

Dean Saucier

The purpose of this study remains a mystery as in no way is the state of Connecticut financially, or otherwise in a position to change the use of the acreage from that of an airport to any other use.

As was stated to the researchers several months ago, in addition to changing any portion of the airport to non-airport use which could result in large scale unemployment of the employees of companies at the airport, the total economic contribution of the Hartford-Brainard Airport in 2010 totaled 368 jobs and \$44.9 million of output, including \$21.3 million of labor income, and \$1.4 million in state tax revenues (CAA Data). As of Dec 2011, there are 120 based aircraft with 81,474 operations (FAA Data). The economic data presented is DIRECT economic benefit as opposed to the additional indirect benefit of Brainard Airport (HFD) such as income, business and sales tax revenues of businesses that abut HFD, who have chosen to be near the airport for transportation convenience, as well as hotels, restaurants and taxis whose employees pay income and sales taxes, business taxes on their revenue and other institutions that benefit from the economic engine known as HFD. Additionally, (From the FAA Airport Sponsor and Airport User Rights and Responsibilities manual) "Use on Reasonable and Not Unjustly Discriminatory Terms"

Grant Assurance 22, Economic Nondiscrimination, requires, in pertinent part, that the sponsor of a federally obligated airport:

"...will make its airport available as an airport for public use on reasonable terms, and without unjust discrimination, to all types, kinds, and classes of aeronautical uses." Assurance 22(a)

"...may establish such equal and not unjustly discriminatory conditions to be met by all users of the airport as may be necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the airport."

Assurance 22(h) "...may...limit any given type, kind, or class of aeronautical use of the airport if such action is necessary for the safe operation of the airport or...to serve the civil aviation needs of the public."

"Assurance 22(i) Subsection (h) qualifies subsection (a) and subsection (i) represents an exception to subsection (a) to permit the sponsor to exercise control of the airport sufficient to preclude unsafe and efficient use of navigable airspace which would be detrimental to the civil aviation needs of the public. However, any airport sponsor restrictions on aeronautical activities based upon safety and efficiency under Assurance 22(i) must be adequately justified and supported, and they must be approved in advance by the FAA.

In all cases, the FAA is the final arbiter regarding aviation safety and will make the determination regarding the reasonableness of any proposed measure to restrict, limit, or deny aeronautical access to the airport. The FAA considers it inappropriate to provide federal assistance for improvements to airports where the benefits of such improvements will not be fully realized due to inherent restrictions on aeronautical activities.

The bottom line is under no circumstances may the State change any portion of Brainard Airport as Grant assurances are in effect for 20 years from the date of the last federal grant accepted by the airport sponsor, which in Brainard's case is 2016. Thus ALL of the Grant assurances are all in effect until 2036, assuming Brainard Airport accepts no further Federal Grants.

This is a futile exercise. The economies of scale preclude the changing of any portion of Brainard airport to other than aeronautical use and the tax revenue from Brainard Airport, directly and indirectly are substantial. Thus any change would adversely affect the economic engine that is Brainard Airport as well as create additional legal and other costs associated with any change. .

Thank you.

Dean Saucier

NBAA - Regional Representative - Northeast

PO Box 3302 - BDL

Windsor Locks, CT 06096-3302

860-292-1994

[dsaucier@nbaa.org](mailto:dsaucier@nbaa.org)

1200 G St NW

Washington, DC 20005

202-783-4472

[www.nbaa.org](http://www.nbaa.org)