

Comment Letter I26

**From:** dave ohlson <daveohlson@hotmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, February 05, 2018 3:24 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** McClellan Palomar Airport Master Plan update and Draft EIR

David Ohlson  
 6372 Huntington Dr Carlsbad, CA

Please receive and consider the following comments:

The current and expanded use of the airport continues to expose nearby residents downwind of prevailing winds to harmful and toxic exhaust and fumes. For this reason, increased use and expansion of the airport to accommodate more traffic should not be allowed. Palomar McClellan is not an essential airport. Economic activity centers around private aircraft, pilot training on small planes and helicopters, and the small facilities similarly related.

I26-1

Second, while there is only a voluntary scheme in place to help reduce noise, my relatively close proximity to the airport, reveals aircraft, including airplanes, helicopters and planes used for touch and go training do not follow the voluntary flight paths. This is particularly noticeable during Saturday and Sunday. The voluntary plan shows departing aircraft to use a turn to the north while many actually disregard this and turn to the south and passing directly over the 600 housing units and Pacific Ridge and Poinsettia schools as they head east then back around to approach the airport from the east. Helicopters are particularly noisy due to their unmuffled engine noise and relatively slow speed. Some improvement would come from a mandatory routing or controller guidance to purposely direct traffic away from residences and perhaps along heavily used roadway routes or undeveloped areas or commercial areas.

I26-2

It is well established today that any form of air pollution and even low amounts of noise are harmful to people. In residential areas this can lead to people staying inside to stay out of the racket. The citizens are more likely to be swept aside by commercial forces and influence. A premier example of this is LA Airport (Tom Bradely) which expanded over the years. Hundreds of houses were bought up under the west bound flight path, taking stunning views and the ocean environment to service passenger and other traffic.

I26-3

My view is that Sandag has been a gross failure for the cities within San Diego County. The push to expand in the face of demand has led to greater and greater degradation of the air quality and tranquility of low noise levels. The concept of reconsidering the placement and expansion of Airports seems remote from consideration. The better outcome is to encourage alternatives and not continue to add to more of the same as a solution when it has been the over-riding problem. Best may be to take the passenger servicing aircraft demand and move it perhaps 20 miles downwind from the ocean in sparsely inhabited land. Fast public systems could take people back and forth from the coastal living corridor to the centralized airport. The current ugly parking garages at San Diego Airport, blocking the views to the sea and aircraft noise hardly seem comparable with tourism themes. Development at all costs just ends costing more and more in money and health. It carries an inertia which science and data powerfully argue against.

I26-4

Please do not expand Palomar Airport.

Thank you,

David Ohlson

**Response to Letter I26****David Ohlson**

- I26-1** The comment asserts that residents downwind of the Airport are exposed to toxic exhaust and fumes, and states that increased use of the Airport should not be allowed. As noted in **Master Response 7**, aircraft in flight are under the jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement of FAA. As such, the County does not have the regulatory ability to place restrictions on Airport users or deter aircraft from using a public-use airport. Furthermore, 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 Draft PEIR have been made in response to this comment.
- I26-2** As discussed in Section 2.4.1 of the PEIR, the Federal Aviation Administration has jurisdiction and regulatory enforcement over aircraft in flight. Please refer to **Master Response 3 (VNAP)** and **Master Response 4 (Noise Monitors and PEIR Calculations)**.
- I26-3** The comment asserts that any form of air pollution and noise is harmful to people. The County and FAA have established quantified thresholds that identify whether total estimated pollutant concentrations emitted by a project would result in an environmental impact. The PEIR Chapters 3.1.2 and 2.4 do include an analysis of potential air quality emissions and noise, respectively, resulting from the Master Plan Update. The PEIR concluded that the Master Plan Update would not result in a significant air quality or noise impact due to aircraft. 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.
- I26-4** The County acknowledges the conclusion comment. This comment does not raise specific issues regarding the substantive environmental analysis conducted within the PEIR. The comment will be included as part of the administrative record and made available to the decision makers prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.