hourigan of Kimley Horn stated the airport must be expanded to handle the new larger \$76.4 million planes like the Bombardier 7000 and 8000 business jets now on the drawing board.

It sounds like Kimley-Horn's plan is forward thinking, but there seems to be a big OOPS in their thinking:

- Bombardier's specification sheet for Global 7000/8000 aircraft stated "Runway Length at Maximum Takeoff Weight (MTOW) for the Global 7000 is 5,950 feet and for the 8000 is 5,800 feet. Today, those requirements have not changed. Therefore, the design models for the new future CRQ is not capable of flying from CRQ to any destination with its fuel tanks fully loaded.
- Carlsbad Citizens need to vote and approve this change in the direction of CRQ

That said, there are three (3) new commercial passenger planes capable of using the new proposed Modified Design Class C/D-III CRQ. Those are the Bombardier CS100, Mitsubishi MRJ70SD and Embraer E190-E2 that will carry from 70 to 134 passengers and safely takeoff and land on the new CRQ 5,697 foot runway. **Page Down** on the following link for more details on those planes <https://www.savecarlsbad.com/future-poto-page>

*Date Revised from December 16, 2017 to December 16, 2015 on April 5, 2017