

Date: 2021 October 18, 2021

To: Mark McClardy Director, Airports Division, FAA Western Pacific Region
Kevin C. Willis, FAA Director Office of Airport Compliance and Management Analysis

From: Paul Marshall, President, South County Airport Pilots Association
Dan Neal, Co-Owner, San Martin Aviation
Other E16 pilots, see signature pages (E16 100LL Signatures.pdf)

Subject: Protection from Santa Clara County Discriminatory Fueling Actions at E16

On August 17, 2021, Santa Clara County Supervisors received a report on aviation lead emissions impact on child blood lead levels (attached, "Attachment-216891 Lead Study report"). The supervisors directed staff that "...the sales of leaded gas will not be permitted at either County airport after December 31, 2021 except for emergency operations." (attached "2021-08-17 Board of Supervisors - Full Minutes-8842," last line of page 21). We ask your assistance to prevent the great aggravation, operational dislocations, safety impacts and unjust discrimination if 100LL fuel sales are ended Jan 1 2022 at E16.

It should be noted that E16 has only 1 fuel tank, and the county is telling San Martin Aviation it wants to convert that fuel tank from 100LL to 94UL at the beginning of the year. 100LL can be used by all pilots at the airport, but 94UL can only be used by about 60% of the pilots at the airport. So, a conversion to 94UL combined with a prohibition of fueling 100LL would result in approximately 40% of the pilots no longer being able to fuel their planes at the airport.

Eliminating sales of 100LL at county airports will do very little incrementally to reduce the amount of lead emitted into the environment by piston engine aircraft burning 100LL fuel. If 100LL sales are eliminated, pilots will either suffer the operational inconvenience and expense of getting self-fueling permits to all pump their own 100LL gas, or will fly to other airports to get their 100LL gas, resulting in extra arrivals and departures solely for procuring 100LL avgas, which will actually increase the total amount of lead emissions rather than reduce them. A very few pilots may be forced to move away to a different airport where they can fuel before and after operations – such a forced move would not reduce overall 100LL usage but would simply transfer it to another place. Pilots visiting E16 from other airports arrive and depart the airport emitting the same amount of lead even though they did not do any fueling at the airport – in this case the FBO has been harmed by being deprived of revenue, but the lead emissions do not change. Some pilots may refuse to visit the airport, lessening its value in the national system of airports, but effecting a very small percentage of total operations and lead emissions compared with the based aircraft. So, a 100LL fueling ban won't significantly change lead emissions at the airport.

If 100LL sales are ended, significant numbers of E16 pilots will be unjustly discriminated against because they are unable to use unleaded fuel and because the FAA has not yet approved their model of airplane and engine to use UL94. Similarly, this unjust discrimination will financially harm San Martin Aviation through the loss of all its 100LL business from the approximately 40% of the planes which are only FAA-approved to use 100LL – those planes would be forced to refuel at other airports using other FBOs. We believe unjustly discriminating against the FBO and pilots who can't use the unleaded fuel constitutes an inefficient, unfair, and illegal way to change over to unleaded avgas. At a minimum, our pilots will suffer operational inconvenience because they have to plan their fueling to occur at other airports and must

start every trip with less than full tanks – even their long trips. Some pilots crash and die due to fuel exhaustion on long trips, and the county shouldn't create one more cause for this to happen. Pilots visiting E16 from other airports may get into unsafe fuel conditions because they don't realize that 100LL is not available at the airport, where in the past it was always available, and they end up flying home or to an alternate refueling airport with inadequate fuel reserves. So, this action of eliminating 100LL sales has much more discriminatory, punitive, safety-reducing effect than helpful lead-reducing effect.

A better way to handle this transition is to simply

- continue to keep 100LL fuel plentiful, convenient, with timely access to those planes which can't use the 94UL fuel, and
- provide plentiful, convenient, timely access to 94UL fuel for the pilots who can use the fuel.

In this case, most pilots who can use 94UL will immediately change over to 94UL. The remaining few pilots who are uncomfortable with using 94UL fuel will still have the option of fueling with 100LL at other airports, and they will likely become comfortable with and start using unleaded fuel at some point in the not distant future.

We believe the county's lead consultants found a small opportunity to reduce average blood lead levels in children living near Reid Hillview, but inappropriately described this opportunity as a crisis (Attachment-216891 Lead Study report.pdf). Yes, we should try to reduce children's blood lead levels from 1.93 ug/dL to 1.83 ug/dL (0.10 ug/dL improvement) as suggested would occur if aviation lead were eliminated by Zarhan on his lead study report on page 29. And yes, maybe people living downwind of Reid Hillview airport can get an extra 0.12 ug/dL benefit relative to all people (1.94 ug/dL vs 1.82 ug/dL also on page 29). And yes, the traffic data is persuasive to suggest that blood lead levels rise when 100LL air traffic is greatest, and fall when 100LL air traffic falls, and that also points to 100LL elimination representing an opportunity to reduce blood lead levels. But if just 11% of the problem $((0.10 + 0.12)/1.94)$ is attributable to lead, that means that 89% of the blood lead problem has nothing to do at all with aviation lead. Aviation lead is not a crisis. Aviation lead merely represents a small opportunity to improve our pollution profile for one of hundreds of pollutants in one small way. Yes, the county should take gradual, effective steps to eventually eliminate all lead in county avgas. No, this is not a crisis, just one small opportunity for improvement. The county and its pilots should make this improvement in a legal way which does not unjustly discriminate against pilots by causing operational dislocation, aggravation and safety hazards. The county should not pursue its present course which will cause all these problems while failing to materially change aviation lead emissions.

We request that you help prevent these problems by communicating to Santa Clara County that they must continue to make 100LL readily and conveniently available to all planes at E16 which are only FAA-approved to use 100LL.

In our view, the proper way to facilitate a smooth, timely change from leaded to unleaded fuels would be to procure another self-serve fuel island and fuel truck at E16. Two fuel islands and trucks would allow both unleaded and leaded fuels to be pumped while the fleet undergoes the change from leaded to unleaded. In the long term, once only unleaded avgas is used, the second fuel island could be

repurposed to JetA. We have communicated this view to the county since February of 2021, but to date the county has taken no action to approve or procure this additional facility, and instead has chosen the discriminatory path of attempting to outlaw all 100LL sales.

We urgently look forward to your support on this issue, and would appreciate you taking the appropriate action well before Jan 1, 2022. Thank you.

