

Glenda Wiles

From: Tami Ritchson <castleahh@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, June 28, 2014 1:15 AM
To: dan@rpa-hln.com
Cc: Glenda Wiles
Subject: attention Ravalli County Airport

Daniel M. Norderud, AICP
Environmental Studies Division Manager
Robert Peccia & Associates, Inc.

According to an article in the Ravalli Republic, dated June 26, 2014,

http://ravallirepublic.com/news/local/article_187e6586-fda4-11e3-9083-001a4bcf887a.html

the preferred alternative in the Ravalli County Airport EA is to expand the runway and purchase more land for 'airport development'.

1. What percentage of Ravalli County's residents, from Florence to Sula, need 126 acres of land for airport development?
2. According to the article, the county airport board chair, Dave Hedditch, is quoted as saying, "There won't be larger jets," he said. "There will be more – maybe one or two a week more.

As a Hamilton resident, one or two more jets flying over my house each week will have a measurable negative impact on both my quality of life, and my home's potential resale value.

3. Dave is quoted earlier in the article: Hedditch said there would be no cost to county taxpayers.

Due to time constraints, I am unable to read the full EA before it's comment deadline. Therefore, I am unable to verify Dave's comment. However, common sense tells me that it will cost more to maintain 5200 foot runway/4200 foot taxiway/126 acre development combined, than it costs to maintain a 4200 foot runway. Many Ravalli County services and infrastructure are already underfunded. Any further cuts, in order to fund expanded airport maintenance, will negatively impact many county residents. Any tax increase to fund expanded airport maintenance will also have a negative impact.

Conclusion: Expanded maintenance costs and noise pollution, combined with limited benefit to most county residents, make Robert Peccia & Associates' preferred alternative unacceptable.