

**Comment Letter I51**

---

**From:** C20\_Sailor <c20\_sailor@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 01, 2018 1:46 PM  
**To:** LUEG, PalomarMP  
**Subject:** Comments on the McClellan-Palomar Master Plan Updates  
**Attachments:** Palomar Master Plan Update Comments.pdf

Attached in a PDF file.

Sincerely,

Lonnie and Anne Smith  
Carlsbad, CA

I51-1  
↓

Comments on the 2018 McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update  
February 28, 2018

**Submitters:**

Lonnie and Anne Smith  
2636 Sausalito Avenue  
Carlsbad, CA 92010  
[c20\\_sailor@yahoo.com](mailto:c20_sailor@yahoo.com)

**Item 1.**

We would like to compliment the County and its consultants on producing a very comprehensive and detailed presentation for the public, and the thorough public meeting Lonnie attended on February 13, 2018.

I51-1  
cont.

**Item 2.**

After looking closely at each of the alternative plans envisioned within the Master Plan Update, the **Preferred Alternative** is indeed the best choice, and the one we endorse as a local residents of the area. Although each alternative adds value to the current airport configuration, it only makes sense to prepare for the most likely future developments, and the **Preferred Alternative** best matches our expectation about how McClellan-Palomar will be used in the future.

**Item 3.**

Our region is in desperate need of additional air travel alternatives. Both Lindbergh Field and John Wayne International are becoming more and more difficult to use for North County residents. Frankly, after looking at the time, money, frequent delays and general inconvenience of traveling to regional destinations in California using either of the above airports, my wife and I usually opt for jumping in the car and driving there instead.

I51-2

My feeling is that from an ecological point of view, driving is the poorer solution compared to flying there from Carlsbad. We likely burn more fuel, produce more pollution and consume more time driving, but the hassle of using Lindbergh or John Wayne makes it more attractive to us.

We realize that the **Preferred Alternative** does not guarantee additional airline service through McClellan-Palomar, but we are hopeful it will make it more attractive to regional airlines. From the point of view of North County residents, it would be wonderful if more regional destinations do become available to us.

**Item 4.**

We would like to suggest that the County as part of its analysis do at least a preliminary study of the resources consumed, and pollution created in each of two travel scenarios from Carlsbad to regional destinations such as Fresno/Yosemite, Oakland, San Francisco, Sacramento, Reno, NV and Phoenix, AZ and maybe even Los Angeles. Compare the pollution and fuel use factors for two people traveling by car versus flying in a C-III or D-III aircraft. I think the results might favor the airplanes, hence be an ecological improvement. That would be an important benefit for our state.

I51-3

**Item 5.**

Beware of “Chicken Little” responses from the public. Our local social media is full of ridiculous claims by detractors such as: 757 and 747 aircraft will now begin operating out of McClellan-Palomar; new construction will cause release of dangerous, toxic substances into our local environment; and that C-III and D-III aircraft will be more polluting and noisy than the current, older fleet of jets.

I51-4

Page 2

**Comments continued:**

Lonnie and Anne Smith  
2636 Sausalito Avenue  
Carlsbad, CA 92010  
[c20\\_sailor@yahoo.com](mailto:c20_sailor@yahoo.com)

**Item 6.**

On various days, and times of day, aircraft approaching McClellan-Palomar pass over our home. We are not bothered by this. However, some people in other neighborhoods closer to the airport do appear to experience regular annoyances, mostly from propeller driven aircraft. We would urge the County to use whatever influence it has with the FAA, asking them to do a fair-minded examination of what can be done to lessen the sound impact of planes approaching and departing McClellan-Palomar in future, including possibly restricted operations in late night and early morning hours.

I51-5

Thank you for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

Lonnie & Anne Smith

**Response to Letter I51****Lonnie and Anne Smith**

- I51-1** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.
- I51-2** This comment states support for the proposed project and stresses that safety is important. While this comment does not specifically address the adequacy or accuracy of the environmental analysis provided in the PEIR, this comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.
- I51-3** This comment recommends conducting a travel analysis comparing aircraft and ground vehicle to determine which method would produce less pollution and result in fuel savings. The environmental analysis conducted for the Master Plan Update was conducted following County Guidelines and in compliance with Federal and State requirements. As this comment does not specifically identify an environmental issue with the Draft PEIR analysis or proposed mitigation, no changes to the Draft PEIR have been made in response to this comment.
- I51-4** The County acknowledges this comment; however, it does not raise an issue concerning the analysis or adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.
- I51-5** The County acknowledges the comments; however, they do not raise an issue concerning the analysis of adequacy of the PEIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15088. Please refer to **Master Response 3 (Voluntary Noise Abatement Procedures)** and **Master Response 7 (FAA Involvement and Oversight)**. Therefore, no further response is required. This comment is included in the Final PEIR for review and consideration by the County Board of Supervisors prior to a final decision on the Proposed Project.