



421 Aviation Way
Frederick, Maryland 21701

T. 301-695-2000
F. 301-695-2375

www.aopa.org

December 4, 2008

County of San Mateo, Planning and Building Department
Attn: Camille Leung, Planner
455 County Center, 2nd Floor
Redwood City, CA 94063

Re: Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Big Wave Wellness Center and Office Park

Dear Ms. Leung:

The Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) represents the general aviation interests of 415,000 members, more than two-thirds of the nation's pilots – including 49,809 of our members in the state of California. On behalf of our membership, AOPA is committed to ensuring the future viability and development of general aviation airports and their facilities as part of a national transportation system. In that regard, we appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Big Wave Wellness Center and Office Park, proposed for a site adjacent to the Half Moon Bay Airport (HAF).

AOPA is opposed to this development because such a project would be an incompatible land use adjacent to an airport. The EIR must look at the impact of this project on the airport's current and future operations and mitigation should not penalize the airport. Rather, a more compatible use should be sought for the property. As the airport sponsor, the County has the obligation to ensure compatible land uses around the airport under both the quit claim deed from the Federal government and the receipt of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) airport improvement funds.

The proposed site location is located within several airport safety zones for runway 30 that should preclude residential development. The first safety zone that impacts the project area is comprised of the FAA mandated runway protection zone which is a trapezoid shape extending from 200 feet east of the displaced threshold on Runway 30 out 1000 feet with a base width of 500 feet widening to a width of 1000 feet. The 2002 *California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook* prohibits any dwelling units within that zone.

In addition, the Approach Protection Zone overlies a portion of the property, and the state of California recommends limiting development to one dwelling unit per 10 to 20 acres. This precludes placing any of the proposed 45 residential units in this area.

The majority of the property is within the traffic pattern zone, which allows residential uses but discourages schools, day care centers and nursing homes. Despite the allowance for residential use within this zone, AOPA contends residential uses adjacent to the airport are incompatible and should not be permitted. The County should identify a more compatible land use for this property.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to share comments and look forward to reviewing the EIR in the future.

Sincerely,

John L. Collins
Manager
Airport Policy