
From: David Faile
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 11:37 AM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Subject: Public Comments For May 5, 2020 Airport Commission Meeting

AIRPORT COMMISSION MEETING COMMENTS

May 5 2020

Agenda Item # 6

The Sikorsky Memorial Airport FAA sponsored Airport Master Plan is a document designed to forecast the future needs of the Airport. Airport user input and public input are a critical part of the Airport Master Plan process. It is imperative that the users and public, especially the residents of Stratford have an open and face to face public meeting preceded by ample time to review and understand possible impacts on both Airport users and the residents of Stratford. Any attempt to complete the Airport Master Plan without acceptable user and community public input leaves a cloud of suspicion over the Airport.

Agenda Item # 7

Airport Minimum Standards need to be reviewed and have input from all users of the Airport. While the two Airport Fixed Base Operators are an important part of the Airport, the users and smaller General Aviation aircraft owners and operators must be included in a presentation of how minimum standards will impact them and be allowed to have input and comment on the presentation. Seeing the document on the Airport web site does not qualify as acceptable opportunity to be part of the process.

David Faile, M-CFI, A&P
Friends Of Sikorsky Airport

From: Paul Lange <pal@lopal.com>
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 3:42 PM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Subject: Comments for May 5, 2020 BDR Airport Commission meeting

Dear Ms. Muoio:

As you know, the undersigned is the principal of N759ZD, LLC, which owns a north ramp T Hangar and stores a general aviation aircraft that is integral to the operation of my law firm. I submit these comments and questions addressed to the Tuesday, May 5, 2020 Airport Commission Meeting agenda.

Item 6 is identified as “Approval of Airport Master Plan Draft Recommended Plan Concepts”. It is unclear to me exactly what that means, having reviewed the “Airport Master Plan Draft Recommended Plan” and the latest “Airport Master Plan Draft Working Paper 3”, both released on Saturday afternoon, May 2, 2020. Specifically, I do not know exactly what is being voted on. There is a reference within the first document: “North Apron – reserve for future corporate aviation facilities with the potential for some or all of the current tiedowns and/or T-hangars to be retained depending on configuration.” In addition to not being specific as to north ramp T Hangars existence going forward, I note that the Draft Minimum Standards later in the require that all T Hangars have a minimum depth of 36 feet. None of the existing north ramp T Hangars are 36 feet deep. This begs the question of why hangars that have been in existence for decades, fully and appropriately supporting the general aviation aircraft stored within them, somehow now fall just short of an arbitrary size requirement without any articulated basis.

As you know, I provided detailed comments to the last draft of the master plan. The issues raised in those comments remain of concern despite a response from the City Attorney’s Office. In short, I remain willing to work with the airport on planning solutions that best suit the airport community as a whole. Each of the planning documents to date, however, contemplate moving north ramp T Hangars without in any way addressing either the viability or the cost of doing so, no less whom will bear those costs. Since neither the viability nor cost issues have been addressed anywhere to date, one can only suspect that the intent is to eliminate light general aviation aircraft from the north ramp, destroy all value in the existing north ramp T hangars, and further saddle these T Hangar owners with removal costs in addition to the costs of relocating their aircraft and establishing alternate hangar arrangements. I respectfully request that the planning study both include and address these critical issues.

Item 7 is identified as “Approval of Draft Airport Minimum Standards.” I note that the Draft Minimum Standards posted pursuant to your email on Saturday afternoon contain at p. 30 the following under the title “Minimum Land and Structure Requirements”: “Single-Unit Hangars, such as T-hangars or small box hangars, must minimally be 1,200 square feet with a depth of 36 feet and the ability to access Aircraft movement areas.” As noted above, the T Hangars in the row that I occupy are 33 ft, 3 inches deep. No explanation or reasoning is provided for this minimum requirement, nor is there any indication of whether airport management intends to grandfather the existing north ramp T Hangars – none of which appear to meet this newly proposed requirement. I respectfully ask you to amend the draft minimum standards to grandfather existing T Hangars from this newly proposed requirement which threatens all north ramp general aviation T Hangars.

Item 8 is identified as “Airport Manager’s Report.” The Airport Manager’s Report posted Saturday afternoon primarily discusses EMAS Vandalism which reportedly occurred on March 20, 2020. Of note in that report is the absence of even the most limited identification of the vandal, or how the vandal accessed the EMAS. A later bullet point states that “Vehicle access limited to the greatest extent possible while the investigations are in process.” Surprisingly, there is no reference to fencing being erected, on no notice, which prevented vehicle access to the north ramp T Hangars. Fencing off north ramp T Hangars created issues that impeded general aviation operations, including handicapped access,

movement of heavy tooling, and ramp and hangar lighting for night flying which had previously been provided by vehicle headlights (there is no access to electricity at the north ramp T Hangars). Precluding vehicle access to north ramp T Hangars is also inconsistent with vehicle access permitted to south ramp hangars. In short, there has been no articulated reason or rational basis to suddenly restrict vehicle access to north ramp T Hangars and to then simultaneously allow such access to south ramp T Hangars. I ask that you either remove the fencing with the speed at which it was erected, or identify the specific problem created by the owners and users of north ramp T Hangars that that the fencing was designed to solve.

Respectfully submitted, _

Paul A. Lange, Esq.
pal@lopal.com

Law Offices of Paul A. Lange, LLC www.lopal.com
Practicing in CT, NY & MA; nationwide in aviation regulatory and transactional matters



CT office: 80 Ferry Blvd., Stratford, CT 06615-6079 | 203.375.7724 x101 | 203.375.9397 (F)
NY office: 445 Park Ave., 9th Fl., New York, NY 10022-8632 | 212.385.1215 | 212.608.1215 (F)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email and any attachments are for the exclusive and confidential use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not read, distribute or take action in reliance upon this message. If you have received this in error, please notify us immediately by return email and promptly delete this message and its attachments from your computer system. We do not waive attorney-client or work product privilege by the transmission of this message.

From: Collins, Sean <sean.collins@aopa.org>
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 4:59 PM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Subject: AOPA Testimony for May 5th Commission Meeting.

Hello Michelle,

Please accept the following testimony of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) for consideration during the May 5th Airport Commission meeting.

As you know, my name is Sean Collins and I am the Eastern Region Manager for the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association (AOPA). We are the world's largest aviation membership organization representing the general aviation interests of 330,000 aircraft owners and pilots across the country, including 3,324 in the state of Connecticut.

With respect to the overall planning process, AOPA wishes to commend the Bridgeport Airport on standing up a Technical Advisory Committee to assist in the masterplan review process. Through engagement, discussion, and acceptance of feedback, such a committee affords the airport the opportunity to make more informed decisions while minimizing any negative impact to affected user-groups. Unfortunately, we have learned from members of this committee that only a single meeting occurred, focusing on a very narrow segment of 'airport planning', related to the potential redevelopment of the "North Ramp". While we commend the airport's decision to use the Committee for focused issues like these, certainly an advisory committee affords value to all aspects of the masterplan updating process. Regular and committed use of advisory committees comprised of existing user-groups also serves to instill greater confidence in sponsor actions as well as serve to head-off future user issues and complaints. For these reasons, AOPA encourages BDR to make greater use of its Technical Advisory Committee.

As it relates to the Draft Airport Masterplan, **section 6.5 Terminal Area Alternatives** AOPA is concerned by the proposed redevelopment of aspects of the North Ramp, potentially displacing up to 25 T-hangar tenants from the airfield. While we recognize the sponsor's ability to redevelop airport grounds in accordance with its needs and obligations, we wish to stress the value these tenants bring to General Aviation airports like Bridgeport.

AOPA took note of an email from airport management to an aircraft owner interested in a North Ramp T-hangar indicating that it is possible that area [the North Ramp T-hangars] may be relocated "*...if they can be accommodated at all*". The last phrase stands out in the context of a Part 16 Determination [Palomar Airport - Docket 16-04-08] whereby tenants brought the complaint against their sponsor in California for unjustifiably displacing tenants. Interestingly, the sponsor prevailed in this case on the grounds that it had provided alternative accommodations. The Determination thereby set a precedent that sponsors may not arbitrarily displace tenants and must instead offer alternate accommodations. With that in mind, AOPA encourages BDR to ensure appropriate accommodations are made to any tenant displaced as a result of future development.

We thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sean Collins

Regional Manager, Government Affairs
Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association
p: 301.695.2090 | f: 202.737.7951
a: 421 Aviation Way, Frederick, MD 21701
www.aopa.org



Confidentiality Notice: The information contained in this email and any attachments is intended only for the recipient[s] listed above and may be privileged and confidential. Any dissemination, copying, or use of or reliance upon such information by or to anyone other than the recipient[s] listed above is prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately at the email address above and destroy any and all copies of this message.

From: Robert Takacs <flytakair@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 8:16 AM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Subject: KBDR Meeting 5/5/20

Hi Michelle,

Thanks for your note. I put together this note for consideration. While it is a little long, I summarize key points at the end. From the material on the web site, it looks like the appropriate way to submit is through you. Is that correct? Please let me know if it is appropriate.

Thanks

Rob Takacs

May 5, 2019

From: Rob Takacs: North T-Hangar owner, airplane operator, A&P, CFII.

To: KBDR Airport Commission

For your consideration during the May 5, 2020 commission meeting.

I am an Oxford CT resident and purchased a hangar and moved my airplane to the Sikorsky Memorial Airport in October of 2019 due to the high cost of hangaring at the Waterbury-Oxford Airport. The aircraft is used for personal use as well as a small aviation business it supports through IR&D and business flights. While we do not bring in the money of a corporate jet, small privately owned general aviation aircraft can be an economic benefit for an airport that wants a diverse portfolio. Light GA aircraft and owners tend to be long term tenants in a general aviation friendly airport and create a consistent income stream. Too many airports have pushed out the small aircraft in hopes of capturing a limited corporate jet market, which can be at the mercy of Wall Street Economics. Moving the plane to Bridgeport has been generally pleasant. It is a great airport to fly out of, with cross wind runways. We are considering moving our home closer to the coast due to proximity to work and airport. However, recent events have made me wonder if the airport will have long term stability and affordability for our small aircraft. The installation of a fence to prevent tenants from accessing aircraft by vehicle, due to alleged vandalism, strikes me as not GA friendly. Every aircraft owner and hangar owner I know is extremely careful about airport regulations, indeed our licenses and in many cases our livelihoods are on the line. The pilot driving the vehicle is typically about to navigate the airport in a much larger vehicle and really is not thinking of joy riding in a car on the airport. Preventing vehicle access to aircraft hangars and tie downs is not an effective way to prevent what occurred and creates an adversarial situation between the airport and its tenants. It seems to be assumed that a tenant created the damage. However, it could easily be an airport vehicle or even an external threat. The external fence line is in constant disrepair and a person could access the airport and allow vehicles in through the gate. I would offer that an investment in cameras is a more cost effective solution than fences inside of fences.

While I purchased North Ramp Hangar 9B with the knowledge that I was on a month to month lease with the airport, I was hoping that this was not a long term situation. The master plan discusses options for the hangars but comes short of a final solution. In fact there are at least three possibilities, maybe four ,if one includes pure elimination. One is that they remain in place, two others are "relocation". Movement of the hangars would be difficult and likely require rebuilding. Also, some of the proposed locations have more serious threat of flooding. It is obvious that the hangars have deteriorated over time, but this is likely a result of not having a long term plan for loyal tenants paying rent for the footprint. It is difficult to invest and commit to improvements when the future is not certain. It would be beneficial to

provide a timeline on opportunities for those tenants who are potentially affected by these plans. The lack of reasonable lease agreement is not beneficial to either the owners or the airport. Owners who take their airplanes elsewhere, take their money elsewhere. The empty ramps are evidence. While general aviation has been on a decline, there are some general aviation airports that thrive in an environment that is conducive to both corporate and general aviation aircraft.

KBDR is a great general aviation airport. It has ample, on field, growth opportunities without displacing loyal tenants. A positive relationship between the airport and existing tenants of all sizes will go far in bringing in more tenants in the tight knit aviation community. The limited runway length will never allow KBDR to be another White Plains and there are already adequate relievers competing for White Plains overflow. I hope that small general aviation aircraft and owners can be a part of KBDR's future.

In summary, when evaluating the master plan, please consider:

- Reasonable and timely accommodations and agreement with North T-Hangar owners
- If immediate planning determination can not be made, consider interim lease agreement beyond one month, preferably multiple years
- Tie Downs and Hangars accommodations should consider flooding effects
- Consider further flood prevention measures, including drain management
- Open and cooperative relationship with tenants, large and small, we want the airport to succeed too
- Security measures that detect external threats and do not implicate vetted tenants

Thank you for your consideration,
Rob Takacs
Hangar 9B

Sent from my iPad

From: Robert Andel <robert.andel@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2020 4:22 PM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Cc: 'David Faile'; sean.collins@aopa.org
Subject: KBDR Vehicular Ramp Access

Ms. Muoio:

I am submitting this written testimony for the Airport Commission meeting on May 5, 2020.

I've owned an airplane at KBDR since 1975, and it has been tied down on the south ramp since that ramp opened. Not being able to get my car close to my airplane is a **really big** issue. Every time I fly, I remove my canopy cover and cowl/bird plugs and place them in my car, I remove my flight bag from my car and put it in the airplane, and I remove what I call my "emergency box" (in case I have to make a forced landing in the middle of nowhere) from my car and put it in the airplane. I also use the emergency box in my car, which is why I don't leave it in the airplane.

In addition to the above, which happens every time I fly, I also do minor work on my airplane on the ramp; primarily cleaning and oil changes. In the winter, I bring my snow shovel and remove ice and snow so I can fly. I make regular visits to the airplane to check on tie-down security, especially during strong wind. I use the alternator in my car to operate a small air compressor in order to inflate the aircraft tires.

At this time, I have to leave my car at a fence located about 300 feet past the Civil Air Patrol building, and walk about another 1000 feet to the airplane. Carrying things that distance every time I need to fly or do something at the airplane is **very, very difficult**. I also have to make multiple trips from the car to the plane, depending on what I need to do at any given time.

I haven't heard a word directly from airport operations since the EMAS vandalism occurred, only what has been relayed to me via FOSA. I hope airport operations is going to include airplane owners/tenants (**the airport's customers!**) in deciding on any changes that are going to be implemented. This is the first serious vandalism at the airport that I am aware of since I started flying from Stratford in 1973. I don't think one problem warrants punishing all airport users by eliminating vehicular access to their aircraft. At the very least, if car access is going to be permanently denied (which it shouldn't), **there has to be a way to get a car much, much closer to the ramp, or a way to get an airplane much, much closer to the car parking area.**

Thank you for your consideration of these issues and the onerous effects the elimination of vehicular access to the ramps has created for airport tenants.

Robert M. Andel
Milford, CT
South Ramp Tie-Down Space #29
AOPA member number 00533000

From: shlfly@aol.com
Sent: Monday, May 04, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Muoio, Michelle
Subject: Airport Commission Meeting 5-5-2020 Comments

Chairman Ganim and Commissioners:

I own a T-Hangar situated on the North Ramp, and have been a tenant at the airport for over 30 years. This is the first time I have felt it necessary to express my opinions to the commission.

I wish to address two issues regarding management of the airport.

The first is to state that I believe that this is not the proper time for the Commission to adopt any new provisions regarding the Airport Master Plan, for the following reasons:

- Because current situation regarding the COVID virus prevents the holding of a true public meeting , where the give-and-take among and between staff, the commissioners and public is more easily facilitated, the approval of the plan at this meeting will inevitably lead to the perception that this plan was rammed through "under cover of darkness".
- There does not appear to be any urgency regarding the adoption of the plan.
- Given the circumstances, the more reasonable course of action would seem to be tabling this matter until a true public hearing can be scheduled, at which time all interested parties can be properly heard.

The second item I wish to address is not on the agenda, but inasmuch as there is no agenda item for correspondence, I will address it here.

I, as well as many of my fellow aircraft owners/airport tenants, am extremely upset that I have been prohibited from accessing my hangar with my vehicle. As I indicated, I have been a tenant for over thirty years, and this is the first time this has happened. It is important that we have vehicle access, as there are many times we need to bring relatively heavy items to the hangar, and I also put my car in the hanger when I go on a longer trip. It appears that this may have been done without commission approval.

I fail to understand the rationale for this action. I am aware of many other airports where the users are allowed to access their hangars by vehicle – I know of no legal prohibition in this regard.

Quite frankly, it appears that this action may have been punitive, or done with some ulterior motive. The fact that the reason given was that someone drove across a portion of the runway makes absolutely no sense, as no pilot would ever drive across a runway. In my view it is much more likely that this was the work of vandals, or even an employee.

I respectfully request the commission to reverse this action, and allow us vehicular access to the T-Hangars and tiedowns. There are ways to allow this that would provide protection from incursions, while still allowing access. I would be happy to discuss this with the appropriate persons.

Thanking you for your consideration, I am

Sincerely yours,

Stanton H. Lesser, Esq.
One Eliot Place
Fairfield, CT 06824
Tel. (203) 336-1811
Fax (203) 255-8883
SHFLY@AOL.COM

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT WAS ADDRESSED, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US. THANK YOU.