

APPENDIX I

LETTER FROM THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION (FAA),
DATED JULY 8, 2010.



U.S. Department
of Transportation
**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Western-Pacific Region
Airports Division

P. O. Box 92007
Los Angeles, CA 90009-2007

San Mateo County Airports

July 8, 2010

JUL 12 2010

RECEIVED

Mark Larson
Airport Manager
Half Moon Bay Airport
620 Airport Drive
San Carlos, CA 94070

Dear Mr. Larson:

Half Moon Bay Airport Planned Wellness Center

We are providing comments regarding the proposal to construct a Big Wave Wellness Center (Center) next to Half Moon Bay Airport (HAF). Based on the information available to us, the Center will be built approximately 500 feet west of runway 30. The presence of a center for the developmentally disabled that is so close to the runway represents a use that is not compatible with normal airport operations. Therefore, it is our determination that the selected site is not appropriate. An alternative site outside HAF's influence area should be used for the Center.

San Mateo County is reminded of the requirements of Assurance 21, *Compatible Land Use*. Airport sponsors are required to take appropriate action to restrict the use of land adjacent to the airport to activities that are compatible with normal airport operations. Clearly, a clinical residential center serving disabled patients would not be considered a compatible use so close to the airport and its runway.

Even if the center is not inside the noise contours of HAF, aircraft operations will have some disturbing impact on the Center. Its occupants will surely be aware of normal airport operations because aircraft over-flight noise will occur. The duration and intensity of the noise, even if it is intermittent, will likely be deemed to be an undesirable nuisance by occupants and residents of the center.

From a practical perspective, the consequences of incompatible land uses should not be taken lightly. The airport's neighbors will surely complain about airport noise. Incompatible land uses such as the Center will eventually provoke persistent criticism related to noise, safety, and emissions.


Once incompatible land uses are established, it is the airport that is expected to undertake remedial action to mitigate the offending irritants. For example, the San Mateo County General Plan was formulated to "promote and protect the public health, safety, peace, morals, comfort, convenience and general welfare." Additionally, the "Airport Land Use Plan includes policies, standards, and criteria to address each of these issues to assist local agencies to achieve land use compatibility with existing and future airport development and operations."

Yet, because of incompatible land uses in the vicinity of HAF, “the County has implemented noise abatement procedures at HAF to further reduce aircraft noise impacts in the surrounding noise sensitive areas.”

The above example discloses the land-use incompatibility shortcoming related to the proposed location of the Wellness Center. The planning and environmental documents proffer that there will not be any negative environmental impacts related to the proximity of the Center to the airport. However, experience actually reveals that the opposite is true. Inevitably, the Center’s users will complain about the airport. The unfortunate public policy reaction to the complaints will inevitably be proposals to impose additional restrictions on normal airport operations. Historically, case after case shows that incompatible land use becomes a quality of life issue for the airport’s neighbors and, thereafter, a losing proposition for the airport.

For these reasons, we must express our objection to the proposed site of the Wellness Center. If you have any questions, please call me at 310-725-3634.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tony Garcia", with a large, stylized flourish above the name.

Tony Garcia

Airports Compliance Program Manager/
Safety-Certification Inspector