

**T. F. Green Airport**

**Feedback to the SRC on Input Received**

**May 22, 2002**

The Rhode Island Airport Corporation (RIAC) received various comments and questions from Study Resource Committee (SRC) members on the Master Plan chapters and the SRC process. Mr. Robert Lamoureux sent a letter to Suzanne Orenstein on April 30, 2002 with specific questions on the Master Plan chapters; feedback is provided to these comments below. Three SRC members read statements at the April 25, 2002 SRC meeting and a few of the specific points from these statements are addressed below.

In addition, Mary Soderstrum received letters from Mr. Peter Scotti and Mr. Gerald Flynn (both dated April 22, 2002, Mr. Flynn’s letter was read at the April 25<sup>th</sup> meeting); Ms. Soderstrum responded directly to these letters on April 30, 2002 and SRC members received a copy of the letter.

**Input on Master Plan chapters from Mr. Robert Lamoureux:**

<b>Summary of Input</b>	<b>Feedback</b>
Page 67 of Chapter III – requirements for the fuel farm: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Has RIAC made any plans to correct the three-day reserve deficit?</li><li>• Considering the proposed increase of 18 additional gates and doubling the size of the terminal, will there be any land available for increasing the capacity of the fuel farm safely?</li></ul>	These questions will be addressed in the alternatives analysis. It is in this portion of the Master Plan where the consultants will evaluate what would need to, and could be, done to meet the requirements identified in Chapter III, including how to provide the three-day reserve and evaluating if the current fuel farm can accommodate the required expansion or if another site is needed.

Summary of Input	Feedback
<p>Page 67 of Chapter III – requirements for the fuel farm:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the solution is to rely on more 9,400-gallon trucks arriving daily, has the safety of the surrounding roads been considered? We have already experienced a fuel spill under a Route 37 overpass. Fortunately no one was injured, but the overpass was nearly destroyed.</li> </ul>	<p>The solution has not yet been determined. The transport of fuel using the highway system in Rhode Island would be required to follow any applicable Federal, state, or local guidelines to ensure safety.</p>
<p>Chapter II, Table II.4-4, Augmented Market Share forecast:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why did the forecast of international passengers increase in the February 22, 2002 report over the September 10, 2001 report?</li> </ul>	<p>Below is a summary of the answer to this question that was provided to Mr. Lamoureux via telephone:</p> <p>The Augmented Market Share scenario assumes that T. F. Green captures an increased share of the Boston Logan international charter activity to the Caribbean and Mexico. International charter activity at Boston was forecast through 2020 and a portion of that traffic was allocated to T. F. Green.</p> <p>At the time of the September 10, 2001 draft forecasts, data on Boston’s international charter activity was only available through September 30, 2000; therefore, a one-year period ending September 30, 2000 was used as the base for future projections (the number of Boston passengers traveling to and from the Caribbean and Mexico for this period was 355,502). When the forecasts were updated in February, new data was available from DOT for the entire 2000 calendar year. This data showed an increase in charter traffic to the Caribbean and Mexico – to 561,481 annual passengers (a difference of 205,979). It is not uncommon for charter activity to fluctuate this much as carriers initiate new service or discontinue service.</p> <p>The same growth rates that were used in the September draft forecasts (just over four percent from 2005-2010 and just under four percent from 2010-2020) were applied to this new base in the revised forecasts, yielding different forecasts.</p>

**Summary of specific points in statements read and distributed at the April 25, 2002 SRC meeting by Raleigh Jenkins and by the community members returning to active involvement:**

Summary of Input	Feedback
<p>The SRC process should be indefinitely suspended until a more thorough assessment of the negative effects of the airport's operations can be performed.</p>	<p>RIAC already put the Master Plan study on hold after September 11 and slowed the study schedule to allow for additional meetings in response to requests by the SRC. RIAC plans to continue the planning process in order to plan appropriately for the future and to obtain input from the users and neighbors of the airport. The planning process will culminate in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which will assess the impacts of the airport on the environment and community.</p>
<p>Why has RIAC allowed the crosswind runway to be out of compliance with FAA design standards while at the same time ignoring Warwick's concerns and tripling the size of the old terminal with FAA approval?</p>	<p>Most airports were constructed before the current design standards were developed and as a result; do not meet all of the current standards. In fact, as stated in Chapter II, Section II.5.2, only 58 percent of the runways at Part 139 commercial service airports meet current RSA design standards. It is usually not possible for these airports to upgrade runways when design standards change because of the constraint that caused the non-standard condition. The FAA therefore requires that airports meet standards if significant improvements are made to the runway (such as an extension or restoring the 20-year life to the pavement) and for new runway construction. The Runway 16-34 safety area only recently became an issue that needs to be addressed because its pavement is nearing the end of its useful life and it needs to be reconstructed, which is considered a significant improvement requiring improvement of the safety area.</p>

Summary of Input	Feedback
<p>The American Lung Association rated Warwick air quality with an “F.” This is a lower rating than Providence or Pawtucket received.</p>	<p>The ALA <i>State of the Air in Rhode Island</i> 2002 report did not evaluate Warwick, Cranston, or Providence individually; rather, it evaluated Kent, Providence, and Washington <i>counties</i>. Kent and Washington counties received an F while Providence county received a D rating. There are many factors that contribute to air quality including the type and level of industry and transportation and whether an area is mainly rural or urban. T. F. Green Airport is located in Kent county and I-95 and the train system runs through Kent and Washington counties. The bulk of Providence County is rural and well away from the transportation corridors, which may contribute to its higher rating. Air quality is an important issue and the EIS will study it in relation to the proposed project and the alternatives.</p>
<p>Some of the citizens of Warwick who have been identified by FAA’s own standards as experiencing hardship today must wait up to 15 years for relief.</p>	<p>To clarify, residents who have been previously identified as being within the noise contour do not have to wait 15 years from now. See page 1 of the April 25, 2002 meeting summary and Mary Soderstrum’s April 30, 2002 letter to Gerald Flynn for further clarification on the status of sound insulation and acquisition programs.</p>
<p>Why should the FAA allow the airport to spend even \$1 of federal taxpayer money on planning before they meet their social responsibilities?</p>	<p>Federal taxpayer money is not used to fund planning studies or airport improvements. The Master Plan and EIS are being funded through RIAC-floated bonds and planning grants from the FAA (which are funded solely from aviation user fees, not tax payers).</p>

Summary of Input	Feedback
<p>We are under no illusions that RIAC will consider genuine community input since RIAC has refused to address the fundamental issues of quality of life and the community's capacity to support the airport. We feel the planning process is flawed by its lack of objectivity, and especially by its refusal to really examine the troubling issues we have raised.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SRC is to review the data prepared by the consultants, to comment on that data, to disseminate the information to others, and to bring ideas and concerns back to the committee. Input from the SRC has already been used to adjust the "typical" master planning process – for example, the SRC defined the forecast scenarios, including the consideration of options to limit growth.</p> <p>The final decisions related to the Master Plan belong to the Board of Directors of RIAC. To date, the input received has been of considerable interest to the Board and they are listening keenly to the comments and input from the SRC. As evidence of this, RIAC is seriously considering "compromise" concepts that do not meet the full 20-year requirements.</p>
<p>RIAC has delayed funding for community health studies, refused funding for real estate impact studies, while spending money lobbying to strip local communities of power in controlling development within their own borders.</p>	<p>RIAC is pursuing the wetlands legislation for two reasons, safety and noise. Upgrading the crosswind runway to meet FAA safety standards and possibly extending that runway to provide noise benefits are both high priorities for the RIAC Board. Since any option requires some wetland impact, we are pursuing the legislation to keep from being blocked from doing anything.</p>
<p>RIAC pretends that all things must be bent to the will of increasing market demand for air travel, while at the same time working and spending money to capture an increasing share of that market from Boston.</p>	<p>RIAC has a very small marketing budget compared to other similar airports. The corporation does not attempt to aggressively market new service or change its role in the region. RIAC chose not to adopt a forecast that would have required a change in this policy (the Augmented Market Share scenario).</p>
<p>RIAC has refused to sit down and negotiate over the boundaries of this business with the political leaders of our towns.</p>	<p>Mike Cheston and Mary Soderstrum are planning to meet with Mayor Avedisian and the Warwick city planners in early June.</p>