

RE: HB 4092 – This bill is not necessary, there is time to follow the land use process

Chair McLain and Members of House Committee on Transportation Policy:

The solo invitation of Attorney Wendi Kellington testimony before your Committee on HB 4092 on behalf of the proponents on February 12, 2018 produced many inaccurate claims that we shall refute here, while adding a few facts:

- The last Master Plan had its kick-off meeting on November 3, 2009 in Aurora, almost 8 ½ years ago.
- The last two chapters of the Plan were presented at a meeting of the Planning Advisory Committee, of which I was a member, in Aurora on September 15, 2011, 6 ½ years ago. That's a long time ago. Much has changed in that time. There are new stakeholders and new issues requiring further discussion after such a long time.
- The Plan was approved with a recommendation in Chapter 7, Table 7A that a runway extension be installed in 2020. The FAA did not approve the runway extension by way of the Master Plan and to this day has still not approved it.
- That table shows that the land acquisition portion of the extension project is estimated to cost \$2,561,000 of which ODA's share is put at \$128,050. ODA does not "completely depend on the FAA to acquire the money."
- There is absolutely nothing in the Master Plan that would give credence to the statement that by way of that document "Marion County and ODA understood they established compatibility with all requirements, including land use requirements, for the extension."
- ODA is proposing that CenturyWest Engineering conduct a study to see if there are sufficient documented 'constrained operations' at Aurora to justify a runway extension. FAA requires a minimum of 500. From what ODA has told me recently, the FAA is still reviewing the study proposal since receiving it in July 2017. That does not seem to bode well for a speedy resolution as to whether an extension is justified or not. Surely this study must be

completed before residences are moved and money is spent on land acquisition.

- Master Plan Chapter 5, page 5 states that extending the runway to the south “would require the relocation of four residences and agricultural lands amounting to approximately 44.5 acres.” Why would that action be taken prior to the FAA saying a runway extension is justified and giving its approval? Why all this land-use concern prior to knowing if the project is a ‘go’ or not? This is a case of “cart before the horse”.

- In Chapter 7, page 2 of the Master Plan it states “The runway improvement project will require review under the ‘National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).” Later, it notes that “If FAA funding is used, the project would also require review under the federal Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA).” Clearly all these requirements will take time, providing an opportunity for land use approvals to be obtained through the established process.

- At the end of her testimony Ms Killington states there is “a lot of uncertainty” about the project and a lot of “chicken and egg”. There certainly is, given the runway extension has yet to be justified and approved by the FAA.

Surely the conclusion must be that Ms. Killington’s testimony on February 12th contains inaccuracies and erroneous inferences. It does not warrant a change in our opinion that there is plenty of time to go through the proper land use process. Please oppose this bill and concentrate the Committee’s energies on the more important matters before you.

This bill is unnecessary. Developers have time to follow the land use rules and local governments and stakeholders would then be able to participate in discussions about the impacts on local communities, perhaps not considered some 8 years ago.

Tony Holt

President, Charbonneau Country Club (homeowners' association)

Attachments area