

DOCUMENT #1: PDK Policy Proposals Presented by Mr. Richard Ossoff and by the Public to be considered at the June 8, 2005 AAB Meeting:

SUBSTANTIVELY, the seven AAB draft PDK Mission/Policy recommendations approved on June 8, 2005 (out of original Items 1-8 below), do not include any of the nine (9) provisions that were proposed by the public for discussion at the June 8, 2005 AAB meeting for possible inclusion in the document. For your convenience, those nine items (#s 9-17) and the earlier eight Ossoff items (#1-8) are indicated at the below in this message.

PROCEDURALLY, none of the nine proposed statements were even allowed to be discussed at the June 8, 2005 by the AAB's Chairman Richard Ossoff, except for item #10, which Mr. Ossoff brought up himself and then, instead of improving the item to make it air-tight, helped to kill. Not a single one of the five AAB members who were present at the meeting was even prepared to entertain discussion of any of the other eight items (#9, and 11-17) above, despite strong requests from the public to do so.

VIEWED MORE BROADLY, the AAB's proposed Master Plan & Policy statement draft excludes almost all policy statements that would mandate substantive, operationally effective, restrictions that could guide PDK development in the future. Instead, the policies state boiler plate, feel good, common sense requirements that one would assume would be expected of any County-run operation, such as that the Airport be operated in a fiscally responsible manner and in accord with BOD mandates.

In justifying the exclusion of items #9-17 from even being discussed at the AAB meeting on June 8, 2005, the argument was made that all nine of the provisions were already adequately addressed by the other seven of the Ossoff/AAB policy proposals that were approved and forwarded to the Board of Commissioners in June 2005.

Even a cursory glance at the the nine public proposals below, however, will show that substantively they are NOT covered in the seven draft policy proposals that have been forwarded to the BOC by the AAB. Procedurally, the Public Involvement Process that was recommended by the FAA regulations and specifically mandated and funded by the Board of Commissioners was ignored--and indeed flagrantly violated--when the AAB refused even to allow discussion of eight of the nine proposed policy provisions recommended by the public.

The following are the eight (later reduced to seven) Ossoff/AAB proposals (#1-8) and the nine (#9-17) public proposals available to the PDK Airport Advisory Board for their June 8, 2005 discussion:

Proposed PDK MISSION/VISION STATEMENT DRAFT—provisions only, without any editorial comment (with additions for discussion 6/8/05)

Mission Statement

Our Mission . . . To Operate a Business Oriented Airport in a Safe, Efficient, and Fiscally Responsible manner and to Preserve the Quality of Life Recognizing a Partnership between Residential and General Aviation Interests.

Core Policies

The airport shall:

- (1) not permit scheduled passenger or cargo services. These operations are deemed inconsistent with the mission of the airport;
- (2) be highly sensitive to environmental and quality of life issues, with special attention to noise abatement, in planning, policy development and operations;
- (3) provide superior facilities and service appropriate to the evolving needs of the general aviation user community;
- (4) effectively serve the broad economic interests of the County and surrounding metropolitan region, importantly serving as a direct and indirect economic generator for the County;
- (5) directly, and through the Board of Commissioners and its appointees, consult with neighborhood representatives and other interested parties in planning and development of airport policy, endeavoring to build a cooperative partnership of community and aviation interests;
- (6) operate in a fiscally responsible and financially self-sufficient manner;
- (7) serve aviation interests in a manner consistent with the adopted policies and goals of the Board of Commissioners of DeKalb County, including the County's applicable Comprehensive Land Use plan;
- (8) accomplish this mission in compliance with applicable federal and state public law governing the operations of the airport and County obligations to the flying public.

Additional Suggested Policy Items Received Before the May 18 deadline:

- (9) make no expansion of its current boundaries except when: (1) the property is required for safety and can be designated as a permanent green space, or (2) the property is acquired for noise abatement purposes and will be restricted to compatible land use, which does not include expansion of runways and taxiways.

(10) use the PDK Master Plan and subsequent Airport Layout Plan to insure that no engineering steps can be taken that could allow the Airport's designation to be changed from a Class II to a Class III status.

(11) review and propose changes to ensure the current fleet mix of local and transient aircraft does not encourage or force smaller aircraft to use other airports.

(12) address the issue of the weight limit at the airport and establish what that limit is for normal use;

(13) prepare a fact sheet on key issues such as why the airport cannot become a scheduled passenger or cargo airport to guide the process;

(14) develop a process for determining off-Airport impacts, particularly negative impacts, on the Community and define ways to compensate for any adverse impacts on the citizens of DeKalb County;

(15) develop an on-going program to encourage positive relations and interaction between the Airport and the Community;

(16) develop an effective institutional framework to insure coordination and communication among County departments and Airport decision-makers;

(16) develop an effective process for insuring that the Part 150 annual noise evaluation recommendation that was approved by the BOC and the FAA is implemented and brought before the BOC and the citizens of DeKalb County.

Compiled by Larry Foster
Vice President, Hawthorne Civic Association

WHY ITEMS #9-17 ARE NOT ADEQUATELY COVERED IN ITEMS #1-8 ABOVE:

There are very great differences between most of the general policy statements in items 1-8, above, and the specific policy guidelines/restrictions in items 9-17, above.

For example , Item #9—included in both the existing PDK Master Plan Policy Statement of 1992, as well as in the Consultants' proposed policy draft— prohibits expansion of the current boundaries of PDK Airport, except under certain specified circumstances. This item is NOT adequately covered (as AAB members suggested) in the vague feel-good statement that the Airport shall be highly sensitive to environmental and quality of life issues. It is understandable why the Airport should want this statement removed, since it has already violated this policy restriction recently in its expansion on the North side of the airport, but the public wants this restriction retained.

Another, even more critical example is provided in Item #10, which would prohibit the airport taking any engineering steps that could allow the Airport to be changed from a Class II to a Class III Airport. This the crux of the whole matter. If PDK Airport is to remain a Class II general aviation Airport, this statement (perhaps as revised to make it airtight) is ESSENTIAL. This Item is NOT covered by Item #1 saying that scheduled passenger or cargo services shall not be allowed. Regularly scheduled passenger services were briefly introduced into PDK Airport (even as a Class II Airport), for example, but were discontinued when the company in question went bankrupt during the Reagan recession of the early 1980s. Prohibiting regularly scheduled aircraft from using PDK is also, in our view, essential, but it is emphatically not the same as taking the necessary steps to expressly prohibit any engineering steps that could allow PDK Airport eventually to become a Class III airport, thereby servicing much heavier Aircraft.

Although Item #10 was discussed by Mr Ossoff at the June 8, 2005 AAB meeting, he carefully guided the discussion to reject the item on two grounds: (1) that it might conflict with future FAA regulations, (2) that the item was not otherwise airtight, as written. Instead of correcting these deficiencies (for example, by adding a provision saying Class II and Class III as specified under FAA regulations current as of the date when these policy declarations are approved, Mr. Ossoff used such concerns as an excuse to shoot down this ESSENTIAL restriction. Ditto for the argument that this statement was not complete and airtight, as written. This deficiency could be corrected, if the AAB had wanted to do so, but instead this was used to shoot down the policy provision.

Items #11-17 could be analyzed similarly, showing how that they also are NOT adequately provided for in the vague generalities that comprise most of Items #1-8, but time does not permit me to do so now. Please let me know if you need such further assistance, and I shall be happy to provide it.

Again, thank you very much for your careful consideration of these important policy issues.

Larry Foster
Vice President, Hawthorne Civic Association