

1. I submitted slides, which should be in your packet.
2. This proposed modification is not about safety, or to obey the FAA, but is to enable development of the Airport. Its implications were overwhelmingly rejected at the recent Chatham Town Meeting. Let us look at the issues.
3. **Slide 4** is **slide 3** simplified in order to contrast the 2005 determination activity (a), which involved a small extension to the runway safety area marked in white, with what is being asked for today. In 2005 there was only a small impact on the upper area of the 100ft buffer and none on the 50ft no-disturb zone of the vernal pool.
4. Shown in red is a proposed 400 foot wide approach surface, which the Airport claims has existed for a long time, but **Slide 1** shows that there is no record of this anywhere, so there is no reason to remove trees, which is the stated purpose for this modification, from under a non-existent approach surface.
5. The Airport's **VMP** is proposing to clear cut, an estimated 250 mature trees from around the vernal pool. This is at least an order of magnitude greater than what was specified in 2005, namely "topping", only, of "15-25 trees". This is brand-new, with an order of magnitude increased impact, which is much more than any type of modification. Even this is dwarfed by the continuing plan shown in **Slide 6** to clear cut 61 acres of trees both on and off the Airport.
6. The Commission regulations specify that "other changes within the vernal pool buffer area ...are prohibited without ...mitigation". Any viable mitigation for this massive removal of mature trees, acting as essential canopy to the vernal pool resource area, is obviously impossible and a reason for rejection.
7. Modification request cites 14 CFR PART 77, which applies to the existing visual approach surfaces, but not to the proposed wider surfaces. These are defined under a different set of United States Regulations called Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS), which do not apply to visual approach surfaces. The Commission regulations do not refer to these, so a modification cannot be extended to wider surfaces.
8. The modification request specifies "removing trees that are over the maximum height" and "trees below the maximum allowable

height may not be removed.” This contradicts the VMP, which intends in addition to remove trees within 10ft of the maximum allowable height.

9. The basis for the 2005 hardship exemption, on the need for an extended Runway Safety Area is no longer applicable, so no hardship would ensue to the Airport presently without this exemption. Last month at Town Meeting, with an overwhelming vote against the widening and the implied tree removal, the Citizens of Chatham essentially decided that the modification would be a substantial detriment to the public good. This would disallow a new hardship exemption under the Commission regulations.
10. Tomorrow the Chatham Conservation Commission is also expected to vote against widening the approach. All these are grounds for rejecting the modification.
11. In 2005 the Airport agreed to permanent protection of the 350 foot vernal pool buffer. This modification is a parody of that agreement and the modification should be rejected.
12. Slide 4 shows the existing PART 77 visual approach surface in blue, but as explained in **slide 2**, the FAA has recently raised just this surface to clear the trees by an extra 10 feet.
13. There is a safer alternative to this modification to avoid any tree removal at all: continue using visual approaches and displace the thresholds as outlined in **Slide 7**.
14. The Airport’s application is not a modification of anything. It is a brand new proposal. Any one of the reasons I have presented is sufficient, but together they present an undeniable rationale to reject the proposed modification.
15. Since the rationale no longer exists for granting the original Hardship Exemption, the Commission Regulations appear to require that the proposed modification must be reviewed as a DRI. The Commission has already received a referral from the Chatham Conservation Commission. There are other important issues at the Airport related to the safety of people on the ground, which the consequences of this modification would exacerbate, which should be the subject of the DRI Referral in its entirety.