

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

### **Updated Instructions on how to submit an aircraft noise complaint:**

We have worked with McClellan-Palomar Airport Management to improve the ease of filling out a noise complaint. See below:

**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/FilingNoiseComplaints\\_CRQ.pdf](http://www.sandiegocounty.gov/content/dam/sdc/dpw/AIRPORTS/palomar/documents/FilingNoiseComplaints_CRQ.pdf)

## **PAAC Admits there is no Procedure for Public Participation.**

During the last two years of attending the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee (PAAC) meetings and continually stating the PAAC is not in compliance with Bullet 4 of its San Diego County (County) Charter, a shocking announcement was made by the chairman of the PAAC in its November 17, 2016 meeting.

The chairman's announcement was in response to a public question regarding why the September 15, 2016 packet was not on the November meeting agenda for discussion as requested in the September PAAC Meeting.

### **To paraphrase the PAAC chairman's response:**

The PAAC has no procedure defined for how the PAAC can accept public request for a topic to be discussed. The chairman went on to state his perceived outline of what the procedure could be, but until the procedure is in writing and approved by the majority of the PAAC members, *nothing presented by the public can be added to the PAAC agenda.*

It was pointed out that the public proactive September packet complied completely with the chairman's proposed procedure. However, the chairman reiterated that before the September 15, 2016 packet can be discussed, the procedure must be defined and approved by the committee; however, because of the PAAC's meeting schedule, the anticipated timeline to define and approve the procedure will take at least three months.

Given the three month or longer timeframe, it was requested that a written response also be supplied. The chairman's answer was, *"We do not have the staff or budget to comply with that request."* Unbelievable!

### **To make sure the above unbelievable statements are fully understood, the PAAC is required to comply with all of its Charter, including:**

The County's PAAC Charter Ordinance No. 8212 (NS), adopted 3/2/93, Ordinance No. 9468 (NS) as adopted 6/11/02 and Ordinance No. 10042 (NS), adopted 3/3/2010, states under Duties, Bullet 4:

- *"To provide an open forum between the Communities and the County on matters pertaining to Palomar Airport."*

After more than twenty-three years of public meetings on the airport issues and ignoring public complaints, the PAAC is now admitting that it has no formal procedure to allow the public to participate or the budget for any staff to properly communicate with the public. Again unbelievable!

After being ignored for more than 23 years,  
any wonder the public has mostly given up attending the PAAC Meetings?  
**Who is looking out for the public's interest and safety? Not the County or the PAAC!**

Lastly, does this twenty-three or more years of violating the County's own Ordinances 8212, 9468 and 10042 along with other identified violations\* of Carlsbad's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015 impact the airport agreements between the County and Carlsbad citizens?

It looks like the Carlsbad City Council and staff have put increased tax dollar revenue before upholding Carlsbad laws to protect its stated core values.

**Could this explains why Carlsbad had four (4) City Managers quit in Five (5) years?**

The last number of years have been interesting, but expensive, for Carlsbad and its citizens. The City Council spent \$650,000 or more of taxpayers' dollars on a special election for Measure A, upwards of \$100 million taxpayer dollars to build and then bailout a golf course that was not to exceed \$20 million and \$350,000 on a parking study in the village before the consultants were fired, etc., etc., etc. What else will be coming to light over the next few years?

There is a plaque in Carlsbad's Council Chamber that states:

"What is popular for Carlsbad is not always right;  
What is right for Carlsbad is not always popular."

With so many taxpayer dollars wasted, one thing is becoming painfully obvious the citizenry and the City Council do not agree regarding what's right for Carlsbad. Also, the City Council seems to be going out of its way to avoid questions and input from Carlsbad's citizenry. For example:

- Unlike previous State of the City meetings, the 2015 and 2016 State of the City meetings did not allow audience participation or questions. Frankly, like the 2015 meeting, the 2016 meeting was another waste of time for the audience. The only information supplied was what a good job the Council was doing and a slick video of life in Carlsbad.
- There is no Council follow-up when issues are brought up at City Council Meetings.

Based on the last two Carlsbad elections, it is becoming obvious the electorate feels its city council is out of touch with Carlsbad's published core values.

You need to look no further than Measure A. It was approved by 100% of the City Council while ignoring approximately 43% of the citizens who simply requested the council to allow Carlsbad citizens vote on Measure A. However, through the initiative process the citizenry overturned the Council's vote. But rather than waiting for the normal voting cycle, the Council voted to force a special and costly election. That decision cost Carlsbad taxpayers \$650,000 or more. A complete accounting has been requested, but after six months, none has yet been presented.

**Measure A was defeated 51.99% to 48.01%**

\* e.g., Hangars were built to routinely house aircraft which are larger than the aircraft which McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ) is FAA Certified to allow for routine takeoff and landing. Fact — CRQ is a FAA Design Class B-II certified airport, but in 2015 (the last year numbers are available), the County reported CRQ had 6,000 Design Class C/D-III jet aircraft operations (takeoff and landings).

**Compound the Measure A defeat with the 2016 City Council elections results.** In that election, **56.53%** of the citizenry voted for the five (5) challengers. Of the two incumbents running, only one was reelected, with only **23.79%** of the vote.

**The winds of change are gaining strength — 51.99% of the citizenry voted to defeat Measure A and 56.53% voted for the challengers!**

Why are the winds of change gaining strength? The majority of Carlsbad City Council is not open to working with the citizenry, only with business.

Like numerous other Carlsbad citizens, our observation on communication with the Council is strictly a ONE WAY street of information provided and ignored by all the Council members.

After researching the proposed County Airport 2013 Feasibility Runway Extension Study, the conclusion was that study was full of holes and at best only presented half the truth. Therefore, an in-depth study was started in 2014 to determine how accurate the 2013 County Runway Study was and whether it would solve the growing aircraft noise issue in Carlsbad and surrounding communities. It was soon determined that a runway extension was not required **unless** the plan was to redesign McClellan-Palomar Airport (CRQ) into a much larger airport.

Consequently, on September 9, 2014, a meeting was requested with Carlsbad's Mayor Hall to go over the study conclusions. The meeting was requested via hand delivery of an eleven (11) page informational packet consisting of an original and 6 copies to City Hall. Each of the packets was individually addressed to Mayor Hall, Council Members Blackburn, Packard, Schumacher and Wood, City Manger Sarkozy and City Attorney Brewer.

The purpose of the information packet was to show how the County of San Diego's reasons for its 2013 feasibility runway extension study for CRQ were misleading at best, were full of easily disproved assumptions and were designed to allow CRQ to easily expand into large jet commercial passenger service. As such, the County's runway extension was in violation of Carlsbad's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015.

The naive expectation of delivering such an informational packet was that a meeting would quickly be scheduled. Since the Mayor did not request a meeting, it became evident that maybe Mayor Hall was already aware of the study's conclusion and in favor of the County plan.

Consequently, on November 9, 2014, another meeting request was sent to Mayor Hall, but this time via Registered/Certified mail.

Mayor Hall quickly scheduled a meeting explaining that he *"never got the original September packet."* Strange that all seven (7) packets evidently got lost.

After the initial December meeting, other meetings followed, but the Mayor elected to take no action, only the wait and see approach. However, the Mayor did suggest that I meet with the City Manager on this subject. Unfortunately, that meeting never occurred; the city manger quit five weeks later.

Over the next two years, meetings were held with the Interim City Manager, Kathy Dodson, and all the previous council members with the exception of Council Member Packard. Why not Council Member Packard? In attempting to hold a conversation with him about the airport, Council Member Packard refused to talk about the airport, not once, but three times, stating, ***"I have been advised by my attorney to not talk to you."***

**In the last two years:**

- **Communities surrounding airports all over the country are picketing and suing the FAA to reduce increased aircraft noise/pollution.**
- **Carlsbad City Council has taken no action to STOP the CRQ expansion and enforce Carlsbad CUP 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015.**
- **Carlsbad City Council Member admits that he was advised not to talk with me.**

## *The airport was there first, so what are you complaining about?*

This is a common statement from airport supporters, but it is not a completely accurate statement. A more accurate statement is that the airport was allowed to move to Carlsbad after the County agreed to have restrictions placed on it. Today, those restrictions have been documented in CUP 172 and violated.

### The facts are:

- 1950's - While Interstate 5 was under construction, the County asked Carlsbad if the small recreational/crop-dusting plane airport in Del Mar could move to County owned land in Carlsbad, and Carlsbad agreed.
- 1979 - After the County airport/landfill were completed the County attempted to install a second runway. The citizens of Carlsbad objected. Again, through the initiative process the Carlsbad citizens' collected signatures to stop the airport expansion and give Carlsbad citizens control over the land use of the airport.

### ~ History Matters ~

Carlsbad's voter initiated CUP 172's "*Basic Transportation General Aviation Airport*" and 4,000 ft. runway.



PRE-LANDFILL PHOTO  
NTA

CRQ opened in 1959 and cost \$163,000 to build



POST-LANDFILL PHOTO  
NTA

Landfill completed in 1975

- 1980 - Carlsbad City Council passed Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015 which formalized Carlsbad's authority over the land use of the County-owned airport, San Diego County agreed to the CUP 172 and Ordinance 21.53.015 conditions.

**Bottom line: CUP 172 and the Ordinance require a majority vote of Carlsbad's registered voters to change CUP 172.**

In CUP 172's list of items NOT requiring Carlsbad's majority voter approval:

1. The runway is not listed as an item. Neither the County nor Carlsbad City Council has the authority to change this.
2. Changing the airport to a Design Class C/D-III **will** require a majority vote of Carlsbad's citizens.

**If Carlsbad officials continue to refuse to stop the airport expansion, Carlsbad and Surrounding Communities' Citizens will say goodbye to their healthy quality of lifestyle and hello to a lot, lot more pollution and reduced property values.**