

Comment Letter I23

From: Kris Wright <kriswrt222@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 02, 2018 11:49 AM
To: LUEG, PalomarMP
Subject: McClellan Palomar Airport Public Meeting

Hello,

I attended the Public meeting for the Palomar Airport Master Plan Update on January 30th at the Holiday Inn. During the public comment period, several people asked questions and were told that the FAA was not there to answer the questions being asked. **I'd like to ask that a representative from the FAA be present at the next Public Meeting on February 13, 2018 to answer all questions.**

I23-1

I am a long time resident of Carlsbad and my questions relate to information that was presented at that meeting.

Question:

The presentation included a slide that showed the area in the airport where the Community Noise Equivalent level (CNEL) at Palomar Airport would be at 65 CNEL. However, later in the forum, it was disclosed that there were no monitoring devices north of the airport-that there "used to be a device" but that there is nothing now. After the presentation one of the panel came up to me and said that there was another method to measure CNEL via Webtrak5. I was told during the forum that the Webtrak5 doesn't measure noise levels below 400 ft. So I am wondering how the study showing the northern border of the CNEL, north of McClellan Palomar Airport was accurate since there was no way to measure noise from ground level to 400 ft. All homes are certainly below 400 ft and I don't see how noise levels or the CNEL could be accurate as reported in the presentation.

I23-2

Comment:

Since the airport allows non commercial airplanes and corporate jets to land at all hours (no restrictions), I am concerned that the new proposal to expand the runway will encourage even more corporate jets and airplanes to land at our airport which will result in MORE noise, particulates and pollutants to become airborne which will contaminate our environment and safe living environments. This will affect the air quality of schools in the area, senior living homes-both populations that are very sensitive to health issues and changes in the levels of air quality. The ALT 5 preferred configuration would therefore allow MORE of the non-commercial, C-3 and D-3 jets to land and take off and my comment would be that the ideal configuration would be ALT 1, Stay at the B2 level and encourage the corporate jets at levels C3 and D3 or greater to land somewhere else. I am for keeping the airport small.

I23-3

Our population in north county is growing fast. The presentation at the public meeting stated that it was SAFER to have ALT 5. I of course, like most people prefer a safe airport but we would have to put a limit to the kind of jets arriving and taking off so that nearby residents in Carlsbad, San Marcos, Vista, Oceanside and other communities will not be exposed to the higher noise expected, the greater pollutants to the environment (which include airborne and seepage from oils, lead, gasoline, flammables, carcinogens, alkaloids into the soils which can then leach into our lagoon and ocean.

As a research scientist in the medical field with a major university, I am aware as to proper handling of hazardous materials and exposure to airborne contaminants. I am very concerned that the addition of larger non commercial airlines and corporate jets at the C-3 and D-3 levels will have a deleterious effect on our local population.

Thank you.
 Kristine Wright
 Laboratory Manager
 University of California, San Diego

Carlsbad resident for 39 years.

--
 Kris Wright
kriswrt222@gmail.com

Response to Letter I23**Kristine Wright**

- I23-1** The County acknowledges the introductory comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required.
- I23-2** As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, existing noise contours surrounding the Airport were derived from detailed flight information gathered in 2016 (January 1–December 31, 2016). This included an evaluation of operational data provided by the County's Airport Noise and Operations Monitoring System and FAA's Traffic Flow Management System Counts and Air Traffic Activity System. The noise contours were produced using the Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT), the FAA's required model for evaluating noise impacts in the vicinity of airports. AEDT uses a variety of inputs to generate noise contours, including number of aircraft operations by type, types of aircraft, day/night time distribution by type, flight tracks, flight track and runway utilization by type, flight profiles, typical operational procedures, and average meteorological conditions. Ambient noise measurements were not used to produce the noise contours. More details on the noise model can be found in Appendix D to the PEIR. Also see **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)**.
- I23-3** The comment asserts the runway extension will produce increased aircraft operations resulting in increased criteria pollutants. The commenter recommends Master Plan Update Alternative #1 to keep the Airport classification as B-II. The PEIR Chapter 3.1.2 does include an analysis of potential air quality emissions resulting from the Master Plan Update. The PEIR concluded that the Master Plan Update would not result in a significant air quality impact. As this comment does not specifically identify an environmental issue with the PEIR analysis or proposed mitigation, no changes to the PEIR have been made in response to this comment. Also, as discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight is the domain of the Federal Aviation Administration. Accordingly, neither San Diego County nor the City of Carlsbad has the authority to implement mandatory noise abatement procedures.