

Carol DeSoto

From: Bonnie Bick <bonniebick@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 8, 2024 10:45 AM
To: Carol DeSoto
Subject: For the Record Aviation Business Park - disapproval
Attachments: Map airport and industrial zoning 240316 (4).jpg; airport comments 2020.11.16.docx; Airport Expansion is a transfer of wealth to a privileged few from the taxpayer (1) (8) (2).docx; Maryland Airport Land Use Study draft 4-15-15, PC Work Session of 9-14-15 (1).pdf; Airport - Tech Park Market Study (2) (1) (1).pdf; highlighted - MWS comments MD Airport Land Use Study 2 (2) (13) (3) (3) (10) (1).docx; Airport Expansion is a transfer of wealth to a privileged few from the taxpayer (1) (8) (2) (1) (1).docx; EPA 2014 comments Maryland Airport SEA CC 10 30 14 (3) (1) (1).pdf; Map showing property owned by relations of CC commissioner and Facchina (12) (1).pdf

[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 Record Aviation Business Park - disapproval

The promoted assumption in Charles County government:

the **private airport expansion will spur business in western Charles County.**

(western charles county, all they have is biodiversity, protected and unprotected forests, Mattawoman Creek wetlands - and the National Marine Sanctuary.)

MD Airport is the ONLY privately owned, FAA Reliever Airport in the Greater Washington Region. (up to Frederick MD and down to Fredericksburg VA.-including seven other Reliever Airports - all publicly owned.) We don't know the process of the designation of a Reliever Airport - do you know wif public participation is necessary?

STUDY # 1 This new Industrial Market Analysis by RKG [Industrial Market Analysis](#)

- * was quickly done at the request of the Planning Commission they needed it before they made their decision to proceed to remove the Watershed Conservation District, environmental protection. 4-3 vote.
- * introduced new information to the Planning Commission decision-makers on the day of the PC Work Session vote - no ability of the public to participate or comment on the RKG study -
- * staff promised PC that the RKG report would include and address *all of their issues*, including the health, safety, and lead pollution issues, the schools, environmental justice, and environmental issues (this didn't happen - instead they used the 2003 federal FAA FONSI to answer all of the PC questions, about the schools and lead - the staff said these things were studied, in the Environmental Assesment and the federal decision was that there was "no significant impact"- but those issues were not studied!)
- * of the 558 acres that were the subject of removal of the Watershed Conservation District only 50 acres of the 558 acres were analyzed in the RKG study. (Facchina was the big (Private) winner of the failed Public-Private Tech Park - and by the way, he has 55 acres in the 558 acres - his land is the furthest out acreage- extension far off on 227 - off into forested leapfrog development business parkland, that will need infrastructure and a new "Priority 'funding Area." I'm sure he appreciates the county extending sewer out there they just love doing it for him. The sewer was projected to cost 8 million dollars in 2015. E Patterson letter.)
- * The (4) PC members who were already cheerleaders for the airport expansion needed an economic study, something to point to that would override the issues that were a problem and discussed at the public hearing. CC points to the RKG study to override the recommendations of the two earlier studies that studied the entire proposed

558-acre rezoning area, not just the 50 acres. Both of those studies are recommended against county airport investment.

STUDY # 2 attachment) Maryland Airport Land Use Study 2015

STUDY # 3 attachment) Airport Tech Park Market Study 2014

AGAIN:

After the public record the Watershed Conservation District removal of the 558 acres for the airport hearing, was closed. RKG study was introduced. The introduction of new material to the Planning Commission after the public hearing should negate the value of the study since the public did not have the chance to read and comment on the new study, the public record was closed before the study was released. (now it is removed in Board Docs!)

The Planning Commission was promised that all of their questions would be covered in this new RKG study, including environmental justice and environmental issues. But of the 558 acres that were the subject of removal of the Watershed Conservation District only 50 acres were analyzed in the RKG study. (the 50 acres that were originally part of Chapman Forest, then the catalyst for the Indian Head Science and Technology Park - CC sold it the Tech Park for one dollar! When the Tech Park failed part of the Pomonkey Forest easement - till Ex-senator Mac Middleton stepped in moved the 50 acres away from being an asset for the people to an asset as part of the proposed airport expansion. their goal is to punch a direct county highway connection \$\$\$ between the airport and Indian Head Highway. This highway would have to go directly through the Pomonkey Forest, the site of the failed Tech Park. - which would mean removing the county easement and destroying a wetland of special state concern. - This plan is "out there" but not officially on the table.)

The (4) PC members who were already cheerleaders for the airport expansion needed something to point to that would override the issues that were a problem. The first two studies, (attached) gave no support for investing county money in the airport expansion or industrial within a 15-mile radius.

(staff memo to PC: " Based on the RKG market analysis and increased interest expressed by various companies, it would appear there is increased demand for land around the airport for development of airport-supporting uses. To rezone the properties to allow such development, the county is proposing this Comprehensive Plan Amendment to make the land use consistent with the future zoning "changes".

Aviation District Tax Map
Industrial Market Analysis
MD Airport CPA Memo to the Planning Commission

A) map

B) RKG study

C) MD Airport CPA memo to the PC - MD Airport CPA memo to the Planning Commission...the second page of this memo is under the subject -

READ: Health Impact and Environmental Assessment and / Mattawoman Impervious Surface.

Economic Development.

in the memo, under **Justification for Business Plan** - this quote,

"The analysis finds that demand for industrial land has increased since the 2015 Airport Land Use Study further concludes that the lands around the airport could **capture more than half** of the projected 117,100 square feet to 175,600 square feet of annualized absorption of industrial development in Charles County."

At the PC Work Session for the Planning Commission, when they voted 4-3 in favor of the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan - the staff said, of the RKG study - **the airport could capture most of the 117 K - 175 K sq feet -exact quote!** The tape was reviewed over and over to be sure to catch the word - **most.**

Here are a few words about the attachments all on the economics of the airport expansion:

attachment # 1) airport comments - some rough thoughts on wasting taxpayer dollars on an unnecessary airport from a CPA - written by a CPA for her testimony on

the airport - a friend, I included it because it is like a rough draft for the economics of the airport.

attachment # 2) Bonnie Bick's review of the videotape of the Consultants(the county took the link down - but I just tried it again and IT OPENS but it is now labeled Airport Hearing - but it is actually the consultant making a public presentation about their **2015 Maryland Airport Land Use Study** presentation to the public (about 200 mostly "our" people attended) where ERM consultants said - don't invest taxpayer \$\$ no need or demand...not an economic engine... (MD airport Land Use Study - is in draft form...when the politicians saw the conclusions, of the Draft study - they never paid to have the study finalized.)But it was really something to watch how regretfully the consultant who had worked for the county for years and years hated to tell them what they didn't want to hear. We never saw ERM consultants in Charles County again.

attachment # 3) this MWS comment letter makes good points from the same economic **ERM 2015 study**. good review... by Jim Long. I just re-read it - there are a lot of timed-out issues - but **I highlighted the parts that are good for you to read.**

The Bryans Road issue that Jim mentions - Bryans Road Town Center **was** changed to a Mixed-Use Village in 2016 - but the county never has changed the zoning. ugg! **AND NOW THE COUNTY IS IN THE PROCESS OF DOING A NEW BRYANS ROAD SUBAREA PLAN - where the consultant is promoting lots of growth.**

attachment #4) MD airport Land Use Study - draft - it is in draft form because the REM was immediately fired for not coming up with the desired outcome - the needed outcome which was - to invest county \$\$ for infrastructure.

attachment# 5) Tech Park Study - done in 2014 - **no need for any new industrial or business zoning within a 15-mile radius.**

then there is the high value now and ever-increasing in value of the ecosystem services- [https://dnr.maryland.gov/ccs/Documents/Charles Co Ecosystem Service Report Final.pdf](https://dnr.maryland.gov/ccs/Documents/Charles_Co_Ecosystem_Service_Report_Final.pdf)

attachment# 6 - **Blue Line** - this is a map of the area around the airport. the blue line is drawn to show that land that is owned by the airport (everything to the left of the blue line - but not the two extra parcels up and to the left. - the lower one of those is the 50 acres that were first part of Chapman Forest, then Tech Park, then part of Pomonkey Forest.)- so the airport is 215 acres now and with the removal of the Watershed Conservation District on the 558 acres - the land owned by PSM and when it is unencumbered with the WCD environmental protection is now over 400 acres. It is possible that the county made a deal with the LLC, before the property was purchased, promising that they would remove the WCD. (someone did a Freedom of Information request - but the county responded that everything is public on board docs - but this "promised agreement" would not be public because it would be illegal. Now CC has removed Board Docs entirely-document retrieval has become impossible!

[Event Marks Kickoff Of Airport Expansion](#)

wp

The Washington Post

<https://www.washingtonpost.com> › local › 2009/06/07

Federal, state and **Charles County** leaders broke ground Friday on a \$30 million expansion of the privately owned Maryland **Airport** near Pomonkey, ...

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maryland_Airport Here dated 2021 - they say the airport is 377 acres. For the 12-month period ending September 13, 2023, the airport had 22,050 aircraft operations, an average of 60 per day: 98% [general aviation](#), 2% military and <1% [air taxi](#).^[1]

The counties

perspective: <https://www.meetcharlescounty.com/blog/2021/07/20/default/maryland-airport-fact-or-fiction/>

The same words as Myths versus facts. county greenwash- and misinformation.