

Input Recieved on Chapter II Raleigh Jenkins

Even before the start of the SRC Master Planning process, serious questions about the ability of the airport administrators and their consultants to effectively evaluate and address the concerns of the citizenry adversely affected by certain airport operations have been raised, to no apparent avail. The failure of RIAC or their consultants to supply available information deemed necessary by their own sub-committee on Quality of Life to help evaluate the situation is a serious concern. Rudely interrupting or otherwise belittling a citizen-member trying to make a point about a quality of life concern is inexcusable. To attempt now to move forward in an apparent hurry with the planning process without making every attempt to gather all available requisite information or even attempting to apply full reasonable due diligence is viewed by the citizenry as further evidence of the myopic vision of RIAC, Landrum and Brown, and the FAA. According to the feed-back I have received, the SRC process continues to be deemed inadequate by the majority of the citizen representatives.

T.F. Green airport is undoubtedly a benefit to society. But no benefit is worth the price of human suffering. To date, the airport administrators have shown that they do not possess the sensitivity, skills, tools and financial resources to effectively, and in a timely fashion, identify and address the hardships they create in the community. Under these inadequate conditions, a "no growth" option would seem to be the only realistic option.

As the citizens have repeatedly attempted to point out through the formal SRC process, the airport's consultant, Landrum & Brown, has consistently failed to include adequate consideration of knowable negative externalities in their planning process, which continues to have a "canned" flavor. Despite hours of public testimony through which legitimate social concerns have been clearly expressed, the paperwork produced to date is woefully short of detail documenting these valid and critical concerns. "Quality of Life" issues received a mere sentence or two in a mere short paragraph or two in the voluminous work produced by L&B as recently as January 2002. This is in despite of over 6 hours of public testimony from the community which did not include a single "pro-growth" speaker despite being an open meeting.

The biased and slanted nature of the documentation being produced by Landrum and Brown is readily detected throughout the voluminous paperwork given to the SRC to review. The paperwork is most impressive not for what it contains, but for what it ignores and downplays.

As already mentioned, the widespread expressed concerns and alarm of the citizenry is essentially missing from these draft reports. Additionally:

1. The draft E.I.S. report appears to downplay the clear call for reasonable due diligence expressed in Warwick's Comprehensive Plan;
2. The draft E.I.S. report essentially ignores the City of Warwick's expressed opposition to any runway expansion. It also fails to contain the results of the community survey responded to by over 3500 concerned citizens;

3. The draft E.I.S. report fails to include any consideration of Rhode Island's own "big dig" at the intersection of route U.S. 195 and Providence, about to begin and scheduled to take four years to complete, despite the obvious effect that Boston's own "Big Dig" had on Logan. Since the airport currently relies on approximately 75% of its passengers from out of state, and since this is a main artery into Rhode Island from Massachusetts, the apparent failure to study this phenomenon is a major omission within the draft E.I.S. received by the SRC;
4. We have previously questioned where HUD and our federal legislators were in the planning process. The quick answer that they will receive a copy of the finished product is not longer satisfactory. It is blatantly obvious that we could use their housing and urban development expertise in the actual planning process due to the close proximity of the airport to housing.
5. The draft E.I.S. report fails to present a reasonable financial cost analysis approach. Negative externalities are not factored in against the positive effects of the airport's operations. A more realistic study would utilize a balance sheet form of analysis with costs included alongside the benefits. However, since L&B apparently can't figure out how to quantify social costs, they appear incapable of creating a more realistic analysis. The reality is the RIAC faces some potential serious financial liabilities as the airport administrator. The citizens have already notified the RIAC that they are actively attempting to quantify the damages they are experiencing as a result of airport operations, some of which the RIAC has openly encouraged, and apparently continues to encourage through the SRC process, despite reasonable evidence that they could harm innocent citizens and their property. Evidence that the RIAC is aware of these potential negative effects can be gathered from RIAC's own Deed of Easement that they require as a condition for citizens to receive entitled sound insulation paid for by federal funds supplied by the FAA. If the RIAC were unaware of potential costs for damages to people and property, why would they require easements not only for sound, but also for "dust", "fumes" and "particle" damages in the future? The citizens, while short on expertise, do not buy the position that Landrum & Brown, nor the RIAC, are incapable of detecting or computing negative externalities produced by their marketing plan.
6. In addition to HUD and their significant insurance and CDBG interests and concerns, there are other entities that it would appear should have participated, and should still be brought into the SRC process to assist with understanding and to ensure that their "stake" in the airport is completely factored in. The Narragansett Indians have an apparent vested interest in the land around the airport, but I am unaware of any representative on the SRC representing their interests as a forecasting approach is being decided. It would also appear that the historical society, the Department of Environmental Management (DEM) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) would all have something to say in advance of a forecasting model being adopted by the RIAC Board and FAA would affect their interests.
7. While it appears that census numbers have been viewed to determine if there are any minorities that would mandate a closer look at operations, an apparent insufficient number of minorities appears to be taken to mean that careful examination is unnecessary. However, the sheer volume of concerns expressed by the general population affected by T.F. Green ought to be enough to justify a careful and complete examination of the application, or lack thereof, of principles of justice within the community.

Bottom line, even without fair and balanced consideration of the public's legitimate concerns, the submitted paperwork contains enough expressed concerns to justify a "no-growth" position until such time as assurance can be given that the resultant growth will not be disastrous socially, economically or environmentally. Even without any growth, serious questions would remain about existent effects on traffic, air quality, education, wetlands, personal property, private rights and public health.

The almost mantra-like premise put forward by both the RIAC and the FAA that "growth is inevitable" is perhaps the most glaring unfounded statement to date. "What goes up, must come down"; "All that glitters is not gold", "There is a limit to everything", and; "Nothing is certain except for death and taxes", all carry more weight than "Growth is inevitable". For the RIAC's board and the FAA to rush forward at this point with a marketing plan that could result in increased stressors when the existing foundation needs to be carefully examined, would have to be viewed as premature.

T.F. Green Airport is undoubtedly an asset to society. So is gasoline. Both require extreme caution in their handling and containment. Careless or reckless use of an indisputable asset can, in fact, have disastrous effects. T.F. Green Airport has already experienced explosive growth that has not been fully or carefully assessed for collateral damages. It remains unknown whether or not T.F. Green Airport has already grown too large for its densely residential container. Continued carelessly promotion or encouraged growth through a planning process lacking in extreme due diligence under the current circumstances would be just cause for great alarm.

It needs to be clearly documented and understood that citizens intend to go outside the SRC process to seek assistance with our most serious problems. We shall seek out authorities that we consider to possess more balanced viewpoints and greater social awareness and skills. While the airport's administrators claim to have intended to inform HUD about the finished product (20 Year Plan), we have taken steps to begin to bring HUD into the equation now, outside the SRC process, since they have housing, urban planning and quality of life expertise that we believe to be critical to the evaluation and decision-making processes. We are also turning to the Department of Justice and any other resource that we can discover that has more skill at addressing concerns of our nature, caused by the operation of the airport in our neighborhoods. Should the RIAC's Board and the FAA choose to ignore our independent actions and go forward with a model that pre-supposes growth we will have no choice but to oppose that model as unfounded, pre-mature and unreasonably dangerous.