



IGOR I SIKORSKY MEMORIAL AIRPORT

Master Plan Update

Comments Received as of February 1, 2020

All written comments on the Master Plan Update and Public Meetings are provided in this document in the order of receipt. A total of 48 substantive comments were received. Written comments were received through multiple means, including:

- Study website
- Direct email
- Comment cards & letters

Names have been omitted to preserve privacy unless directly affiliated with an organization

1. David Faile, Friends of Sikorsky Airport, 1/27/2020

Where on the web site are the comments that people make regarding the Airport Master Plan? Many people submitted comments and we should be able to see them...

2. Paul Lange, N759ZD, LLC, 11/27/2019

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the PowerPoint presentation first made available at the public hearing on Wednesday evening, November 20, 2019. The undersigned represents N759ZD, LLC, a North Ramp T Hangar owner. I am also the Managing Member of N759ZD, LLC. I preface the comments below by stating that I am an active member of the airport community and that I am interested in the overall success of BDR. I support doing my part, any reasonable inconvenience included, to advance the interests of the airport community. The comments below stem from "Draft Working Paper 2" published in advance of the November 20, 2019 public meeting, the Powerpoint presentation circulated at that meeting, the public comments made by the presenter, and the November 12, 2019 memo that was included with a monthly hangar bill which arrived on November 20, 2019.

1. **Lack of Notice.** The master planning process to date has been circumspect due to a lack of notice and opportunity to be heard with respect to T Hangar owners and tenants. The City of Bridgeport and Airport management failed to provide the T Hangar owners with notice of meetings to discuss the Master Plan including the meeting held on November 20th. This is unacceptable since the City possesses the addresses and demonstrated ability to communicate with each individual T Hangar owner when it suits the City's interest.
2. **Failure to Consider Technical Advisory Committee's Input.** The Technical Advisory Committee had no input into what was presented at the November 20th meeting.

Specifically, the public hearing took place immediately following the Technical Advisory Committee meeting, clearly demonstrating that the 64 slide PowerPoint was prepared prior to the Technical Advisory Committee meeting. The integrity of any public process demands that an advisory body have an opportunity to present views before decisions are made. That did not occur on November 20th, and the views of that body were neither heard nor considered.

3. **Failure to Provide Time for Meaningful Public Comment.** The master plan process is described as a two-year process. It is highly circumspect that the public comment period on what was presented for the first time in the November 20, 2019 PowerPoint slides is limited to a total of five business days during a holiday period. The time provided is inadequate for consideration of 11 alternative scenarios and to provide meaningful comments on each. At the very least, the 11 alternative options and the PowerPoint presentation should have been published well in advance of the public hearing. Alternatively, a longer comment period following the meeting should have been provided. I strongly urge that the process going forward provide for timelines that allow a reasonable time for comment from all airport constituencies.

4. **Substantive concerns; reservation of rights.** The Powerpoint slides presented for the first time on Wednesday evening, November 20, 2019 show some 11 alternative scenarios described as “concepts”. These concepts were developed without any input from either the Technical Advisory Committee or from T Hangar owners. Additional oral comments were made by the presenter indicating that the T Hangars would need to be moved because the North Ramp will be reserved for corporate aircraft storage. Other statements were made by the presenter that the T Hangars could not remain on the North Ramp because access to them involves crossing another tenant’s leasehold. These statements cause serious concerns, each of which is discussed in detail below. Each of the 11 concepts contemplate removal and relocation of the North Ramp T Hangars. No consideration of any kind has been provided anywhere describing the reasoning behind the stated decisions to eliminate T Hangars on the North Ramp and why not a single alternative to moving the T Hangars was even considered. Oral statements by the presenter at the meeting made clear that moving the T Hangars is a foregone conclusion. In particular, the presenter stated that the North Ramp under any circumstance would be reserved for corporate aircraft storage and further that the T Hangars needed to be moved because access requires crossing another tenant’s leasehold. Removing and/or relocating the T Hangars presently located on the North Ramp is problematic for the following reasons:
 - A. **The T Hangars are real estate owned by the individual T Hangar owners.** The Connecticut Supreme Court determined that the T Hangars located on the North Ramp are classified as real estate and subject to taxation as real estate rather than personal property. See Town of Stratford v. Jacobelli, 120 A.3d 500 (Conn. 2015). Following that decision, the Town of Stratford issued a root deed for this newly constituted real estate. The City of Bridgeport did not intervene in the litigation between T Hangar owners and the Town of Stratford, notwithstanding its notice of same. Thus, the City waived its right to contest that the T Hangars located on the North Ramp are real property, owned by individuals or entities such as the undersigned. Any responsible planning document needs to consider T Hangar real estate rights that include

deeds claimed simultaneously by both the City and Town, this in addition to the ownership rights of T Hangar owners themselves.

- B. Eminent Domain and a Governmental Taking of Real Property.** Given the deeded ownership of this real property, any taking of that property interest by the City as proposed in the November 12, 2019 memo must as a matter of law follow an eminent domain process to compensate such owners for the fair market value of their property.
- C. Flooding.** Oral Comments made by the presenter indicated that flooding was not considered as part of the available options. In short, the East Ramp is considered by the contractor as viable space to park aircraft. Such conclusion is belied by the fact that the East Ramp is subject to frequent and extensive flooding. Knowingly relocating T Hangars to a location known for frequent and extensive flooding places the City in the position of unnecessarily assuming risk for property damage claims at the first instance of flooding. Accordingly, it is an entirely unsuitable location for the T Hangars.
- D. Insurance coverage concerns.** Moving the T Hangars to a location known for frequently flooding may impact the continuing insurability of the T Hangars and the aircraft stored within them. This should be carefully considered and studied before a decision is made to relocate the T Hangars from the North Ramp.
- E. Potential Grant Assurance Violation.** The City's conduct to date exposes it to claims of Grant Assurance 22 [nondiscrimination] and 23 [exclusive rights] violations. Relocating the T Hangars to a location known for flooding to make room for corporate aircraft storage favors one type of tenant over another and may actually be construed as granting an exclusive right.
- F. Capability of T Hangars to be moved.** This issue needs to be studied and considered to determine whether it is even possible to move the existing structures, no less evaluating the cost of doing so and options for funding such moves. Ignoring that issue in the planning process is inappropriate and irresponsible, particularly since the City's November 12, 2019 memo makes clear that it expects T Hangars to be moved at owners' sole cost and expense, and neither Airport Master Plan Draft Working Paper 1, Airport Master Plan Draft Working Paper 2 nor the November 20, 2019 PowerPoint address funding in any way.

In conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to present these comments and trust that they will be considered and addressed in a meaningful and appropriate manner. I further reiterate that the undersigned is willing to work with the City as part of this process for the good of all concerned if the financial burden of doing so is not placed on the undersigned.

3. David Faile, Friends of Sikorsky Airport, 11/25/2019

November 25, 2019 Friends of Sikorsky Airport works very hard to support, represent, and promote the Airport. In this regard, I would like to make several comments about the Airport Master Plan process: I for one do not feel that, as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee, I have been included in the planning process except for one short meeting that mostly concerned the North Ramp T-Hangars. Technical Advisory Committee members hear about Airport plans at a meeting two hours before the public meetings. Our comments don't seem to be welcome and there is no discussion! My additional comments include: The Control Tower cannot see a large section of Taxiway Alpha and an FBO. The FAA was alerted to this before it became an obstruction! They did nothing! We hear that the Fuel Farm next to Taxiway Golf is within an area that impacts the clear area for Runway 11-29. The FAA was alerted to this obstruction before it was built. They did nothing! The clear area for Runway 24 has an

obstruction that the FAA was aware of long before the Airport gave the tenant a 99-year lease. The FAA did nothing! Runway 11-29 is the longest runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport. It is also the preferred runway for noise abatement. Any reconstruction must not reduce the length of this runway. For Sikorsky Memorial Airport to continue to have an economic impact on the region, the Airport must maintain the current runway length with access provided to all aircraft that use the Airport. The Airport manager's email to an airplane owner interested in a North Ramp T-Hangar included the following: However, these t-hangars are located on property that is on a month to month lease with the airport. It is possible that area may be relocated and t-hangar owners would have to relocate at their own expense if they can be accommodated at all. On November 12, 2019, the Airport sent a letter to North Ramp T-Hangar owners saying that all sales of the existing T-Hangars are suspended but any owner is free to rent or remove their T-Hangar at their own expense! Access to the North Ramp and North Ramp T-Hangars is through the controlled gate at Atlantic Aviation. Airport management indicates this is a significant problem. There was a time when there was a separate North Ramp gate on Main Street that was removed by the Airport, the folks at Atlantic Aviation have no problems with the access arrangement, and there is easily a location to re-install a gate on Main Street. The Airport, the Airport Master Plan, and the FAA have an obligation to respect and accommodate all tenants. Progress and growth at Sikorsky Memorial Airport is expected and welcomed by the users, but not if it deprives some airport users of current and future access to the Airport. David H. Faile, Jr Friends of Sikorsky Airport

4. 11/24/2019

Community Access. Three examples: Increased pedestrian and visitor access to the Air & Space Museum as represented by Curtiss Hanger restoration. Increase footprint of the CAS to enable permanent display of airships, and also temporary exhibits i.e. visiting airships 2nd, the Civil Air Patrol. Assure this training facility has viable footprint to conduct its youth programs and accomplish its mission. Third, maybe the Windsock needs to be re-located, but please consider re-locating so similar venue remains available to the public.

5. 9/9/2019

We are curious to know if there will be an RFP issued for marketing/advertising/branding strategic planning and execution in reference to the improvement of BDR?

6. 9/8/2019

Does the city of Bridgeport own the land on which Sikorsky airport exists? Thank you.

7. 7/22/2019

The ability to use either runway 11-29 or 6-24 is essential to safe operation on windy days. Please keep 11-29 available for use.

8. 7/17/2019

Keep that runway jet/turbine capable. Any reduction in airport capabilities reduces attractiveness to business which will hinder economic development and growth for the area and state. Where's Lamont? He should be all in on this.

9. 7/17/2019

I urge those responsible for the continued operation of Runway 11/29 at KBDR to continue to provide the support necessary for continued operations on that runway. It is a viable and necessary facility to safely conduct flight operations for aircraft of any size during the varied and challenging conditions that exist during cross wind operations at KBDR 11.29

10. 7/17/2019

I am the director of operations for a Hawker 800XP and we need runway 11/29. It is the longest runway at 4761 with the improvement removing the displacement it will be a useful runway. Today, at 30 degrees C, we are limited from our maximum take off weight of 28,000 to 25,400 pounds. Should we move to OXC, we can take off at maximum gross due to the longer runway. Adding 10 knots allows us to operate at 26,000 and if we use the 15 knots of wind reported today, its 26,200! Almost 1,000 lbs. That's 10% of our fuel capacity. Put us back at runway 24 and back down to 25,500. 15 knots of wind with only 100lbs of increased capacity. As for landing, we could use the improved runway and removal of the displacement. At today's temp of 30C, we need 4414 feet of runway. If use today's wind, we only need 4008 feet of runway. Runway 24 is displaced and therefore limiting, and runway 6 would be a tail wind, also limiting. I feel that the 11/29 is an important component for the Bridgeport airport and a major consideration for Connecticut's weak aviation industry. This airports value is in its ability to support general aviation turbine equipment. Take that away and the jets will move away as well.

11. 7/17/2019

Flying as both an airline and corporate pilot and flight instructor over the last 40 years, I often relished the option of runway choices following cold front passage where northwest winds over 25-30 knots virtually precluded the use of Runway 6. But with Runways 11-29 no longer their original width, that option no longer applies to Air Carriers wishing to reestablish service at KBDR. Sure, one can say they can always miss and divert to New Haven (KHVN) or Westchester County {KHPN) but the economic costs involved apply to both the Air Carriers themselves and to their passengers. Limo charges and crew repositioning expenses can go logo-rhythmic very quickly. It's time to restore KBDR to an airport fully credentialed to handle Part 121 operations. The City and it's citizen road warriors deserve nothing less. JJD

12. 7/16/2019

Runway 11-29 is needed due to high winds after a front passes, also it is the prime noise abatement runway

13. 7/16/2019

To whom it may concern, as a private pilot for five years and a police officer for 20 years, I believe the closure of runway 11/29 would be a major safety issue for both new and experienced pilots. Runway 11/29 offers both an optional wind, safety and noise abatement alternative to runway 6/24. I received my private pilot license at Sikorsky Airport and without runway 11/29, I feel the width and length was a major deciding factor. Please feel free to reach out to me to explain my views in person. I have worked with several transportation companies doing studies with being an active police officer in Fairfield and would be more than happy to explain the very important reasons for keeping runway 11/29 open and active.

14. 7/16/2019

To whom it may concern, as a private pilot for five years and a police officer for 20 years, I believe the closure of runway 11/29 would be a major safety issue for both new and experienced pilots.

15. 7/15/2019

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Airport Master Plan. I am concerned the FAA will not fund repairs and improvements to runway 11-29. As a private business owner and active general aviation pilot I use the airport on a weekly basis for work. On many occasions flying home from a business trip this runway has ensured my safe arrival. If not for this runway my confidence in keeping my plane at BDR would wane. It's the longest runway at BDR. It's the runway most used after a cold front passes through our area. If the runway were to close I would serious consider moving my aircraft for safety reasons.

16. 7/15/2019

I appreciate the opportunity to comment concerning repairs and improvements to Runway 29. As an aircraft co-owner of a General Aviation airplane, based at KBDR and a tenant of Atlantic Aviation, I support that Runway 11-29 be maintained, repaired and improved. Our airplane is maintained by a maintenance provider at KBDR, it is hanger tenant of Atlantic Aviation and fuel is purchased from Atlantic Aviation. For those 3 items we spend approximately \$15,000.00 to \$17,000.00 per year directly on the airport. I agree with the comments made by the Friends of Sikorsky Airport that: "Runway 11-29 is the longest runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport and serves the larger aircraft using the Airport. Runway 11-29 is the preferred runway for noise abatement and enhances our ability to be a quiet and friendly neighbor to both Stratford and Milford. Runway 11-29 is the runway of choice after cold frontal passage and strong winds (over 25 Knots) from the Northwest continue for three to four days. These periods of strong northwest winds would virtually close the Airport to operations by the two Airport based flight schools and many other operations without Runway 11-29. Many larger aircraft would be forced to divert to an alternate airport. Most of the small aircraft based at the Airport would have to wait for wind conditions to improve." While a shortened or narrower runway 11-29 should not present difficulties for our airplane, the closure of Runway 11-29 would cause us to seriously consider relocating to a different airport. The cross wind issues with only Runway 6-24 available could place our airplane outside its operational envelope - that would be a major factor in a decision to move and take our expenditures and support of on-airport businesses with us. It was good to see Airport (Manager) reaching out to the local community with the recent public meeting - I look forward to the next one!

17. 7/15/2019

Please do not consider closing RW11-29. Despite the fact that the current government administration in Bridgepoint could care less about the airport, the future of the airport has tremendous potential to become a viable and efficient transportation system. Closing the runway reduces capacity and seriously affects flight safety especially for light general aviation aircraft weighing less than 7,500 lbs. BDR is vital to the NPIAS and users should expect the FAA, state and City of Bridgepoint to realize that closing 11/29 is short sighted thinking. Also, with the onset of light sport aircraft, several in use at the airport now, the safety risk is increased due to lower wing loading as a result of their design. These aircraft are difficult to maneuver in wind

conditions above 15 knots. Students flight training in this type of aircraft is on the increase at BDR and nationally. Master plans should be written with positive forecasts for economic growth, safety and the environment as prime factors. Closing 11/29 is a big step in the wrong direction. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Steve Ferguson

18. 7/15/2019

Runway 11-29 is the longer runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport and serves the larger aircraft using the Airport. Runway 11-29 is the preferred runway for noise abatement and enhances our ability to be a quiet and friendly neighbor to both Stratford and Milford. Runway 11-29 is the runway of choice after cold frontal passage and strong winds (over 25 Knots) from the Northwest continue for three to four days. These periods of strong northwest winds would virtually close the Airport to operations by the two Airport based flight schools and many other operations without Runway 11-29. Many larger aircraft would be forced to divert to an alternate airport. Most of the small aircraft based at the Airport would have to wait for wind conditions to improve.

19. 7/15/2019

Concerning the closure of runway 11/29. Recalling that BDR was reduced in the past from three runways to the current two runways, this was a significant reduction in airport capability. BDR is used by commercial, corporate and private pilots all coexisting on the same field. Removal of 11/29 will increase cross wind landing and takeoffs and as a result will increase pilot workload and reduce safety margins. BDR as you are well aware is on the coast where at times the wind can blow hard. Having a runway more aligned with the wind only increase operational safety. Removal of a vital runway pair will force pilots (some in training) to make difficult approaches to touchdown and initiate high workload takeoffs.

20. 7/15/2019

I am concerned that the draft master plan does not call for improving/maintaining 11-29. I know the 06-24 construction was more expensive than projected, but 11-29 is a safety issue. With the recent 2nd circuit ruling on FAA decisions pre-empting state and local statutes, the FAA does not need to give in to local pet projects which will double the cost of repairs/improvements. Since it is a safety issue, updating and repairing 11-29 should not require local permits etc because of pre-emption for exclusive federal decisions on safety issues. Also, the Bridgeport mayor is supporting improving KBDR's infrastructure. Some safety considerations: Runway 11-29 is the longest runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport and serves the larger aircraft using the Airport. Runway 11-29 is the preferred runway for noise abatement and enhances our ability to be a quiet and friendly neighbor to both Stratford and Milford. Runway 11-29 is the runway of choice after cold frontal passage and strong winds (over 25 Knots) from the Northwest continue for three to four days. These periods of strong northwest winds would virtually close the Airport to operations by the two Airport based flight schools and many other operations without Runway 11-29. Many larger aircraft would be forced to divert to an alternate airport. Most of the small aircraft based at the Airport would have to wait for wind conditions to improve.

21. 7/15/2019

The Bridgeport Sikorsky Memorial Airport is a crucial resource for Bridgeport, the surrounding region and the State of Connecticut. Bridgeport airport warrants further development and

capacity increases that will continue to enhance the safety, efficiency and effectiveness of flight operations that directly contribute to the economic vibrancy of Bridgeport. As a corporate pilot for an organization based in Bridgeport, I urge you to support efforts to develop the airport. Having access to two runways at Bridgeport, runways 11/29 and 6/24, that can support Category C and D aircraft contributes to Bridgeport's ability to accommodate and support flight operations by private and commercial operators. Flight operations by these operators provide the airport, and surrounding businesses and vendors, with an economic benefit that affects not only the immediate area of Bridgeport but adjacent communities and economies. As you look to the future and envision ways to improve the airport, please consider the upgrade and use of standardized runway and taxiway markings and signage. The installation of LPV approaches on all runways would enable the airport to keep pace with current, and emerging, instrument approach technologies. Finally, runway extensions and lengthening, if possible, would position the airport to support not only current, but future operations, as the level of flight domestic and international flight activity increases across the region.

22. 7/15/2019

Commenting in support of needed repairs for runway 11-29. This is KBDR's longest runway, it is the preferred runway for noise abatement and, it is better aligned for strong winds from the north west (cold front passage).

23. 7/15/2019

I'm writing to voice my support for the continuation of runway 11/29 at BDR. It's a necessary runway for larger aircraft and has a long overrun area on Rwy 29. It is also the preferred runway for noise abatement, and as a former operations person at BDR I used to get noise complaints from residents frequently when a jet would land on Rwy 24 late at night. Closing runway 29 would only increase the noise complaints. During winter, the winds are generally from the northwest, and closing runway 29 would severely restrict operations at BDR.

24. 7/15/2019

The following bullet points are offered as to why the airport should maintain its current runways: -Winds often are too strong to land only on runway 24. If runway 29 is taken away as an option, we would often have to execute a missed approach or go to another location due to the wind limitations of our airplane. Bridgeport is our home airport, so executing missed approaches and going to another airport is inconvenient and costly. - Bridgeport is one of the few airports that can accommodate larger corporate aircraft in the southwest CT area, with easy access to New York. Closing one runway makes it less appealing to those users reducing economic activity in the region. - CT infrastructure is already not sufficient to meet the needs of the state. Why would we want to take away some of the infrastructure we already have? - The approach to runway 29 and departure off runway 11 immediately takes you out over the water. This reduces potential noise issues. - There is not enough hangar space at other alternative airports. Bridgeport is truly a unique and viable choice that meets our needs and needs to be supported more, not less.

25. 7/15/2019

I believe it essential that KBDR continue to have a well-maintained pair of runways. Both runway 6/24, which is oriented for prevailing breeze operations (24) and nor'easter wind and storms (6)

and runway 11/29 which is oriented for use in the very strong and gusty winds for 2-3 days after passage of a cold front are critical to the ability of the wide range of aircraft found at Sikorsky Memorial to operate safely, efficiently and consistently. I know they are both essential for my use of the airport. If these two runways cannot be maintained in current or better condition, the viability of the airport as we know it will cease. And that would be an incredible shame because the airport is such an important resource to Bridgeport, Stratford and all of southwestern Connecticut. Without it, or an effective version of it, many of the businesses in this area will be forced to either use less desirable alternatives or, in the extreme, relocate to areas better served. I can't stress enough how important this is to me personally as well as to the other airport users including transient aircraft and all of the businesses directly and indirectly affected.

- Chris Johannessen

26. 7/15/2019

I've recently heard of the possibility of neglecting runway 11/29 and not going forward with repairs. This runway is vital to the usage of the airport by light aircraft such as the one I own and base at the airport. It's important to keep this runway (the longest) open and in good condition in order to facilitate the use of the airport in all wind conditions and for all aircraft. Runway 11-29 is the runway of choice after cold frontal passage and strong winds (over 25 Knots) from the Northwest continue for three to four days. These periods of strong northwest winds would virtually close the Airport to operations by the two Airport based flight schools and many other operations without Runway 11-29. Many larger aircraft would be forced to divert to an alternate airport. Most of the small aircraft based at the Airport would have to wait for wind conditions to improve. Runway 11-29 is the longest runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport and serves the larger aircraft using the Airport. Runway 11-29 is the preferred runway for noise abatement and enhances our ability to be a quiet and friendly neighbor to both Stratford and Milford.

27. 7/15/2019

29/11 is a very very important runway! It needs to stay for many reasons. It is never a good idea to limit landing options to just one runway. As a pilot I remain whole hearted against any reduction of length or width of runway 29/11. Thank you, Rich Hayes

28. 7/15/2019

I am a general aviation pilot, Private rating and fly out of Three Wing at least 35-40 times per year for both my architectural business and for pleasure. I am dismayed to hear that Runway 11-29 may not be favored for funding, either for maintenance or improvements. It will severely curtail my use of the airport for many reasons: 1. It is the best runway for noise abatement with the least amount of impact to those in Lordship or the Devon section of Milford. 2. I believe I use Runway 11-29 for half of my annual flights due to prevailing winds at those times and the strong winter winds coupled with a crosswind condition on 6-24 would limit my ability to use the airport. Please don't squander the resource that we have in this runway by removing its priority status and affecting us whose lives would be at risk without the alignment 11-29 provides. 3. Removing 11-29 from priority and funding status will impact the regional economy as the charter operations will not be able to benefit from this longer runway that is oriented away from neighborhoods and sensitive areas. Please reconsider the status of runway 11-29. It is essential.

29. 7/15/2019

The flexibility and safety of having 4 active runways was a major factor in the deciding factor of basing my aircraft in Bridgeport. The recent proposal to cease the maintenance of runway 11-29 is disappointing and short-sighted, as the resulting loss of aircraft will likely put additional strains on revenues. Understanding that every dollar counts, why not invest in the future of the airport versus path of conscientious neglect currently being proposed. An on field restaurant, antique aircraft and other creative events would enhance the experience of users and add to the revenues thru leases and higher activity. The number of times I've flown to stay current, but pick a field with lunch options or other attractions is 99%. Given the coastal weather, strong and variable winds, particularly out of the NW in the winter are a major safety concern should 11-29 be closed, and will force me to reconsider the appropriate home for my aircraft, likely moving it out of state to NY.

30. 7/15/2019

I would like to offer my unconditional support for the reconstruction and upgrade of Runway 11/29 at BDR, particularly as it would facilitate the return of commercial airline service to this airport. When such service was available in the past, I used it as often as possible for my frequent (at the time) business travel. I would gladly do so again. Even though diversions were common due to weather, the convenience of ready access to local commercial air service was tremendous. Failure to reconstruct and/or extend Runway 11/29, combined with a possible abandonment of same runway, would devastate the chances of the return of such commercial service. Such a failure would also have serious effects on existing commercial and civil operations at BDR. The airport's location on a point extending into Long Island Sound creates a natural need for an alternate crosswind to runway to 11/29, namely the recently reconstructed runway 6/24. Such a loss would be a great detriment to the larger Bridgeport economy. Regarding neighborhood issues: Noise - I have lived in Lordship for over 35 years. Never have I been disturbed by airport operations. Do I hear aircraft? Yes. Do I get an occasional whiff of Avgas or jet fuel? Yes. Has any of this ever disturbed my way of life? No. Environment - The local environment has co-existed with airport operations since its founding. I see no reason that this should change in the future. In short, BDR needs to return to the economic asset it has been in the past. Let's get on with it!

31. 7/14/2019

I am commenting on and against the consideration to close KBDR runway 11-29, while I support the repositioning to allow full length use. - Having 2 available runways with 50deg variance in headings, allow use and successful takeoff and landing, when crosswind make the other runway less certain, thereby making the day to day airport operations more useful. - Noise abatement has been a large part of the community acceptance to KBDR, versus the whining and negative tones we saw in the 1980's and 1990's. only having rwy 6-24, will result in more noise complaints and negative attitudes, from those in both Lordship and Milford, due to the flight paths and distances. - Air traffic can successfully operate on both runways, with proper safety margins, particularly with the radar finally now available at KBDR. This works very well when operations are from combinations of smaller GA aircraft, higher speed Jet aircraft and especially when Helicopters and student training are put in the mix. - Lastly having rwy 11-29 allows traffic patterns to stay mostly away from the JSD (Sikorsky Heliport) and using only rwy 6-24, results in aircraft becoming much closer the JSD airspace and increased risk of an incident occurring. In closing I was not able to locate the reasoning anyone is considering the closing of rwy 11-29 and knowing these may alter me view. However please whatever the final answer is make a

workable plan, and get some highly skilled people involved so the Main St. flooding fiasco, that still continues today, is not repeated. Kindly.

32. Jeffrey Troccolo, C.F. Capital Management, 7/13/2019

We have been based at KBDR for 8 years and operate a category C turbojet aircraft. We utilize 11/29 very often and would find losing use of those runways to be detrimental to our flight operation. Having flexibility and the capability to utilize all runways at KBDR allows our business tool to be of maximum productivity for our client. Without that flexibility, the efficiency generated by owning this aircraft would deteriorate while travel delays and costs would increase. Maintaining and or improving the runways at KBDR, 11/29 in this instance, is vital not only to the success of our company and flight operation, but to all operations and the community at large. The investments made in our community as a result of the business being done thru the use of private aircraft is immense and KBDR is a valuable piece of that conduit. Limiting it, losing it or degrading it would send the wrong message and substantively reduce operations and money spend in the area. Please fund 11/29 rehabilitation and continue its operational readiness. I would also ask that you please consider standardized taxiway and airport markings as well as additional LPV approaches to all runways. The approaches are needed and would be a welcomed addition to the growth KBDR is currently seeing. Thank you. Jeffrey J. Troccolo Aviation Director C.F. Capital Management LLC 203-482-4982

33. David Faile, Friends of Sikorsky Airport, 7/13/2019

The Sikorsky Memorial Airport FAA Master Plan has the potential to negatively affect the Airport and consequently, the economy and welfare of the region.

Friends Of Sikorsky Airport (FOSA) is an organization made up of Airport users and Airport supporters. This includes an email list of over 480 active members and an additional two hundred members. We represent the Airport tenants, Airport users, and others supporting the Airport and work with the surrounding communities to insure we are the best neighbor possible while at the same time promoting the Airport's economic value to the region.

Modifying, shortening, or eliminating Runway 11-29 will have significant detrimental impacts for the businesses operating at the Airport, transient aircraft traffic, and the surrounding community.

The FAA is fully aware of the sensitivities to noise and aircraft operations and the impact on surrounding communities. Any modification to Runway 11-29, the preferred noise abatement runway, will cause concerns and bad favor with the areas of Lordship and the Milford shoreline because larger aircraft will be forced to use Runway 6-24 exclusively. Current operations strive to utilize Runway 11-29 when conditions permit and light winds allow the use of Runway 11 or 29.

Runway 11-29 is the longest runway at Sikorsky Memorial Airport and certain operations require that aircraft use the longer runway. With the decommissioning of the Harbor Power Plant and removal of the 511 Foot (ASL) stack, Runway 11 could well qualify for a GPS RNAV approach to serve the Airport during low ceiling and visibility conditions.

Weather conditions, specifically after the passage of a strong winter cold front, produce three to four days of strong winds that favor Runway 29. Locally, these conditions are known as "Seat

belts and sunglasses weather!” With winds above 25 Knots during these times, even the large aircraft operators must utilize Runway 29. Changes to Runway 11-29 that make the runway unusable by the larger aircraft will require them to land elsewhere. Experience shows that after a few times having to divert because of wind conditions, they will stop using Sikorsky Memorial Airport. This will be a negative impact on both the Airport and the surrounding economy.

A second flight school has recently started operations at the Airport. Having Runway 11-29 available allows them to operate without interruptions for strong northwest winds. The same applies to the many small and medium sized aircraft which could be forced to cancel operations if Runway 29 is not available.

Friends Of Sikorsky Airport recognizes the need to preserve and improve resources that, like our Federal Highways, navigable rivers, and harbors are a resource for the American economy. Maintaining and improving Runway 11-29 is a must for the preservation of the Airport and the economy of the State and region.

34. 7/13/2019

I have been flying out of KBDR for 22 years now. I remember when the airport had airline service and I actually used the service occasionally. It was a good feeling knowing that your dollars were staying local and the convenience factor was huge. I now work at the airport and although it doesn't have airline service it does support many corporate aircraft and a large amount of training and private aircraft. I am concerned that any loss of funding towards keeping runway 11/29 a safe well maintained runway would be detrimental to the entire airport. If runway 11/29 becomes unusable it may be the end for Sikorsky airport. It would impact jet traffic and small aircraft during certain times of the year. If aircraft keep having to divert, it would mean aircraft would move out to find more suitable bases and that impact would be substantial. In order for Sikorsky airport to maintain its competitive edge over other locations we must keep it safe and maintain the runway so that Sikorsky can stay one of the most important locations in the United States. I know that any cuts in funding to runway 11/29 would mean the company that I work for would have to revisit their 5 year outlook for our business and possibly consider alternatives. The cut in funding all makes sense until an accident happens from an aircraft trying to land in a crosswind. It would be only a matter of time.

35. 7/12/2019

We have been tenants of KBDR since 1978 and have been flying a high performance twin turboprop aircraft for the past 10 years. Runway 11/29 is a critical feature to our tenancy at the airport and emphatically recommend that the level of service brought by the current airport configuration be continued for the safety of ALL users of this strategically located facility.

36. 7/11/2019

BDR runway 11-29 is integral to the airport. As a private pilot of a light piston aircraft, I am aware it is the preferred runway for noise abatement. Larger jet traffic creates the most noise, hence I see it as crucial that the runway not only be maintained, but also be able to accommodate jet traffic and larger propeller operations, especially if there is a chance of commercial flights out of BDR in the future. Thank you, Nick

37. 7/11/2019

I'm not at all comfortable with the idea that runway 11-29 could be deemed un-needed. I have made many landings on R/W 29 in my time at Bridgeport and the one time I had an engine emergency I used runway 11 which I was very happy to have as it was aligned with my flight path. Since runway 11/29 is the longer of the two runways it seems counterproductive to remove that asset when any increase in traffic or size of traffic is likely to occur in the future.

38. 7/11/2019

It is very important for safety and noise abatement reasons to make sure that both runways, including runway 11-29, remain open and are left at their current length or even extended. Note that not only is there a lot of corporate jet and charter activity at the airport, but also flight schools. Forcing students into crosswind landings, or even a situation where weather conditions shift and the crosswind component exceeds an aircraft or pilot's capabilities, is a significant risk if 11-29 is closed or shortened.

39. 7/11/2019

KBDR is the only airport in Southern CT and at a time when the area is struggling to retain and attract businesses, transportation infrastructure is of paramount importance. Having both 06-24 and 11-29 available is extremely important to the long term ability of the airport to attract users and revenue. Ideally, the master plan would call for the expansion of 11-29 to allow commercial service to return to KBDR at a time where all of the Fairfield county users go to NYC airports or KHPN. There is a significant un-tapped and under served market for commercial service to places like Orlando, Miami, Ft Lauderdale, Tampa, Denver, Salt Lake City and the Caribbean and other such vacation and/or business destinations. Many people in the area work in NYC and have business related travel and would easily prefer going to KBDR over NYC airports for commercial travel. Preserving, updating and maintaining both 11-29 and 06-24 are important to allow CT to start to have a more business friendly climate to attract employers who would utilize KBDR as transportation infrastructure if it was an available option.

40. 7/11/2019

I am the chief pilot for RC Jet, LLC and we fly a Lear 45. We fly into KBDR often. I want to stress the importance of keeping runway 29 a primary runway. Runway 11/29 is slightly longer than 6/24. There are occasions when the temperatures are high and we need the extra length in order to accommodate the fuel necessary to complete a trip. Also, the crosswind factor is very critical. If 11/29 is designated a less important runway and becomes an "additional" runway as classified by the FAA, this would force the use of runway 6/24 in high wind conditions and either cause a cancellation in a departing flight or a diversion if flying in. This would mean landing at another airport and incurring fees and delays. Runway 11/29 is needed to make KBDR a viable destination for jet aircraft.

41. 7/11/2019

Considered modification or termination of Runway 29-11 at KBDR is counter-productive to the needs of the aircraft operators as well as the surrounding community. Please register my opposition to any action that would downgrade the utility of the airport based on the stated considerations. I operate an aircraft from that airport, the location and design of which is superior to other airports in the vicinity.

42. 7/11/2019

The importance of runway 11-29 to the airport is paramount. This would limit the operational viability of the airfield and risk losing many jobs. Do not close 11-29!

43. Annette Macaluso, City of Bridgeport (Airport), 7/11/2019

I have been an employee of the City of Bridgeport/Sikorsky Memorial Airport with over thirty years of service, and I fully support keeping and updating Runway 11/29 at Sikorsky Memorial Airport. Shortening or abandoning Runway 11/29, would not only hurt the tenant users/airport community but would cause a safety issue in case of an emergency, and I have witnessed many aircraft emergencies over my tenure. Airports are all about safety and the possibility of shortening or closing RW 11/29 would be a huge safety issue in my opinion. Lives over money to keep RW 11/29 funded, is what should be taken into account as the Master Plan progresses. Investors have always been interested in Sikorsky Memorial Airport over the years and the possibility of closing RW 11/29 would be a detrimental to Fairfield County and the aviation community.

44. 7/11/2019

I am in total support of PRESERVING runway 11-29. I have been flying out of BDR since 1978, and it is my experience that the strongest winds at the airport are out of the northwest thus creating the necessity for this runway to remain open. Shutting this runway down would cause difficult cross wind conditions for general aviation aircraft at BDR.

45. 7/11/2019

Maintaining both 11/29 & 6/24 runways to their full capability is critical to preserving air safety as well as insuring that BDR will remain a vital economic asset to the State of Connecticut. With increasing competition for corporate investment from other states, it is critical we maintain full capability at BDR to support economic growth in Bridgeport, Fairfield Country and Connecticut. As a user of the airport for over four decades and the CEO of a company serving the aerospace industry, I know first hand how valuable airport resources are to economic growth and therefore, strongly urge the FAA and State of Connecticut to invest the resources to expand rather than diminish BDR. Thank you, A. Hollander

46. 7/11/2019

As a pilot based at KBDR keeping and expanding runway 11-29 is important to the flying safety of GA aircraft, but will if expanded provide the economic growth to the area via airlines and businesses electing to establish a presence around the airport

47. 7/11/2019

To Whom it May Concern, I am the owner of a Cirrus SR22 that is parked at Volo Aviation. I read with great concern the possibility that runway 11-29 may have a limited future at BDR. Given strong coastal winds we often encounter at BDR, I can tell you with great certainty that eliminating that runway would reduce flexibility to fly and significantly reduce safety on days I choose to fly but get caught with unexpected shifting winds. I understand there may also be

discussion about potential limited funding under FAA guidelines that would result in keeping 11-29 active, but shortening and reducing its width. As a pilot, length and width are huge safety cushions, particularly at coastal airports that frequently experience high and gusty winds. Any change with respect to 11-29 that compromises safety would cause me to seriously consider switching my home airport from BDR back to HPN. It seems to me that any consideration to reduce the usefulness or eliminate 11-29 all together is penny wise and pound foolish. While costs may be reduced on the margin, future revenues will likely be far more adversely impacted causing a downward spiral for BDR. Rather than making a plan to reduce services, how about we make a plan to invest in the infrastructure to not only keep existing tenants at BDR, but also attract new ones. Sincerely, Bradley Purcell owner N355WT

48. Joseph Gresko, City of Stratford, 3/9/2019

Thank you for the information at the first TAC meeting. Please also communicate the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) coping meeting scheduled for March 21 at 5:30 at 999 Broad Street in Bridgeport. <https://www.ct.gov/ceq/cwp/view.asp?a=987&q=249438#Scoping>