

Comment Letter R-I26

From: Robt Carter <bobcarter43@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 05, 2018 10:43 PM
To: council@carlsbadca.gov; scott.chadwick@carlsbadca.gov; LUEG, PalomarMP; Robt Carter
Cc: bobcarte43@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: CRQ Airport Meeting on June 19

Hi, I have a couple of new points regarding the proposed expansion of the Palomar airport.

1. The owner and promoter of Cal Pacific Airlines has said in press releases that several new business' moved into North County as a result of his proposed airline operation at Palomar. The new FedEx distribution center in Oceanside was specifically given as an example. As a retired FedEx employee that is familiar with their operations I can say this is not true. The FedEx distribution center in Oceanside is a FedEx Ground facility, not an air facility. As such, its cargo moves on the ground in trucks. The CPA contention is false.

R-I26-1

FedEx does have an air express facility in Carlsbad. This facility trucks air express packages to the San Diego airport in large cargo containers that fit on large FedEx cargo planes. Inbound packages arrive in Carlsbad via large air cargo containers via the San Diego airport as well. The airline cargo containers require large body aircraft, not regional jets that have to be hand loaded.

I am not a spokesman for FedEx but I can say that your being mislead about FedEx's motives in moving to Oceanside.

The second point I would like to make is the fact that 5 people were killed at the Santa Ana Airport this afternoon while on an approach to land. This tragic accident is what happens when you have an airport in your city. This might be a good time to see how many accidents have taken place at Orange County to get a feel on what could happen with larger operations at CRQ. God forbid an aircraft crashes at LegoLand or the Factory Outlets which are in the departure flight path of CRQ.

R-I26-2

Thanks for listening.
 Regards, Bob Carter

On Friday, June 29, 2018, 9:49:51 AM PDT, Robt Carter <bobcarter43@yahoo.com> wrote:

On Wednesday, June 27, 2018, 10:38:38 PM PDT, Robt Carter <bobcarter43@yahoo.com> wrote:

Hi, my name is Bob Carter and I have a few concerns about the proposed CRQ master plan. I am not an expert in environmental issues but did live next to (three blocks away) the LA airport for 20 years so have some first hand experience with noise pollution, air pollution and traffic congestion around airports. I am a licensed pilot and have also spent over 40 years working in the airline industry.

R-I26-3

During the questions and answer session, Mr. Paul Hook said that his company's (Cal Pacific Airlines) aircraft omit "zero smoke" and "zero emissions". He said that the planned aircraft , the Embraer 170 and 145 fell into this category. Being somewhat skeptical I looked up the engines specifications for the Embraer 170 and it does emit both smoke and emissions. The GE engine most Embraer 170's use is the GE CF34-8-E. While this engine meets ICAO CAEP stage 6 emission standards and ICAO chop 4 noise standards, that does not mean that their are "no emissions and zero smoke". I used the original Cal Pacific Airlines aircraft number N760CP for my research. It does not make sense that large jet engines emit no smoke, or emissions nor noise. There is obviously combustion and thus exhaust and noise. Mr. Hook's comment is obviously a inaccurate.

Given that noise and air pollution were two top issues during the meeting I think the record should show the actual incremental smoke and emissions which can be found on line via GOOGLE search by engine type (see above). In addition, one must wonder how an accurate upfront Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is if aircraft types, flight schedules, number of aircraft are not known. When I asked the panel during the Q @ A, they agreed that this is indeed a problem.

During the meeting, the presenters (Kaplan, Kirsch, Rockwell) showed a number of examples where they claimed that citizens and airport authorities found mutually acceptable solutions to noise and emission problems. One of the examples of such a "success" was the move from the old Denver Stapleton Airport to the new DIA airport, which is approximately 17 miles due East or 19 minutes of driving with no traffic and 45 minutes with heavy rush hour traffic. What was **not mentioned** was the **prime reason** for the move and that was the fact that the Stapleton runways were too close together to operate parallel simultaneous take off and or ILS landings because the runways were too close together. During bad weather, this limitation caused significant flight delays with aircraft circling for extended periods of time waiting for their time to make the final ILS approach to only one active runway. . This was the primary reason for the new airport construction, not noise or air pollution. Stapleton did not have enough land to expand the runways to meet safety requirements. I say this was a misleading example of stake holders finding a mutually acceptable solution.

Mr. Kirsch also did not mention the fact that the Santa Monica Airport has plans to close as a result of citizens concerns over safety, noise pollution, and air quality. He also did not mention that LAX has had to buy out at great expense hundreds of homes around the airport property because of noise, pollution and safety concerns. Also not mentioned were the constant complaints of citizens of Newport Beach over noise at the John Wayne airport. Not mentioned were actual air crashes at LAX and night time operational constraints (landing from the west). In addition, many regional airports have closed in the past two years as airlines have pulled out of them due to a lack of traffic volume.

It was also stated that moving from a "D2 Airport" classification to a "D3 airport" represent "no new uses to the current airport plan". This is a stretch given the fact that the CUP defined CRQ as a "General Aviation Airport" which traditionally meant small private aircraft. The Embraer 170's are not small private aircraft. In fact, the current runway needs an extension for safe operations with a full load of 70 passengers. This is a "New Use" and is a violation of the original CUP terms. This reclassification is a major change to the agreed to historic use of the airport. The historic context of CRQ was that is was to remain a small "General Aviation Airport". The proposed 500 ft eastern extension is being sold as a "safety" issue. Ironically, this proposed 500 feet extension is just enough additional runway for an Embraer 170 to get off the ground with 70 passengers - a full load. This appears to be an expensive move to allow a specific airline to operate their older and larger 70 passenger jets. If an airline airlines was to buy newer more expensive jet aircraft with more power, this extension would not be necessary.

In closing, I want to say that I just returned from a 5 day trip out of the San Diego airport. When I got into my car that was parked at an airport parking lot, I turned on my windshield wipers, sprayed them with the soap, and looked at the black grim that was produced on either side of the windshield. This black dust was all over my car. Yes, this is the impact of having high performance jet operations. While much cleaner than older jet engines, air pollution is still an unfortunate reality. Do the citizens of Carlsbad really want this dirty gritty air covering their city? I suspect the answer is no. I say, let them vote on it.

The question I ask is what is the compelling need to expand airline operations at CRQ when we already have a fine airport less than 45 minutes away that serves hundreds of destinations. This is like Torrance wanting their own airport to compete with LAX. For those saying that they will save time commuting to the San Diego Airport, that is not really true as CRQ will only serve 4 original destinations and we know that those four destinations will not meet the needs of the general flying public. Lindbergh Field will still be used for the majority of the traveling public. Cal Jet Elite trimmed their flights from two a day to 9 weekly flights prior to stopping operations.


R-I26-3
cont.

Here are several suggestions: 1. Offer the citizens a "No airport Expansion" vote in a special election. 2. Since the Coaster already operates from Carlsbad to the San Diego Santa Fe station with every 15 minute bus connections to the San Diego airport, promote its usage. 3. Promote UBER which charges only \$45.00 one way to Lindbergh Field. It is door to door, operates 24 hours a day, and eliminates the daily parking fees.

The prime promoter, County Supervisor Bill Horn is terming out later this year. Promote a vote for a new Supervisor that lives in Carlsbad that is against this unnecessary and costly airport expansion. Carlsbad leadership has to decide if it wants to be sensitive to its citizens needs for a quiet high quality bedroom community or cater to a small group of business interests that want expansion, congestion, noise pollution, and air pollution all in the name of progress.

Thanks for listening,

Robert Carter
bobcarter43@yahoo.com



R-126-3
cont.

Response to Letter R-I26**Bob Carter**

- R-I26-1** This comment includes remarks and clarifications regarding FedEx cargo ground operations in its relation to northern San Diego County. The County acknowledges receipt of this comment; however, it does not cite specific environmental issues with the PEIR analysis or proposed mitigation. No changes to the PEIR have been made, and 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.
- R-I26-2** The comment recommends for the County to study aircraft accidents in Orange County to anticipate potential aircraft accidents that could happen at McClellan-Palomar Airport. Please refer to **Master Responses 6 and 7** for a discussion of existing Airport activity and FAA's oversight of aircraft, respectively. Furthermore, the comment does not provide input related to the recirculated Draft PEIR subjects (i.e., Biology, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Energy Use and Consumption, RPZs). Therefore, no changes to the PEIR have been made, and 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.
- R-I26-3** This comment consists of a duplication of the commenter's original email sent on June 29, 2018. Please refer to **Response to Comment R-18**. No further response is required.