

### **Five Major Problems with the Environmental Assessment**

-Purpose and need section of the Environmental Assessment (EA) is based on 507 documented flight-plan operations by B-II aircraft, 482 (96%) of which could be conducted at maximum weight and capacity on the existing runway. Thus, of all the operations cited, only 25 actually require runway expansion.

-These B-II aircraft will make up, by optimistic FAA projections, no more than about 1 percent of total ARB volume for the next two decades, which means the airport will remain a small airport that does not require expansion. So the project cannot be justified based on the FAA's own forecasts. Even the claimed interstate commerce by aircraft from ARB is mythical: Only .0039 of all ARB operations are such interstate commerce flights that go beyond Michigan and its border states, an insignificant number

-Audubon Bird Species Observed report (Appendix F) identified no Canada Geese in 2006, 2007, 2008, the most dangerous bird with respect to at least eight new types of jets that would be attracted to a longer runway. And yet we all know this is by far the most populous bird by far in the area. And the most dangerous when jets are around. Ask Sully! Look at the attached photos.

-The Environmental Assessment fails to discuss the impact on the political jurisdiction of Pittsfield Township, in which the airport is wholly located, Ann Arbor and Lodi, and the inherent safety risks to their citizens. While the vague "local objective" of runway overruns is given no more than passing reference in the EA as a cause of safety need at the airport now that our research has debunked the sponsors' initial local argument, nothing is said about the risks to local citizens posed by the larger jet aircraft an extended runway would invite. These aircraft, heavier, with greater fuel capacity, carrying up to 10 passengers, would fly dangerously close to homes. These are not idle fears: Nine people have died from aircraft fatalities from planes flying within three miles of ARB in its traffic pattern within the last 37 years; there has not been a single reported injury on the airport during the corresponding period.

-New, lower-flying jets, Canada geese, and runways closer to homes do not mix well. They invite danger to people. They threaten their life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness -- basic constitutional rights. The EA study ignored all this.

Some bird damage done to jets:



