

Written Testimony for the Montgomery County Council
Regarding Bill Number 24-23
Reinstate the Airpark Advisory Committee
Lead Sponsor – Dawn Ludtke
Co-Sponsor- Council President Glass

I'm writing today as a 25-year resident of East Village, a community of Montgomery Village, approximately 2.2 miles from the Airpark. Before 2018, there was virtually no plane traffic over our home and we only heard or saw aircraft when driving toward the airpark or when my family visited one of the local businesses much closer to the Airpark. Since that time, flight paths have evolved to be directly over our home; and flights, especially those that are touch-and-go's, have increased dramatically. It is all day- and night- long. Many flights are quite low, loud, and have decreased the pleasure I received from gardening and enjoying our neighborhood. Additionally, we understand most planes use leaded gas and we can't help but wonder if we should be eating the vegetables we are growing. More recently, there is also jet traffic- and we seem to be more in the flight plan of our larger commercial airports. When walking the dog at night, it's not unusual to be able to see the lights from 5-6 planes in the sky- as well as hear some. I'm awakened by the noise of aircraft in the middle of many nights as well as before dawn.

I support the establishment of this community committee to assist in influencing reasonable adjustments in the operation of the Airpark.

Reasons establishing the Airpark Advisory Committee Is Needed

- Although the Airpark has held several community sessions over the past 1 ½ years, there have been no favorable results in response to community comments and requests; continued expansions do not reflect community impacts or desires
- Continued growth of the number of flights per day
- No apparent regulation of the time of day of flights. Flights are basically 24-7; a small airpark should have community friendly hours
- Increased number of training companies, several offering deals for 1-day training and flight
- The pollutants generated by the Airpark are out of alignment with the progress being made through the County Climate Action Plan initiatives through county transportation (green hydrogen microgrid/buses). Is the Airpark's non-inclusion a recognition the Airpark is a polluting entertainment for a few and not needed transportation most citizens will use?

Slight Amendments Suggested Regarding Membership

Because the stated purpose is to "advise the County Executive, County Council, and the Revenue Authority regarding the community impacts of Montgomery County Airpark operations," I recommend at least 80% of the members be from the various communities near the Airpark affected by the noise and pollution rather than the current 50%. First, there are numerous communities within Montgomery Village, within East Village probably being the most affected by the Airpark. It seems reasonable to specify East Village and several of the other most affected. Secondly, I question the inclusion of a representative from the Montgomery County Economic Development Corporation (whose mission is growth) as well as two business owners from "the county" (too broad; I could see if they were located within a mile of the

Airpark). Finally, I don't clearly see how a flying school representative could represent "the community impacts," though one could be useful as a non-voting member.

Thank you for your consideration of my thoughts and support of this bill.

Barbara Fischer