

## Carol DeSoto

---

**From:** Bonnie Bick <bonniebick@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 8, 2024 12:31 PM  
**To:** Carol DeSoto  
**Subject:** For the Record ❁❁Charles County Aviation Business Park❁❁

**[External Content Warning] This message is from an external sender. Please exercise caution when opening attachments and hover over any links before clicking.**

For the Aviation Business Park record.

Commissioners: Please do not continue supporting changing the zoning and removing the Watershed Conservation District from the 558 acres around Maryland Airport.

Lead exhaust, as per health studies, is detrimental to the health of children. The impact has been studied in other airport areas and should also be studied as an environmental justice issue in Charles County. This airport uses piston engine aircraft, which burn leaded gas. The proposed airport expansion would mean increased air traffic which would have increased negative impacts on community health and quality of life. There is no economic study in support of this rezoning. Two county studies recommend against taxpayer subsidies for industrial zoning in this area. The most recipient study, the RKG study that supported subsidizing the 50 acres, is not available for review.

Charles County is proposing to remove the Environmental Protections on critical areas of Mattawoman Creek. The County Commissioners are on the cusp of changing the zoning in a large, extremely high-value environmentally sensitive forested stream valley, above the mainstem of Mattawoman Creek and located above two DNR-identified flood zones. The county proposes to remove the Watershed Conservation District (WCD) which permits 8% impervious with industrial zoning that allows 70% impervious. Due to the predictably disastrous Mattawoman Creek impacts of this proposal, the decision needs scholarly study before it is decided.

We request Charles County delay the airport decision until assistance from the state can be obtained and an updated study of the % of impervious surface in the watershed is determined.

1) Lead exhaust, as per health studies, is detrimental to the health of children. The impact should also be studied in Charles County. This airport uses piston engine aircraft, which burn leaded gas. The proposed airport expansion would mean increased air traffic which would have increased negative impacts on community health and quality of life. That is what happens when you have a great increase in noise carbon monoxide and other toxic exhaust components, including lead. Even those who do not live close to the airport should consider the increased risk of asthma, cancer, respiratory and heart problems that would be borne by those closer to it. These life-threatening conditions will disproportionately affect young children and the elderly in our community. To make matters worse, JC Parks Elementary School and Matthew Henson Middle School are located less than half a mile away from the airport and experience airplane flyovers.

2) The rezoning will change the size of the airport from 215 acres to 400+ acres to more than 763 acres of airport and business park if the Watershed Conservation District and its environmental protections are removed.

3) Is the purpose of the rezoning of the 558 acres really to permit employment or is it a means of subsidizing private development? (as was the Tech Park) The airport's current 215-acre has had two large parcels zoned BP (business park) - for 20 years - with no business activity to date. Those two BP parcels would easily support employment-supporting development - the rezoning should be delayed to see if more industrial and business zoning is needed.

4) Charles County is not providing adequate public information on its proposed airport expansion rezoning and business park: The PSM airport owner has never presented any information to the citizens of Charles County. The Board Docs public documents archive has been discontinued. The relevant documents: Airport Master Plan which lists CC's fiscal responsibilities - The RKG economic study of the 50 acres and past information on the airport is no longer available to assist citizens in making informed decisions.

**I do not support the airport rezoning - see - Maryland Department of Planning notes:**

Much of the land area proposed for the change in land use is identified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) as a Targeted Ecological Area, defined as “lands and watersheds of high ecological value that have been identified as conservation priorities.” Portions of the area are also within protected easements. Further, it appears that the property is also located within the county’s Priority Preservation Area (PPA), which preserves agricultural lands. Therefore, the proposed plan amendments may have a significant impact on Charles County’s resource conservation/water quality protection efforts.

**MDP Comments:**

There is no question that the expanded airport land use would require increased amounts of impervious surface for a larger runway, new taxiways, larger hangers and aprons, parking, industrial park roofs parking lots, roads, etc. In addition to generating more stormwater runoff, airports require chemicals for clearing runways, de-icing and servicing planes, firefighting, etc., not to mention increased road salting for complementary development.

