

Hi, Gail.

By now you should probably have received not only my original correspondence requesting an extension of the SRC process and corresponding delay of the FAA EIS, but also my response to Mr. Cheston's speedy rejection of this suggestion.

Hopefully, the entire SRC can discuss this in more detail on Thursday in a more reasonable and creative fashion.

It is looking more and more probable, however, that the citizens will need to turn to the Inspector Generals of both FAA and HUD to get outside assistance with this process and our environmental and housing concerns. While you may actually be personally sympathetic and capable of empathy and willing to listen, it is now reasonably clear that RIAC's Executive Director lacks this capacity.

We know that the FAA Advisory is dated, but we have been informed that it is still the one in effect until a new one is produced and that the new one will not be less restrictive. We therefore reasonably expect it to be followed to the letter as much as possible. This does not appear to be the case.

There is a mountain of environmental concerns that need to be openly and critically evaluated and addressed before any proposal for expansion ought to come out of any master planning process for T.F. Green. In fact, it is reasonable to assume that a master plan could be performed solely to address critical environmental problems and that the solution of these problems, and not airport expansion, could be the legitimate focus of that subsequent EIS. The citizens deserve this at a minimum.

Should RIAC try to by-pass this process of open, complete and honest planning, the Regional Office of FAA should step in and demand that they not push their plans forward without proper due diligence. Proper due diligence regarding the situations faced by the airport-affected citizens has simply not been performed at T.F. Green to date, despite Mr. Cheston's protestations. The increased operation of planes in the heart of a residential land use area has caused untallied hardships. FAA's own measurements of DNL touch but the tip of the iceberg. FAA should not allow RIAC to ignore those hardships below the level subsidized by FAA as RIAC has effectively done over the past many years. This fact alone should be enough to call for a master plan with environmental problems as its focus.

In my opinion, FAA should not allow even the consideration of expansion until all those identified as experiencing hardship at current levels of operation according to FAA's own standards have been adequately protected in a timely fashion. This is simply not happening. People are still living within 350 feet of idling jet engines, and not scheduled for purchase until sometime in 2004, if RIAC can find the money. RIAC has announced it is purchasing a mere 10 -12% of the homes already identified as living in hardship severe enough for the federal government to pay for their removal out of harm's way. What of the other 90% of the people living under such severe conditions? Doesn't RIAC have the funds to protect the citizenry? Should FAA be supporting an airport manager's plans for growth when it apparently cannot

fiscally manage to protect those clearly adversely affected by their operations to the point of hardship? The environmental situation at T.F. Green is totally unacceptable. The FAA Regional Office has been eerily silent on these matters.

We should not have to involve U.S. Senators to uncover truth. FAA must know of the suffering and hardships created by T.F. Green's operations. They have already been defined to a limited but serious degree according to FAA's own standards in defining those eligible for soundproofing and buyout. The environmental concerns are documented in pages upon pages of public testimony. Has FAA read, evaluated and acted on this testimony? RIAC is now apparently agreeing to hold more public testimony sessions. Don't they have enough already? Regional FAA representatives were present and received the written statements of RIAC's executive director about the overly restrictive deed easements and did nothing to correct the statements or the situation. Where was the reasonable outrage from the FAA officials on hand when the airport operator was making such wild claims?

Can the Regional FAA office expect the citizens to trust them when they will not even step in to lay the law down on something so outrageous?

Hopefully, we can once again begin to attempt to establish meaningful dialogue on Thursday to begin to address these fundamental concerns. The thought of prematurely terminating the SRC process under these current conditions is justifiably a cause for alarm.

Sincerely,

Raleigh