

Information on the Proposed Site of a Future San Diego Regional Airport at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar

Compiled from information from meetings on the airport proposal, planning groups, town councils, newspaper articles, press releases, and reports.

The Ballot Language is Misleading

The ballot language currently put forth by the Airport Authority board is: “To provide for San Diego's long-term air transportation needs, shall the Airport Authority and government officials work to obtain approximately 3,000 of 23,000 acres at MCAS Miramar by 2020 for a commercial airport provided necessary traffic and freeway improvements are made, military readiness is maintained without expense to the military for modifying or relocating operations, no local taxes are used on the airport, overall noise impacts are reduced, and necessary Lindbergh Field improvements are completed?”

Let us examine the points in the current ballot language before discussing the larger issues.

“3,000 of 23,000 acres at MCAS Miramar”

There is deception in this wording. Close to 16,500 acres at Marine Corps Air Station Miramar is environmentally protected habitat for eleven endangered species, much of which is legally required environmental offset to permit the development of the surrounding communities. The San Diego Landfill uses 1,400 acres, courtesy of the U.S. Marine Corps. East Miramar, east of I-15, is unsuitable for an airport because of the mountains. When the Marines moved to Miramar, only 600 acres could be used for further development. Some of that has been used, and coming housing units (over 1,600) and a school will take nearly all the available land. Currently, the Marines use about 3,500 acres of Miramar. The Airport Authority wants 3,000 acres. Clearly, its numbers demand that the Marines leave Miramar.

“Necessary traffic and freeway improvements are made”

The airport (Federal Aviation Administration) will pay only for roads that are directly related to airport access. Most of the “necessary traffic and freeway improvements” would have to be paid for by taxes. An airport at Miramar would add “144,000 vehicle trips per day” to the I-15, I-5, and I-805 freeways. As mitigation for the traffic impacts, the Airport Authority’s report says that “Airport-related vehicle trips to and from this site would require street improvements including: 1) widening of Miramar Road from I-805 to Camino Santa Fe and from Camino Ruiz to I-15 to be an 8-lane expressway with 2) grade-separated intersections/interchanges at Camino Santa Fe, Kearny Villa and Camino Ruiz; and 3) relocating part of Kearny Villa Road eastward.” It also proposes the demolition and relocation of sections of both I-15 and SR 163 and construction of an I-15/Miramar Way interchange that would take drivers into the airport. None of this would be paid for by the airport.

Currently, \$1 billion is being spent to widen Interstate 15 and build a center HOV lane that will accommodate commuter buses. The Airport Authority’s plan for Miramar would require moving I-15 several miles to the east when the airport is built. The required changes to I-15 and I-805 would cost at least that much and would have to be funded by the state (CalTrans) or by TransNet taxes (only if the SANDAG board approves changing the existing list of approved

TransNet projects) or by transportation bonds issued by the county, with the interest being paid by the taxpayer.

“Military readiness is maintained without expense to the military for modifying or relocating operations”

There is no way that military readiness can be maintained, said the Secretary of the Navy, Rear Admiral Len Herring (for Navy Region Southwest) and Major General Michael Lehnert (for Marine West) at a June, 2006, meeting held by the Airport Authority. At a July 26 meeting of the County Board of Supervisors, General Lehnert stressed that the Marine’s flight schedules and base operations are constantly changing to maintain readiness and fulfill operations and deployment needs and cannot be preset to accommodate civilian flight schedules. You cannot mix tactical fighters with commercial jet liners without drastically altering the way the Marines operate and compromising military readiness.

Joint use is in violation of federal law and military training regulations because it hinders military training and endangers both the public and the Marines who are preparing for duty. Pentagon officials argue that joint use would be impossible at Miramar because it would mix commercial passenger planes with armed tactical warplanes. It would mix straight-in and straight-out commercial flight profiles with the oval flight patterns used by military aircraft to simulate aircraft carrier operations. This means that the military planes must take sharp left turns as they prepare to land, which would not be possible under the joint-use plan. It would mix civilian airline priorities for timeliness with military priorities for mission and training needs, and experienced civilian airline pilots with inexperienced Marine trainee pilots. In addition, military flights often involve two or more aircraft at one time and multiple “touch and go” landings and takeoffs.

Joint use would compromise base security and the security of stored weapons and military equipment.

MCAS Miramar is the only fighter base on the West Coast within a 200-mile radius; is at the center of West Coast military ranges for refueling, training, and logistical reasons; and is critical to national defense, which is why the Pentagon and Congress opposed plans to move the base during five rounds of military base closures (BRAC).

The Airport Authority’s report says that “Adjustments to military operating configurations, including redesign of arrival, departure and closed pattern procedures, would be required to mix civilian and military operations at the joint-use facility.” The report doesn’t mention the total number of air operations per year (currently 100,000 at Miramar and 200,000 at Lindbergh), let alone the 100,000 additional flights the Airport Authority wants for the 24-hour-per-day, 7-day-a-week civilian airport operation.

The Airport Authority’s proposal would cost the military a great deal. Further, the Authority’s economic analysis does not account for the huge economic impact the *departure* of the Marines would have on San Diego or the \$15-to-\$20 billion it would cost to move them.

The Airport Authority’s objective clearly is to force the Marines out of Miramar. City Councilman Jim Madaffar says, “The Airport Authority voted to place a deceiving and vague question on this November’s General Election ballot. Do not be fooled: Miramar does not work as a joint-use airport.”

“No local taxes are used on the airport”

This refers only the cost of the airport itself, not the massive infrastructure required to support it. Local taxes would have to pay for the physical infrastructure (rental-car facilities and other buildings) and transportation infrastructure (new roads and relocation of existing freeways) to

support the airport. One must also consider the inevitable cost overruns that accompany such massive construction.

"Overall noise impacts are reduced"

Of all the sites considered, a civilian airport at Miramar would expose the greatest number of homes to extensive aircraft noise. The Authority's report states, "... with both civilian and modified F-18 operations outlined above, noise impacts would increase substantially compared to existing conditions." In fact, an additional 6,481 residential units would be affected by 65-decibel CNEL (California Noise Equivalent Level) noise exposure, making a total of 10,765 residential units in the 65 dB CNEL "circle" (18,471 people). Sixty-five dB is the threshold at which environmental law says mitigations are required (noise quieting, building restrictions).

Tierrasanta would bear the largest noise impact, including areas of 70 dB and 75 dB, although the impacts in other communities would be significant. For the 450+ homes in the highest noise area, the "recommended" mitigation is to sell them to the Airport Authority (to condemn them). The loss of homes was a Tier-1 criterion used to disqualify other sites but was ignored in considering joint use at Miramar.

The report says, "The 60 and 65 CNEL noise contours extend into public parks and recreational facilities owned by the City and County of San Diego, and increased noise and visual intrusion could adversely impact public lands [including Mission Trails Regional Park]... The Secretary of the Interior would need to approve the use of these lands" (meaning that they might not be useable because of noise.) The report does not identify other parks, schools, and public facilities that would be impacted by the noise.

The report says that if the airport were civilian only, the noise impacts would be dramatically reduced. With jumbo jets landing and in full-power takeoff, it is unlikely that the added noise in University City, Mira Mesa, Mission Gorge, Tierrasanta, UTC, La Jolla, Rancho Bernardo, Penasquitos, etc., would be offset by reduced noise downtown and in Point Loma.

"Necessary Lindbergh Field improvements are completed"

According to City Councilman Jim Madaffer, who served as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee to the SANDAG Airport Site Selection Committee in '88 and '89: "It's time we stop assuming that Lindbergh Field cannot handle San Diego's air travel needs. If our Airport Authority would simply put half the effort into improving Lindbergh Field as they have in the futile effort of trying to take over Miramar, our airport problems would be solved!"

"There are numerous options available to improve Lindbergh Field and there have been several half-hearted efforts to make improvements, but nothing ever full scale because taking over Miramar has long been the dream for those we have entrusted to manage Lindbergh Field."

The Airport Authority's Report Oversimplifies or Ignores the Impacts

Impact on Regional Economy

As soon as the Airport Authority passed its resolution, its staff was told to take the necessary measures to get land-use plans surrounding MCAS Miramar changed so that they are based on commercial, rather than military, aircraft. Such land-use restrictions drastically affect buildings and height. They would severely impact businesses in the area—particularly in Sorrento Valley, a major contributor to the local economy. For example, Biosite recently established a campus on Camino Santa Fe. The airport land-use restrictions would prevent Biosite from expanding to accommodate the 6,000+ employees it will need. Qualcomm also plans to increase its campus with higher buildings; it recently reported to the Mira Mesa Planning Group that its job-

opportunity losses would be in the thousands, should a more restrictive land-use policy be put in place. It has recently started to expand to Las Vegas, where land-use restrictions are much more lenient.

Regarding the economic issues, the “Voice of San Diego” has published Dr. Richard Carson’s (UCSD, Economics) letter that describes the “bogus” analysis being used by the Airport Authority to justify the need for a new airport. The following is an excerpt:

The San Diego County Regional Airport Authority’s updated economic analysis released last week is just as flawed as the first, according to the chairman of the economics department at University of California, San Diego.

In a letter to authority Chairman Joe Craver, professor Richard Carson writes that the new analysis—part of the justification for building a new airport—repeats the mistakes of a 2001 study that says building a new airport could help the region reap \$94 billion in gross regional product.

Carson challenges the model the report is based upon, saying that the report assumes businesses will simply close up shop instead of finding other ways to ship their cargo if Lindbergh Field becomes constrained. That, he wrote, “is clearly ludicrous.”

The Airport Authority doesn’t mention that the Marines’ presence at Miramar directly brings San Diego billions of dollars per year. In 2005 dollars, the Navy Department (including Marines) claims that it pumps about \$9.2 billion into San Diego County. The military’s presence helps to mitigate dips in the area’s economy. MCAS Miramar is the seventh-largest employer in San Diego County. If we evict the Marines for the second time (the last was from El Toro), they may leave San Diego and California for good.

The use of Miramar as a commercial airport would shut down Montgomery Field. Additionally, the Airport Authority’s plan says that some businesses would have to be “relocated.” It would require extensive use of eminent domain government land and property seizures, but the Airport Authority has not indicated whose land will be taken to facilitate the proposed physical and transportation “improvements.”

Additional Impacts on Existing Communities

The report proposes construction of a new runway between the existing runway/landfill area and SR 52 with no discussion of the noise and air-quality impacts. It discusses air-quality impacts during construction but says nothing significant about air-quality impacts resulting from the addition of 200,000+ flights per year. Particulates from jet fuel are carcinogens.

More importantly, it does not discuss the increased potential hazards of falling objects and aviation disasters. Exhibit 4.4-12 of the military sites analysis report shows accident-potential-zone (APZ) depictions for the existing oval flight path, with APZ 1 (the most serious) directly under the flight path. In the plan to move the oval southward to the new runway, the APZ 1 depiction covers *only* the part of the flight path that’s on MCAS property; the rest of the oval (atop northern Tierrasanta and Kearny Mesa) is shown as APZ 2. This clearly is misleading.

The report says, “The airport would be viewed primarily from Scripps Ranch, the proposed military housing development in East Miramar, Tierrasanta and the UTC/Golden Triangle area, as well as nearby surface streets and freeways. . . . Aircraft operations would be visible for many miles, as are current military operations, but a new airport would greatly add to those impacts. In general, operations would have substantial adverse visual impacts for miles around.” It also says that there would be significant new light pollution in the region, both during construction (including moving the freeways east) and from airport operations.

Environmental Impact

County voters will not have any environmental impact report for the proposed airport when they vote in November. However, in addition to the impacts discussed above, there would be a loss of protected habitat in Miramar due to the push for development and the need to build the new transportation routes, rental car parking lots, hotels, etc.

Do We Need a New Airport?

The Airport Authority contends that Lindbergh Field will run out of capacity by 2015 and devastate the San Diego economy. In fact, the number of passengers increased by 7 % from April 2001 to April 2006—an annual increase of 1.4 % a year. This figure is roughly in sync with San Diego population growth but is less than half of what the Airport Authority uses in its forecast. Over the same time, takeoffs and landings fell by 3 %, and the number has been flat for over a decade. The Airport Authority's claims also confuse the natural return of airline passengers after 9/11 with a change in long-term trends in passenger growth.

As City Councilman Jim Madaffer says, “Years of false starts and repeated failures by government leaders on the idea that Lindbergh Field might be moved has accomplished nothing more than putting off the inevitable: to make the necessary improvements to Lindbergh Field. Aviation technology will continue to outpace the inefficiencies of Lindbergh Field. The claim that we need a new airport because fully loaded 747s could never fly non-stop from San Diego to Tokyo is rubbish. Today, fully loaded 777s have no problem making the San Diego-Tokyo run. Of course you have to have a market for this. So far, none exists. Take British Airways as an example. They used to fly non-stop from San Diego to London. What happened? No market and therefore no more British Airways in San Diego. Lindbergh Field had nothing to do with them leaving. It's simple economics.

“Those clamoring for a new airport claim that passenger traffic has increased and will continue to increase. In reality, the number of operations (flights) at Lindbergh over the last five years has actually gone *down*. In 1995, the annual operations at Lindbergh were 245,280. Ten years later in 2005, the annual operations went down to 228,672.

“Part of the fallacy with a new airport has been ‘build it and they will come.’ Most airlines don't have a lot of money these days for fancy new gates and more terminals. The name of the game for airlines is to get the best seat per mile rate that they possibly can and that means fill the planes with as many people as possible. Furthermore, as aviation technology continues to improve, planes will be larger, quieter, take off and land in shorter distances, and carry many more people. Readily available information in publications such as *Aviation Week* and *Space Technology* indicate that the planes of tomorrow are better suited to airports like Lindbergh. In another 20 years, the days will be over where we will need 12,000-foot runways and dual simultaneous ILS (Instrument Landing System) approaches with 4,200' runway separation.

“Furthermore, most economic projections touting a new airport are inflated and are paid for by those promoting Miramar for a commercial airport.

“The biggest problem with Lindbergh Field has not been with its runway but with ingress and egress to the terminal facilities. By building some simple solutions we can begin to solve the passenger and cargo issues at Lindbergh Field. There are plenty of good ideas such as:

- Off-ramps from I-5 near Washington Street that go directly into a new parking and terminal facility north of the runway
- A trolley spur that goes to the airport
- Dual-level departure and arrival decks into the existing terminals
- A departure-only runway”

County supervisor Pam Slater-Price's staff contacted five major airlines; all said that they would not consider San Diego as a potential hub airport.

A new airport at Miramar would result in: higher ticket prices; diversion of desperately needed tax dollars to pay for the new infrastructure (including road construction); and a few new nonstop flights to places such as Bakersfield and Oklahoma City, but not the large number of overseas flights touted. This was proven by the British Airways flight to London, which was not commercially feasible despite the fact the number of London passengers was twice that of the next most popular overseas destination.

In respect to the claim that there is a problem with air cargo capacity at Lindbergh, much of San Diego's air cargo already goes to places like Ontario, where air cargo from throughout Southern California is consolidated and flown around the world. Air cargo flights make up a small fraction of the traffic at Lindbergh Field. Simply shifting corporate jets to other San Diego county airfields (Brown, Gillespie, Montgomery, and Palomar) would solve the "problem." The Airport Authority's own consultants put some huge disclaimers about the "problem" in their report. At the July 27 County Supervisor's meeting on the issue, John Chalker of the "Coalition to Preserve the Economy," who spoke on behalf of the Airport Authority board, said, "It's not about flying to the far East or cargo."

Another argument used by the Airport Authority is that a single runway is inadequate and the land area at Lindbergh is too small to support the number of projected passengers. Many airports need two runways to meet their standard capacity requirements only when adverse weather (i.e., snow) reduces the rate of flight operations. There are excellent expansion opportunities at Lindbergh that the Airport Authority has refused to consider because they are focused on two 12,000-foot runways. Options such as a departure-only runway or a splayed (split) departure runway at Lindbergh would cost much less than building an entirely new airport.

Those who have studied the Airport Authority's "educational materials" have found numerous contradictions and discrepancies, raising serious doubt about the validity of the conclusions.

Citizens Organizations, Community Groups, and Elected Officials Protest the Site Selection

Citizens' organizations such as the City of San Diego Airport Advisory Committee (not the same as the San Diego Regional Airport Authority, which proposed the Miramar site) and the Community Planners Advisory Committee on Transportation (COMPACT) have passed resolutions opposing the selection of Miramar or opposing the concept of closing Lindbergh. The COMPACT Board has recommended that the Airport Authority stop its pursuit of replacing Lindbergh field. The board also recommended that the Airport Authority be re-integrated with the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to incorporate airport planning as one element of a full transportation infrastructure strategy.

Taxpayers for Responsible Planning (T4RP), founded by Alex Barron, represents people who believe a "March to Miramar" is little more than a land grab driven by special-interest developers who want the land at Lindbergh Field. The T4RP Website is www.SaveMiramar.org.

The Endangered Habitat League stands with T4RP in an effort to protect the eleven endangered or threatened plant and animal species that live on MCAS Miramar.

The Town Councils and Community Planning Groups of communities such as Mira Mesa, Tierrasanta, University City, Scripps Ranch, Rancho Penasquitos, La Jolla, UTC, and Clairemont are opposed to the selection of Miramar for a regional airport (see examples of resolutions in the appendix).

Elected officials opposed to the Miramar site for a civilian airport include:

- San Diego City Councilman Jim Madaffer
- San Diego City Councilman Brian Maienschein
- San Diego City Councilman Scott Peters

- Mary Sessom, Mayor of Lemon Grove, who was one of the dissenting votes on the Airport Authority Board
- San Diego County Supervisor Pam Slater-Price
- San Diego County Supervisor Dianne Jacob
- San Diego County Supervisor Bill Horn
- California State Assemblywoman Lori Saldana
- California State Assemblyman George Plescia
- California State Senator Christine Kehoe
- California State Senator Dennis Hollingsworth
- United States Congressional Representative Duncan Hunter
- United States Congressional Representative Bob Filner
- United States Congressional Representative Brian Bilbray
- United States Senator Barbara Boxer
- United States Senator Dianne Feinstein

State Senator Christine Kehoe's letter to the Airport Authority board opposing the site selection cites "excessive high noise levels" at "26 of the region's most treasured parks; the disruption of a major transportation corridor by 'moving' sections of I-15 and SR-163 to the east, not to mention 144,000 new vehicle trips per day on already-gridlocked freeways; no clear answer as to who will pay for moving the freeways, the potential loss of the use of over 1,200 acres of light industrial lands due to land-use compatibility problems . . . which hurts the high tech-biotech industry" and "shifting accident potential zones into well-established neighborhoods and commercial-industrial areas surrounding the base." She also says, ". . . you have not thoroughly evaluated how Lindbergh Field could meet our needs for more years into the future. Nor are you basing your decision on a valid economic analysis of the region's needs weighed against potential costs."

State Assembly Republican Leader George Plescia (San Diego) says, "Turning Miramar into a 24 hour-a-day international airport while risking public safety and military training is not a viable solution to San Diego's airport needs. The Airport Authority's joint-use proposal, which is a violation of federal law and military regulations, is nothing more than an attempt to cover the fact that the Authority has failed its mission and wasted millions of dollars in 'user fees' and taxpayer funds."

City Councilman Brian Maienschein says, "I oppose Miramar as a site for a new regional airport. There are too many factors against it. Miramar is an ideal military airbase, but it is a dangerous, expensive and shortsighted choice for a new commercial airport. Not only am I opposed because of my concerns such as noise, safety and traffic congestion, but also the surrounding infrastructure is inadequate. For example, technical consultants have concluded that a 5-mile segment of Interstate 15 and parts of State Route 163 north of Route 52 would have to be moved east." He also cites Forbes magazine in pointing out that San Diego's strong military economic base helps to buffer against extreme income swings.

San Diego Unified School District board member Katharine Nakamura cites the impact the noise would have on many schools and the resulting expense for the school district.

Lobbyists for the Airport

ASAP 21 (<http://www.asap21.net/index.php>) is a group sponsored, in part, by the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce. It is running a well-financed campaign to evict the Marines from Miramar. However, the San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce is not unified in its support of the Miramar site. Five Chamber committees have voted on the ballot measure, and two of them, including the Policy Committee, have resoundingly voted against the measure. A July 27

Chamber vote to support the measure, according to a Chamber official, “was as close to a tie as it possibly could have been”: 19 to 18.

The “Coalition to Preserve the Economy” (spokesperson John Chalker) is also allied with the Airport Authority board.

What You Can Do

1. Voter education and registration: talk to your neighbors, clubs, colleagues, and church groups.
2. Support education about the proposed Miramar site by speaking out at public meetings, etc.
3. Write letters to the *Union Tribune* and the “Voice of San Diego,” to S.D. City Council Members and the Mayor, and to your elected representatives locally, in Sacramento, and in Washington, D.C.

Links of Interest

1. Taxpayers for Responsible Planning (T4RP): www.SaveMiramar.org
2. jmadaffer@sanidiego.gov
3. <http://campbellot.com/jointusenot/>
4. University City Planning Group: <http://uc-planning-group.com/> Click on links that appear under “AIRPORTS” on home page.
5. Dr. Richard Carson’s article:
http://voiceofsandiego.com/articles/2006/06/02/this_just_in/975carson.txt (go to the VoSD link and click on the word “letter” in the article).
6. <http://www.sdreader.com/php/cityshow.php?id=SH041306>
7. For confirmation re the Airport Authority Board’s vote, see <http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/metro/20060605-1329-bn05airport.html>
8. <http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/military/20060603-9999-7m3airport.html>
9. <http://www.voiceofsandiego.org/articles/2006/05/31/news/02supervisors.txt>

Appendices

I.

TIERRASANTA COMMUNITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION NUMBER 03-2005 (ch-1)

FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING POSSIBLE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN "JOINT USE" OF MCAS MIRAMAR

WHEREAS, continued Federal control of MCAS Miramar will be maintained for the foreseeable future now that BRAC 2005 has concluded; and

WHEREAS, with the conclusion of BRAC 2005, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) has stated an intention to examine in earnest the several military sites-including MCAS Miramar (east and west)-as possible locations for the next San Diego International Airport (SDIA); and

WHEREAS, the SDCRAA has been directed to recommend a location for the next SDIA in order that the public may vote on this matter in the November 2006 general election; and

WHEREAS, all indications are the SDCRAA is likely to produce the recommendation that the next SDIA should be located at MCAS Miramar via a "Joint Use" agreement that would permit simultaneous military and civilian flight operations; NOW, THEREFORE;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Tierrasanta Community Council established the following to be Findings of Fact regarding the possible Joint Use of MCAS Miramar by a civilian airport:

1. Joint Use is feasible when military and civilian operations are compatible, but for a variety of reasons this is not the case for MCAS Miramar:

- The military's use for training is intermittent (sometimes during the day and sometimes at night); an airport's use is for continuous, steady-state landings and takeoffs on a continuous basis (24-hrs per day, every day of the year).
- Airlines use only highly experienced pilots; MCAS exists to train junior Marine pilots.
- Marine flight profiles frequently are for recurring "touch and go" operations, where pilots fly left-hand ovals over the Air Station; an airport's flight profile is fixed: straight in and straight out.
- Airlines carry passengers and cargo; sometimes military planes must carry live ordnance, and because of this the air station must provide for the stowage, handling, loading and disposal of this ordnance on the airport's grounds.
- The MCAS includes live-fire ranges for pistols and rifles in close proximity to the airfield and its approaches.

2. The incompatible types of flight operations discussed above make Joint Use impossible without causing either a degradation in the Marines' ability to train pilots or interruptions to the business of the scheduled airlines. Joint Use of MCAS Miramar given the Marines' training requirements could only occur if the airlines would permit frequent interruptions to scheduled flight operations, and this would be disruptive to the airport and its passengers. Alternately, Joint Use of MCAS Miramar given the needs of a future SDIA could only occur if the Marines' training requirements are subordinate to civilian flight operations, which would severely degrade the military's training mission in preparing pilots for the Global War on Terror. Joint Use of MCAS Miramar would result in an untenable balancing of wholly incompatible needs: the needs of military flight training to ensure the combat readiness of Marine Corps aviators,

versus the need to ensure uninterrupted civilian arrivals and departures to maximize airline and airport revenues.

3. Any future SDIA requires a second full-length runway separated by 4,300 feet from the existing runway (the second runway is needed to provide the added capacity for the predicted level of operations in 2030). At MCAS Miramar, a second runway must lie to the north of the existing 11,000+ foot runway (because it cannot be built on the existing landfill that lies to the south). A runway 4,300 feet to the north would put it on top of the current military housing at MCAS Miramar and also on top of a section of Miramar Road. In addition, FAA safety regulations would require the elimination of a significant portion of southern Mira Mesa (houses & schools removed, buildings lowered, etc.) in order to provide the required safety and protection zones. Accordingly, there is no suitable location for a second runway at the existing MCAS Miramar (west of I-15).

4. If East Miramar were proposed then the two runways would have to be built on highly topographical lands. The canyons in East Miramar run generally north and south, but due to prevailing winds the runways would have to be built primarily east and west. This would mean the hills would have to be cut down, and the canyons filled in, to produce sufficient flat surface on which to build dual 11,000+ foot runways. In addition to extraordinary cost for all the required earth moving, this would cause massive and irreparable harm to the sensitive and endangered species contained in East Miramar. There could be no possible environmental mitigation to account for the significant elimination of protected habitat due to the amount of largely unimproved land that would be disturbed in such an undertaking.

5. Base security would be severely compromised by a continuous and unregulated flow of civilian people, vehicles and aircraft onto or in close proximity to the remaining military facility.

6. Military operations currently are 5-days a week, with limited flights during the weekend, occasional flights at night, and very few flights after midnight. Civilian operations would, by FAA mandate, be 24-hrs per day and 7 days a week.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, based on the above Findings of Fact, the relocation of SDIA operations to MCAS Miramar would result in a disastrous reduction in the Marines' ability to prepare military aviators for combat in defense of United States interests at home and abroad; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, based on the above Findings of Fact, the relocation of SDIA operations to MCAS Miramar would result in significant and seriously disruptive consequences to the community of Tierrasanta, including: increased noise, increased vehicle traffic, increased pollution, increased incursions into the surrounding protected habitats, and elimination of the community's character as an "Island in the Hills"; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the above Findings of Fact make Joint Use of MCAS Miramar impractical, infeasible, unwise and completely detrimental to the interests of national security, regional prosperity and the homeowners of Tierrasanta; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Tierrasanta Community Council altogether and unreservedly rejects as short-sighted and counterproductive any possible future report by SDCRAA that might propose the MCAS Miramar Joint Use option to the County for a vote in November 2006.

This resolution was adopted by the Tierrasanta Community Council during its meeting on November 16, 2005, by unanimous vote.

II.

UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY PLANNING GROUP RESOLUTION DECEMBER 13, 2005

FINDINGS OF FACTS AND CONCERNS REGARDING POSSIBLE MILITARY AND CIVILIAN "JOINT USE" OF MCAS MIRAMAR

WHEREAS, continued Federal control of MCAS Miramar will be maintained for the foreseeable future now that BRAC 2005 has concluded; and WHEREAS, with the conclusion of BRAC 2005, the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority (SDCRAA) has stated an intention to examine in earnest the several military sites-including MCAS Miramar (east and west)-as possible locations for the next San Diego International Airport (SDIA); and WHEREAS, the SDCRAA has been directed to recommend a location for the next SDIA in order that the public may vote on this matter in the November 2006 general election; and WHEREAS, all indications are the SDCRAA is likely to produce the recommendation that the next SDIA should be located at MCAS Miramar via a "Joint Use" agreement that would permit simultaneous military and civilian flight operations;

NOW, THEREFORE; BE IT RESOLVED, that the University Community Planning Group established the following to be Findings of Fact regarding the possible Joint Use of MCAS Miramar by a civilian airport:

1. Joint Use is feasible when military and civilian operations are compatible, but for a variety of reasons this is not the case for MCAS Miramar: * The military's use for training is intermittent (sometimes during the day and sometimes at night); an airport's use is for continuous, steady-state landings and takeoffs on a continuous basis (24-hrs per day, every day of the year). * Airlines use only highly experienced pilots; MCAS exists to train junior Marine pilots. * Marine flight profiles frequently are for recurring "touch and go" operations, where pilots fly left-hand ovals over the Air Station; an airport's flight profile is fixed: straight in and straight out. * Airlines carry passengers and cargo; sometimes military planes must carry live ordnance, and because of this the air station must provide for the stowage, handling, loading and disposal of this ordnance on the airport's grounds. * The MCAS includes live-fire ranges for pistols and rifles in close proximity to the airfield and its approaches.
2. The incompatible types of flight operations discussed above make Joint Use impossible without causing either a degradation in the Marines' ability to train pilots or interruptions to the business of the scheduled airlines. Joint Use of MCAS Miramar given the Marines' training requirements could only occur if the airlines would permit frequent interruptions to scheduled flight operations, and this would be disruptive to the airport and its passengers. Alternately, Joint Use of MCAS Miramar given the needs of a future SDIA could only occur if the Marines' training requirements are subordinate to civilian flight operations, which would severely degrade the military's training mission in preparing pilots for the Global War on Terror. Joint Use of MCAS Miramar would result in an untenable balancing of wholly incompatible needs: the needs of military flight training to ensure the combat readiness of Marine Corps aviators, versus the need to ensure uninterrupted civilian arrivals and departures to maximize airline and airport revenues.
3. Any future SDIA requires a second full-length runway separated by 4,300 feet from the existing runway (the second runway is needed to provide the added capacity for the predicted level of operations in 2030). At MCAS Miramar, a second runway must lie to the north of the existing 11,000+ foot runway (because it cannot be built on the existing

- landfill that lies to the south). A runway 4,300 feet to the north would put it on top of the current military housing at MCAS Miramar and also on top of a section of Miramar Road. In addition, FAA safety regulations would require the elimination of a significant portion of southern Mira Mesa (houses & schools removed, buildings lowered, etc.) in order to provide the required safety and protection zones. Accordingly, there is no suitable location for a second runway at the existing MCAS Miramar (west of I-15).
4. If East Miramar were proposed then the two runways would have to be built on highly topographical lands. The canyons in East Miramar run generally north and south, but due to prevailing winds the runways would have to be built primarily east and west. This would mean the hills would have to be cut down, and the canyons filled in, to produce sufficient flat surface on which to build dual 11,000+ foot runways. In addition to extraordinary cost for all the required earth moving, this would cause massive and irreparable harm to the sensitive and endangered species contained in East Miramar. There could be no possible environmental mitigation to account for the significant elimination of protected habitat due to the amount of largely unimproved land that would be disturbed in such an undertaking.
 5. Base security would be severely compromised by a continuous and unregulated flow of civilian people, vehicles and aircraft onto or in close proximity to the remaining military facility.
 6. Military operations currently are 5-days a week, with limited flights during the weekend, occasional flights at night, and very few flights after midnight. Civilian operations would, by FAA mandate, be 24-hrs per day and 7 days a week.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, based on the above Findings of Fact, the relocation of SDIA operations to MCAS Miramar would result in a disastrous reduction in the Marines' ability to prepare military aviators for combat in defense of United States interests at home and abroad; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, based on the above Findings of Fact, the relocation of SDIA operations to MCAS Miramar would result in significant and seriously disruptive consequences to the community of the University City including: increased noise, increased vehicle traffic, increased pollution, increased incursions into the surrounding protected habitats, and elimination of the community's character as an "Island in the Hills"; and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the above Findings of Fact make Joint Use of MCAS Miramar impractical, infeasible, unwise and completely detrimental to the interests of national security, regional prosperity and the homeowners of University City and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the University Community Planning Group altogether and unreservedly rejects as short-sighted and counterproductive any possible future report by SDCRAA that might propose the MCAS Miramar Joint Use option to the County for a vote in November 2006. This resolution was adopted by the University Community Planning Group during its meeting on December 13, 2005, by unanimous vote.

III.

Mira Mesa Town Council Motion on Joint Use of MCAS Miramar

Adopted January 9, 2006

The Mira Mesa Town Council is opposed to joint use of MCAS Miramar as a civilian airport and is opposed to inclusion of joint use at MCAS Miramar as an option in the Airport Site Selection Program to be presented to the County for a vote in November 2006. Our opposition is based on the fundamental incompatibility of the military and civilian operations at Miramar.

MCAS Miramar is strongly opposed to joint use and has presented the reasons clearly at multiple public meetings. The incompatibilities are severe enough that joint use would likely lead to eventual abandonment of military use of Miramar. The Mira Mesa Town Council supports continued military use of Miramar. We stand together with MCAS Miramar, as well as the other communities surrounding Miramar, to strongly oppose joint military/civilian use of MCAS Miramar.
