



COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

LAND USE AGENDA ITEM

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

GREG COX
First District

DIANNE JACOB
Second District

KRISTIN GASPAR
Third District

RON ROBERTS
Fourth District

BILL HORN
Fifth District

DATE: October 10, 2018

01

TO: Board of Supervisors

SUBJECT

MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE (DISTRICT: 5)

OVERVIEW

McClellan-Palomar Airport (Palomar Airport) is owned and operated by the County of San Diego and located in the City of Carlsbad. The airport provides general aviation, corporate and commercial services; serves as a gateway to resorts, tourist attractions; and is utilized by local businesses and residents. Based on an economic vitality study prepared for the Palomar Airport, activities related to the airport generate millions of dollars of income and revenue for the surrounding local communities, including Carlsbad, San Marcos, Vista, Oceanside, and Encinitas.

Across the nation, airport master plans provide a framework to guide future airport development over a 20-year period. Palomar Airport has had two previous master plans. The most recent one, completed in 1997, has reached the end of its 20-year planning period. On December 16, 2015 (3), the Board of Supervisors (Board) directed Department of Public Works (DPW) staff to proceed with a Master Plan Update and to prepare a Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).

Staff collaborated with stakeholders including aviation business owners, pilots, and individuals from the surrounding community to get community input for the proposed Master Plan Update. DPW has prepared a proposed Master Plan Update for Palomar Airport with the goal of developing a framework to ensure existing and future aviation demand continue to be accommodated in a safe and cost-effective manner. Existing facilities, forecasts of future airplane operations, aviation demand, and alternatives for future facility development were all considered during the update process.

This is a request for the Board to adopt the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update. Through the development of the proposed Master Plan Update, a staff recommendation and several options were developed and are included for the Board's consideration. This is also a request to certify the associated Final Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR).

RECOMMENDATION(S)

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

1. Certify that the Final PEIR, SCH No. 2016021105, has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, that the Final PEIR was presented to the Board of

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

Supervisors, that the Board of Supervisors reviewed and considered the information contained therein, and that the Final PEIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board of Supervisors. (Attachment B)

2. Adopt the Findings Concerning Mitigation of Significant Environmental Effects pursuant to Section 15091 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Attachment C)
3. Adopt the Statement of Location and Custodian of Record. (Attachment E)
4. Adopt the decision and explanation regarding recirculation of the draft PEIR. (Attachment F)
5. Adopt the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program prepared in accordance with Section 15097 of the State CEQA Guidelines. (Attachment G)
6. Approve the McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update (Attachment H)
7. Provide direction on the classification of the Palomar Airport final Master Plan Update alternative and associated options by selecting one of the following alternatives and any available options:
 - 7a.1 D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative, with a runway extension of 370 feet; or,
Option #7a.2: Allows a runway extension up to 800 feetOr
 - 7b.1 B-II Enhanced Alternative, with no runway extension; or
Option #7b.2: With a runway extension up to 200 feet; and/or
Option #7b.3: With a runway extension up to 900 feet; and/or
Option #7b.4: Directs staff to return to the Board for further consideration of the D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative

FISCAL IMPACT

There is no fiscal impact associated with these recommendations. There will be no change in net General Fund cost and no additional staff years.

The proposed actions will not commit the County of San Diego (County) to construct any facilities or improvements and will not financially obligate the County. The Department of Public Works will return to the Board of Supervisors (Board) at a later date for approval to advertise and award construction contracts as projects are fully designed, and for any necessary appropriations as funding becomes available for implementing the Board's selected Master Plan alternative. It is expected the projects will be completed in phases over the 20-year planning period covered by the Master Plan Update, and staff will seek annual authorization to apply for federal, including Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and state grants in future years.

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

BUSINESS IMPACT STATEMENT

Approval of the proposed Master Plan Update would plan for future investment in Palomar Airport allowing the County of San Diego to continue to provide aviation services to businesses and communities in north county. The proposed Master Plan Update, if approved, will make safety and operational efficiency improvements at Palomar Airport which will play a role in accommodating current and forecast of aviation activities at the airport. Jobs created by airports attract highly skilled trades and professional service employees. The Economic Vitality Analysis Study, prepared for the Palomar Airport, forecasts that by 2030, Palomar Airport will support over 4,600 jobs in the area, with an estimated \$155.2M in personal income, \$33.4M in state and local tax revenue, and \$560.8M in business revenues.

ADVISORY BOARD STATEMENT

On September 20, 2018, the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee recommend by a vote of 5 Ayes, 1 Noes, with 2 absent and 1 vacancy, to support the Staff's recommendation to the Board to approve the Master Plan Update, with a B-II Enhanced Alternative including Options 1, 2, and 3 which allows a runway extension of up to 900-feet over the existing inactive landfill and directs staff to return to the Board in the future for further consideration of the D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative if a viable solution can be found to alleviate land use concerns from the D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative's Runway Protection Zones.

BACKGROUND

The McClellan-Palomar Airport (Palomar Airport) is owned and operated by the County of San Diego (County) and located in the City of Carlsbad. The airport is a gateway to and from San Diego's north county providing facilities and services for general, corporate, and commercial aviation uses. The County opened Palomar Airport in 1959 after the airport was relocated from Del Mar due to the construction of Interstate 5. At the time the airport's location was selected, the surrounding area was mainly used for agricultural purposes. The City of Carlsbad established a Growth Management Plan in 1986 to proactively manage growth, which changed the land uses around the airport to include commercial and industrial uses. Since that time, development has encircled the airport.

Airport Master Plan

Across the nation, airport master plans provide a framework to guide future airport development to enhance safety and operational efficiency over a 20-year planning period. The most recent Master Plan was approved by the Board on September 16, 1997 (15). On September 28, 2011 (3), at the request of aviation businesses, and with support of mayors and some council members in the north county cities of Carlsbad, Escondido, Oceanside, San Marcos, and Vista, the Board directed Department of Public Works (DPW) staff to conduct a feasibility study to determine if there were potential improvements, including extension of the runway, that could make the existing Palomar Airport safer and more efficient. On September 25, 2013 (2) the Board received the completed feasibility study for potential runway improvements.

The proposed Master Plan Update was started in early 2014 and included options and alternatives from the feasibility study. On December 16, 2015 (3), the Board directed staff to proceed with the proposed Master Plan Update and to prepare a PEIR. Existing facilities, forecasts of future operations, aviation demand, and alternatives for future facility development were all considered

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

during the master plan update process. During the planning process, costs and alternatives were developed and environmental impacts were analyzed based on aviation forecasts.

Stakeholder Outreach

The County's stakeholder outreach for the proposed Master Plan Update began in 2014. Stakeholders included aviation business owners, pilots, and members of the public from the surrounding communities. There was a dedicated website for the proposed Master Plan Update and PEIR and an email distribution list. County stakeholder outreach during the release of the PEIR and draft Master Plan Update included public workshops in north county, an open house at the airport terminal, stakeholder meetings and several meetings with the City of Carlsbad staff and the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee. Stakeholder input was considered in the proposed Master Plan Update and PEIR. The major concerns raised included:

Noise – The proposed Master Plan Update recognizes that noise is an ongoing concern for communities around the airport. The PEIR noise analysis indicates that noise levels have decreased around Palomar Airport over the past 20 years and are not expected to reach previous noise levels over the 20-year planning period in the proposed Master Plan Update. The airport is surrounded by commercial and industrial use properties and there are no residential areas within the FAA-designated noise-impact area. However, staff recognize that noise is a concern of stakeholders. To address community concerns, Palomar Airport has an Airport Noise Officer who helps implement a Voluntary Noise Abatement Program (VNAP) to coordinate with, and educate pilots on quiet hours, minimum altitudes, and flight routes to try to avoid residential areas. Based on stakeholder input, staff have increased outreach to other airports in the region to educate pilots coming to Palomar Airport about the VNAP, increased the amount of information available to pilots and businesses on the airport, and have improved VNAP signs on the airport to make them easier to see and understand. In addition to two existing noise monitoring microphones on the south and east sides of the airport, one microphone is being installed to the north and one to the west of the airport to monitor noise.

City of Carlsbad's Conditional Use Permit (CUP)-172 and vote of the people – In August of 1980, the Carlsbad City Council adopted an ordinance in their Municipal Code that would require a city-wide vote of the people if the City Council was required to take a legislative action to authorize the expansion of Palomar Airport. The County subsequently entered into CUP-172 with the City of Carlsbad in September 1980 to allow flexibility in airport development if the structures and uses on the airport were aviation-related. Commenters on the Master Plan Update PEIR asserted that a vote of residents of the City of Carlsbad is required pursuant to Carlsbad Municipal Code § 21.53.015. For the Master Plan Update, there is no expansion of the airport because there are no zone changes, general plan amendments or other legislative action needed by the City of Carlsbad and all improvements are proposed on existing County-owned airport property.

Inactive Landfill – The Palomar Airport is constructed over portions of an inactive landfill, and stakeholders commented that runway extensions constructed over landfill areas could damage the methane collection system and impact the environment. Prior to construction of any improvements on the landfill, the methane collection system will be re-designed to

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

accommodate the improvements. Construction plans for the improvements will be reviewed and approved by regulatory agencies to ensure public health and safety.

Traffic – Several commenters were concerned about future vehicle traffic since the current morning and peak-hour traffic conditions on roads in the communities near the airport were already busy. The County coordinated with the City of Carlsbad to obtain data regarding their nearby future land development projects. Vehicle traffic on all area roads were evaluated in a comprehensive Traffic Impact Analysis that was completed and published as part of the Draft PEIR. The PEIR found no direct traffic impacts to roadways would occur.

Aviation Forecasts

Aviation forecasts examine the level of demand expected to occur at the Palomar Airport over the 20-year planning period and are used to guide design and layout options in the Master Plan Update and to determine the environmental impacts in the Final PEIR. The forecast includes the number of commercial passengers, the number of takeoffs and landings, and anticipated aircraft sizes.

The proposed Master Plan Update contains a baseline forecast based on airport activity from 2016 that was prepared using Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) guidelines. However, the 2016 usage reflects very limited commercial service for a single year that is not reflective of historical trends because commercial service had been continually operating from 1990 to 2016. Therefore, two additional planning level scenarios were developed that considered commercial service will resume at the airport and will expand over the 20-year planning period with additional flight destinations. Use of the planning level scenarios received concurrence of the FAA and reflect potential growth related to the return of commercial airline service at Palomar Airport.

Scenario 1 is based on the number of passengers that the current airport terminal could handle. This scenario fully utilizes the existing airport terminal capacity. Scenario 2 reflects the number of passengers predicted to use Palomar Airport in the Regional Aviation Strategic Plan (RASP) prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments in 2011 as a contingency to address San Diego’s regional airport needs. To support the larger number of passengers, Scenario 2 would require some modifications to existing airport terminal facilities, such as two additional passenger gates, larger restrooms and more area for Transportation Security Administration screening. Both scenarios forecast that there will be more commercial passengers using the airport than the historical peak during 1999-2000. Even with increased numbers of commercial passengers, the number of takeoffs and landings are forecasted to be 30% less than the historical peak:

Forecast	Departing Commercial Passengers	Takeoffs and Landings
Baseline	171	192,860
Scenario 1 - Utilize Existing Terminal	305,000	195,000
Scenario 2 - SANDAG Projected Use	575,000	208,000
1999/2000 – Historical Peak	78,000	292,000

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

Airport Classifications

The FAA classifies airports based on the characteristics of the airplanes that will use the airport. The size and type of the airplanes using an airport is considered in the design of the airport. Airplanes are given an alpha designation (A, B, C, D, and E) based on an airplane's approach speed and a numeric code (I, II, III, IV, V and VI), which is based on an airplane's wingspan and tail height. An airplane with a C or D alpha designation would land at a faster speed than an airplane with a B designation, and an airplane with a III numeric code would have a wider wingspan than airplanes with a I or II designation. Palomar airport is used by B-II mid-sized business jets and larger C-III and D-III corporate business jets and C-II commercial passenger jets. While airplanes larger than B-II operate at Palomar Airport, the FAA requires operational restrictions on some commercial planes to ensure that larger airplanes are not on the runway and taxiway at the same time.

On December 16, 2015 (3), the Board directed staff to proceed with the proposed Master Plan Update focusing on a modified C/D-III classification, as the preferred alternative, and to prepare a PEIR. FAA airport design guidance recommends the proposed Master Plan Update include improvements to support larger D-III airplanes because there are more than 500 annual takeoffs and landings of airplanes larger than D-III at Palomar Airport. During coordination with the FAA it was determined that combining the C/D classifications was not acceptable to the FAA; therefore, only the D-III alternative is being presented for the Board's consideration.

The County can elect to keep Palomar Airport at a B-II classification because the FAA recognizes there can be unique situations that affect an airport's classification. While Palomar Airport is currently classified by the FAA as a B-II airport, Palomar Airport's runway is 150 feet wide which is the same width as FAA's design standard for D-III runways. The wider runway at Palomar Airport is an important existing enhanced feature above a regular B-II airport standard that allows aircraft faster and larger than B-II airplanes to safely use Palomar airport. These larger and faster airplanes are already safely using the airport and can continue to safely use the airport in the future.

Main Design Features for Consideration

The Master Plan Update considers four main airport design features to make additional enhancements to an already safe facility:

- 1) **Engineered Material Arresting System (EMAS):** Construction of EMAS provides an additional safety feature to assist with stopping airplanes in an emergency. An EMAS is a bed of engineered material built at the end of a runway. The materials are high-energy absorbing materials that will crush under the weight of an airplane. EMAS enhances safety by working like a runaway truck ramp to slow and safely stop an airplane absorbing its forward energy should it overrun the runway.

- 2) **Runway Extension:** The existing runway length of 4,897 feet does not provide some airplane operators the same benefits they would have with a longer runway. Additional runway length is needed by some airplanes to takeoff fully-fueled and loaded to allow them to fly farther. In addition, a runway extension would reduce airplane noise for communities west of the Palomar Airport because it would allow most airplanes to increase flight

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

elevation sooner. By increasing elevation sooner, tan airplane would be quieter to people on the ground because the airplane would be higher in the air. Any runway extension that requires construction over areas of inactive landfill may not be fully eligible for the FAA's usual 90% grant share since FAA has indicated they may be reluctant to fund projects that result from the County's placement of the landfills

- 3) **Runway and Taxiway Shift:** Shifting the runway to the north to increase the distance between the runway and the taxiway would meet FAA design standards and enhance safety for larger airplanes and increase safety margins. The additional space between the runway and taxiway provides more room for larger and faster airplanes to safely come to a stop if they run off the side of the runway.
- 4) **Runway Protection Zones (RPZ):** RPZs are areas that extend off the end of the runway and serve to enhance the protection of people and property on the ground. The size of RPZs are defined by FAA design standards based on the size of aircraft. Compatible uses within the RPZs are generally restricted to land uses such as agriculture, golf courses, and similar uses that do not attract concentrations of people. Building sizes or other improvements that may be obstructions can also be restricted. Incompatible land uses within an RPZ include residences and places of public assembly such as churches, schools, hospitals, cinemas, shopping centers, and other uses with similar concentrations of people. Specific diagrams for the RPZs can be found in the proposed Master Plan Update (Attachment H).

Master Plan Update Alternatives

An important goal of the proposed Master Plan Update was to keep all projects on the airport's existing property. The proposed Master Plan Update includes six alternatives for the future classification of Palomar Airport. Four of the alternatives did not meet the objectives of the proposed Master Plan because the improvements were not within the existing airport boundary or would have adversely impacted existing airport businesses. The following two alternatives were selected as the most viable for the future of Palomar Airport and are being presented for Board consideration. Both alternatives can accommodate the aviation forecasts in the proposed Master Plan Update.

D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative and Options (Recommendation #7a.1)

The D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative (D-III Alternative) was developed to meet FAA design standards, with some modifications, while enhancing safety for existing and future operations of larger D-III airplanes. The current estimated construction cost for the D-III Alternative is approximately \$108.5 million; of which approximately \$88.2 million could be funded by FAA and the remaining \$20.3 million could be funded by the County. The D-III projects would be phased over several years and are anticipated to be completed within 13 to 20 years, dependent on available funding. The airport changes and options include:

- 1) **EMAS:** The D-III Alternative includes the construction of an EMAS at the west end of the runway. This EMAS enhances airport safety by providing a means to quickly stop an airplane that may overrun the end of the runway. This is an advantage on the west end due

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

to a slope at the end of the runway. Additionally, EMAS allows for FAA D-III design standards to be met for runway safety area.

EMAS is also planned to be added to the existing B-II runway as an interim safety improvement. When the runway is relocated to the north under the D-III Alternative, the EMAS for the B-II runway can be relocated and expanded to meet D-III standards and align with the new shifted runway. The first phase of installing the interim condition EMAS for the existing B-II runway is anticipated to be completed in the next 0 to 7 years, and the next phase includes the relocated and larger D-III EMAS that is anticipated to be completed within 13 to 20 years, dependent on available funding.

- 2) **Runway Extension:** The D-III Alternative includes an extension of the runway by 370 feet that would allow airplanes to takeoff with more fuel which would enable farther flights without having to stop to refuel. For example, with the 370-foot runway extension, a D-III-sized airplane could reach the United Kingdom without refueling.

An interim runway extension of 200 feet on the existing B-II runway is planned to provide additional runway length for takeoff. With this interim extension, a B-II-sized airplane could expand its range and reach most of the east coast except for the northeastern area of the United States. When the runway is relocated to the north under the D-III Alternative, the interim condition 200-foot runway extension on the B-II runway will be removed along with the remaining portions of the existing B-II runway. The first phase to construct an interim 200-foot runway extension for the existing B-II runway is anticipated to be completed in the next 0 to 7 years, and the next phase includes an extension of the runway by 370 feet to align with the new shifted runway and is anticipated to be completed within 13 to 20 years, dependent on available funding.

Option 1 (Recommendation #7a.2): Extend Runway up to 800 Feet – Option 1 would add up to 430 feet of runway extension to the 370 feet extension. An 800-foot extension would allow the B-II-sized airplane to reach any destination on the east coast and allow a D-III-sized airplane to travel into the middle of Europe and to parts of China without refueling. This option would require the construction of an additional EMAS on the eastern end of the runway, bridging the inactive landfill, and construction of a retaining wall at the south side along Palomar Airport Road. The extension would likely be done in phases and current estimated construction cost for the D-III Alternative with Option 1 (additional \$23.7 million) is a total of \$132.2 million. Approximately \$89.5 million could be funded by the FAA and the remaining \$42.7 million could be funded by the County. The project would be phased over several years and is anticipated to be completed within 13 to 20 years, dependent on available funding.

- 3) **Runway and Taxiway Shift:** The D-III Alternative includes a shift of the runway to the north by 123 feet and a shift north of the taxiway by 19 feet. The shift north increases the distance between the runway and the taxiway to meet design standards for a D-III airplane by providing more clearance between airplane when they are operating on the runway and the taxiway at the same time and FAA operational safety restrictions could be lifted.

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

- 4) **RPZ:** A 370-foot extension is necessary as part of this alternative to minimize the effects of new RPZs on private properties at the east end of the airport. One office building would be affected with the 370-foot runway extension. Any runway extension less than 370 feet would place a second office building into the RPZ.

D-III Alternative Constraints

There are several constraints associated with the shifting of the runway and taxiway north:

- The shift north would result in the relocation of over 30 small general aviation airplanes to the south side of the airport and would eliminate the self-service fuel facility on the north ramp. These smaller airplanes could be accommodated on the south side of the airport and the relocation would be phased as space became available.
- To accommodate the D-III improvements, four Modifications of Standards will need to be presented to the FAA for approval.
- The D-III Alternative would affect an existing office building on the north side of the airport. The existing building is not currently located in the RPZ at the east end of the airport but would be brought into the east end RPZ if the runway was shifted north. Any effects to the property could be addressed by working with the property owner and the FAA before making the decision to pursue the D-III Alternative.

B-II Enhanced Alternative and Options (Recommendation #7b.1)

The B-II Enhanced Alternative (B-II Alternative) was developed to meet FAA design standards while enhancing safety for existing and future airplane operations from larger and faster C-III and D-III airplanes. Remaining at a B-II classification is less costly compared to the D-III Alternative and the current estimated construction cost for the B-II Alternative, without any runway extension, is \$26.8 million; of which approximately \$24.2 million could be funded by FAA and the remaining \$2.6 million could be funded by the County. The project would be phased in over several years and is anticipated to be completed within seven years, dependent on available funding. The airport changes and options include:

- 1) **EMAS:** The B-II Alternative includes the construction of an EMAS at the west end of the runway. This EMAS enhances airport safety by providing a means to quickly stop an airplane that may overrun the end of the runway. This is an advantage on the west end due to a slope at the end of the runway.
- 2) **Runway Extension:** The B-II Alternative includes two options for runway extension:

Option 1 (Recommendation #7b.2): Extend Runway by 200 Feet – Option 1 would add up to 200 feet of runway extension. Extension of the runway by 200 feet would provide additional runway length for takeoff and landing. For example, a B-II-sized airplane could expand its range and reach most of the east coast except for the northeastern area of the United States and would allow a D-III-sized airplane to travel about 300 miles farther to

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

reach Japan without refueling. The current estimated construction cost for the B-II Alternative with Option 1 (additional \$14.9 million) is a total of \$41.7 million. Approximately \$37.5 million could be funded by FAA and the remaining \$4.2 million could be funded by the County. The project would be phased in over several years and is anticipated to be completed within seven years, dependent on available funding.

Option 2 (Recommendation #7b.3): Extend Runway up to 900 Feet – Option 2 would add up to 700 feet of runway extension to the 200 feet extension in Option #7b.1. Extension of the runway up to 900 feet would allow a B-II-sized airplane to reach any destination on the east coast of the United States; the current runway is not long enough to allow the B-II airplanes to reach the east coast. The extension would allow a D-III-sized airplane to extend its range to most of the countries in Europe and to parts of China without refueling. The runway extension would require bridging the inactive landfill and construction of a retaining wall at the south side of the airport along Palomar Airport Road. The extension would likely be done in phases, and the current estimated construction cost for the B-II Alternative with Options 1 and 2 (additional \$69.3 million) is a total of \$96.1 million. Approximately \$37.6 million could be funded by FAA and the remaining \$58.5 million could be funded by the County. The project would be phased in over several years and is anticipated to be completed within 20 years, dependent on available funding.

- 3) **Runway and Taxiway Shift:** Shifting the runway would not be necessary for the B-II Alternative.
- 4) **RPZ:** There are no new constraints to properties located in the RPZs for any of the options presented in the B-II Enhanced Alternative. For the B-II Alternative, the RPZs at each end of the runway are currently larger than the FAA requires for a B-II category airport. If the B-II Alternative is selected, then the size of the existing RPZs will be reduced to match the FAA design standards.

Option 3 (Recommendation #7b.4): Explore Solutions Runway Protection Zone Constraints for a Future D-III Design Designation – The Board can direct staff to work with the property owners in the future to determine if a viable solution can be found. Staff would return to the Board to provide information on the options for the Board’s consideration. Option 3 allows for initial improvements, such as EMAS, to be pursued while the County determines if any viable solution can be found to alleviate new land use concerns from the RPZs needed for the D-III Alternative. If a solution can be found for the land use concerns, staff would return to the Board at a future date to provide information on the solution and to allow consideration for a D-III design designation.

B-II Alternative Constraints

There are a few constraints associated with the B-II Alternative that should be considered:

- Currently, when commercial airplanes larger than B-II are on the runway or taxiway, no other airplane larger than B-II can be on either the runway or taxiway. The FAA has

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

indicated that if the B-II alternative is chosen, an operational restriction may be extended to all airplanes larger than B-II. The restriction could mean time delays for larger airplanes.

- At the east end of the runway, one office building and a portion of a storage facility would be removed from the RPZ. At the west end of the runway two existing parcels would be removed from the RPZ and existing land use restrictions may be removed; one parcel is a vehicle parking lot and the other is an industrial building. If the County later decides to pursue the D-III Alternative, the two west-end parcels would again be placed within the RPZ. Placing the two parcels back into the RPZ in the future within the larger RPZ required for the D-III Alternative could create renewed use restrictions on these parcels.

Summary of Airport Alternatives and Staff Recommendation

Staff developed a recommendation and several options for the Board to consider that meet the aviation forecast and will enhance safety at Palomar Airport:

Alternative and Recommendation	Options
D-III Alternative Recommendation #7a.1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shift Runway & Taxiway North • Extend Runway 370 Feet 	Option 1: Extend Runway up to 800 Feet with East EMAS
B-II Alternative Recommendation #7b.1	Option 1: Extend Runway up to 200 Feet Option 2: Extend Runway up to 900 Feet Option 3: Review D-III Land Use Solutions and Return to the Board

Staff recommendation is for Palomar Airport to remain a B-II classification and include Options 1, 2 and 3 which would extend the runway up to 900 feet and to determine if a viable solution can be found to alleviate new land use concerns in RPZs posed by the D-III Alternative. If a solution can be found to alleviate the land use concerns with the D-III Alternative, staff would return to the Board for further direction. The B-II Alternative safely accommodates larger aircraft, like D-III airplanes; has a lower estimated construction cost; does not impact the northern airplane parking area; and enhances safety through the construction of EMAS. The staff recommendation and all options are feasible alternatives for the proposed Master Plan Update and future development of the Palomar Airport. With a B-II Alternative, the airport is safe today and will be safe in the future, while allowing flexibility in the future should the opportunity arise to pursue the D-III Alternative.

Environmental Review Process

The County prepared a Final PEIR for the proposed Master Plan Update in accordance with Section 15168 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. The PEIR analyzed the environmental impacts from all improvements anticipated in the Master Plan Update. The PEIR proposes all feasible mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts to below a level of significance, and describes the project objectives, environmental setting, and project alternatives. Environmental analysis of the D-III Alternative in the PEIR allows for a full review

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

of the feasible alternatives discussed in the PEIR and provides CEQA analysis for alternatives with less environmental impacts including the Staff Recommended B-II Enhanced Alternative.

A Notice of Preparation for the PEIR was circulated for public review from February 29, 2016 to March 29, 2016. The County circulated the Draft PEIR and the Draft Master Plan Update for a 61-day public comment period from January 19, 2018 to March 19, 2018. Based on the comments received during the initial public review period, the County elected to revise and recirculate the Biological Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and Energy Use and Consumption portions of the PEIR to clarify and strengthen the analysis. Updated RPZ exhibits from the Master Plan Update were included with the PEIR recirculation to provide the public the opportunity to review. Public comments were received on the recirculated portions of the PEIR from June 21, 2018 to August 6, 2018.

Since the PEIR analysis was conducted at a programmatic level, subsequent project-level CEQA review will be needed once a project in the Master Plan Update moves forward for design and construction. A summary of the impacts analysis in the PEIR, including portions of the PEIR that were recirculated, is set forth below.

Significant Impacts and Mitigation

The following impacts were found to be significant and mitigable as described in the PEIR:

Traffic – The traffic analysis utilized the City of Carlsbad methodology and shows that over time, Palomar Airport vehicle traffic may have a cumulative impact at two intersections along Palomar Airport Road at Camino Vida Roble and El Camino Real. Like other development projects in the City of Carlsbad with cumulative impacts, traffic mitigation will be in the form of a fair-share payment to the City prior to the impacts occurring. The City collects these payments and uses them to address traffic congestion within their network.

Biology – The Master Plan Update proposes elements that require earthwork which will include removal of sensitive vegetation and habitat for sensitive bird species. Biological Resources was one of the Draft PEIR sections that was recirculated to include review of potential impacts associated with the relocation of existing FAA navigational lighting on a parcel owned by the County east of El Camino Real if the runway shifts to the north. Impacts to these biological resources will be mitigated through preservation, creation, and/or restoration of in-kind sensitive habitat and species-based mitigation as overseen by the state and federal resource agencies.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources – The Master Plan Update anticipates the installation of a retaining wall that would be visible to motorists as they pass by the airport along Palomar Airport Road. Design of the wall will incorporate colors, textures, and landscape, where feasible, as discussed in the City of Carlsbad’s design guidelines to minimize the visual change along the corridor.

Hazardous Materials – Palomar Airport is underlain by three cells of an inactive landfill that closed in 1975. The County continues to maintain the inactive landfill to ensure the site is environmentally safe, including monitoring and maintaining landfill gas systems, maintaining

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

stormwater Best Management Practices, maintaining soil cover, and monitoring groundwater quality and surface water. The inactive landfill continues to be monitored by the County's Department of Environmental Health Solid Waste Local Enforcement Agency, the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, and the San Diego County Air Pollution Control District. Impacts to the inactive landfill will be incorporated into the design of future runway extensions and will be addressed through the implementation of a Soil Management Plan, which will designate standard practices for construction and project-specific protocol to address materials as they are encountered during construction activities.

Construction Noise – An analysis was conducted for construction activities and airplane noise. Airplane noise was determined not to be a significant impact based on FAA guidance for evaluating aviation noise. However, construction could result in elevated noise levels during certain activities. Therefore, for future airport projects that will generate construction noise, a demolition and construction management plan will be prepared for each individual project to identify specific measures to help ensure surrounding industrial and public properties are not affected by the project's construction noise.

Less than Significant Impacts

The PEIR evaluated other environmental resources including Air Quality, Energy Use and Consumption, Land Use and Planning, Operational Noise, Public Services, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and the analysis concluded the Master Plan Update did not exceed thresholds of significance and would not result in significant environmental impacts under CEQA. In response to public comments on the Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Energy Use and Consumption sections, further analysis was conducted and incorporated in the PEIR to include more specific modeling data and an updated review of the regulatory framework.

Public Comments Received

The County received 138 comment letters from agencies, organizations and individuals regarding the Draft PEIR and Master Plan Update documents during the initial and recirculation public review periods. The letters included comments on existing airport operations and noise; biological resources; climate change; hazardous materials; and traffic. The letters and responses to comments are included in the Final PEIR as Attachment D.

ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT

Potentially significant environmental effects identified in the Program Environmental Impact Report (PEIR) include impacts to aesthetics and visual resources; biological resources; hazards and hazardous materials; construction noise; and traffic. Findings supported by substantial evidence have been made for each significant effect (Attachment C). Strategies to minimize and mitigate these potential impacts have been incorporated into the proposed program. The Mitigation, Monitoring, and Reporting Program (Attachment G), provides a mechanism for compliance with the mitigation measures. The PEIR concluded that these impacts can be mitigated to a less than significant level.

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

The PEIR discusses potential significant effects of buildout of the Proposed Master Plan Update's 16 anticipated improvements (including all the Airfield alternatives described in the Master Plan, such as the B-II Enhanced Alternative and the D-III Modified Standards Compliance Alternative) as a first-tier programmatic environmental review. When an individual Master Plan Update project is proposed, it will be examined using the PEIR to determine whether an additional environmental document must be prepared pursuant to CEQA Section 15168(c).

LINKAGE TO THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO STRATEGIC PLAN

Today's proposed action supports the Operational Excellence and Sustainable Environments/Thriving Strategic Initiatives in the County of San Diego's 2018-2023 Strategic Plan. Airports provide infrastructure and facilities that serve the aviation community and the general public and play an important role in the local economy. Approval of the Palomar Airport Proposed Master Plan Update would enhance the County's ongoing efforts to provide modern infrastructure, innovative technology and appropriate resources to ensure that the County provides superior service delivery to customers. Carefully studying and analyzing proposed projects to ensure all impacts to environmental resources are mitigated contributes to a region that is healthy safe and thriving.

Respectfully submitted,



SARAH E. AGHASSI
Deputy Chief Administrative Officer

ATTACHMENT(S)

- A. Vicinity Map
- B. Final Program Environmental Impact Report
- C. Findings Concerning Mitigation of Significant Environmental Effects
- D. List of Commenters, Letters of Comment, and Response to Comments on the Program Environmental Impact Report
- E. Statement of Location and Custodian of Record
- F. Decision and Explanation Regarding Recirculation of the Draft Program Environmental Impact Report
- G. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
- H. McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan Update

**SUBJECT: MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT MASTER PLAN UPDATE
(DISTRICT: 5)**

AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION SHEET

REQUIRES FOUR VOTES: Yes No

WRITTEN DISCLOSURE PER COUNTY CHARTER SECTION 1000.1 REQUIRED

 Yes No

PREVIOUS RELEVANT BOARD ACTIONS:

December 16, 2015 (3), directed staff to proceed with the McClellan Palomar Airport Master Plan focusing on the modified C/D–III classification, subject to the preparation of a Program-Level Environmental Impact Report; September 25, 2013 (2), received Feasibility Study for Potential Improvements to Palomar Airport Runway; September 28, 2011 (3), directed staff to conduct Feasibility Study for Potential Improvements to Palomar Airport Runway; June 14, 2011 (10), directed staff to return with scope, cost and timeline for feasibility study for improvements to Palomar Airport; September 16, 1997 (15), approved the 1997 McClellan-Palomar Airport Master Plan; and March 19, 1979 (66), directed staff to proceed with implementation of the 1975 Master Plan and established the Palomar Airport Advisory Committee.

BOARD POLICIES APPLICABLE:

Board Policy F-44

BOARD POLICY STATEMENTS:

N/A

MANDATORY COMPLIANCE:

N/A

ORACLE AWARD NUMBER(S) AND CONTRACT AND/OR REQUISITION NUMBER(S):

N/A

ORIGINATING DEPARTMENT: Department of Public Works

OTHER CONCURRENCE(S): N/A

CONTACT PERSON(S):

Richard E. Crompton
Name
858-694-2233
Phone
Richard.Crompton@sdcounty.ca.gov
E-mail

Derek R. Gade
Name
858-694-3897
Phone
Derek.Gade@sdcounty.ca.gov
E-mail