

READINGTON Township COMMITTEE
READINGTON TOWNSHIP, HUNTERDON COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

HOLLAND BROOK SCHOOL
READINGTON Township, NEW JERSEY

JANUARY 17, 2006
6:30 P.M.

IN THE MATTER OF

SOLBERG AIRPORT

.....

PUBLIC HEARING

B E F O R E:

THE READINGTON TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

MAYOR GERARD SHAMEY

FRANK GATTI

JULIA ALLEN

THOMAS AURIEMMA

BEATRICE MUIR

VITA MEKOVETZ, Township Clerk

A P P E A R A N C E S:

CONNELL FOLEY, LLP
85 Livingston Avenue
Roseland, New Jersey 07068
Attorneys for the Township Committee
BY: JAMES RHATICAN, ESQ.

SHARON DRAGAN, ESQ.
Attorney for the Township Committee

JACQUELINE KLAPP REPORTING SERVICES
Certified Shorthand Reporters
59 Old Croton Road
Flemington, New Jersey 08822
(908) 782-0874

1 MAYOR SHAMEY: Good evening, ladies
2 and gentlemen, can everybody hear me okay? In
3 the back as well?

4 John, you can hear me in the back?
5 Good. Welcome to the January 17, 2006,
6 meeting of the Readington Township Committee,
7 which I would like to begin by announcing that
8 all laws governing the Open Public Meetings
9 Law have been met.

10 (Discussion on other matters.)

11 MAYOR SHAMEY: I would like to begin
12 by thanking all of you who have come out this
13 evening. It appears, at least thus far, the
14 weather is cooperating, but I guess we will
15 see about that. The level of interest in this
16 issue, that is the future of Solberg Airport,
17 is something that has been on the front
18 burner, if you will, for many years, perhaps
19 as many as 30 or 40 years. The level of
20 interest in this issue has not only been high,
21 but it has been sustained over quite a long
22 period of time.

23 Many of you who were here for our
24 meeting in August, at which time the Committee
25 took into consideration the passage of the \$22

1 million bond ordinance for acquisition of the
2 Solberg site, that bond ordinance was
3 withdrawn on August 22, 2005. Many of you in
4 the audience tonight, and many of you not in
5 the audience tonight, have been engaged and
6 followed the public discussion on a wide range
7 of issues in this Township affecting our
8 quality of life for many years, and we thank
9 you for your involvement and for your
10 participation in our meetings concerning these
11 issues and concerning life here in Readington.

12 We are grateful for the active
13 involvement of all concerned. This meeting
14 logistically was quite interesting and quite a
15 project to put together. I would like to,
16 first of all, thank the School Board for the
17 use of the Holland Brook School, I'd like to
18 thank Mike Scarro, who has helped us
19 tremendously with regard to some of the
20 technical aspects in our presentation this
21 evening, our Township Administrator, Vita
22 Mekovetz, has been working feverishly to make
23 sure everything falls into place and this
24 comes off with a minimal of hitches or
25 glitches; and Mr. Kevin Fisher, our Buildings

1 and Grounds Director, he and his staff have
2 worked very hard to put this together this
3 evening.

4 Finally, our police department. I
5 would like to thank Jim Paganesi and his
6 department for their assistance in tonight's
7 meeting.

8 Why are we here tonight? We are here
9 tonight to do three things: The first thing
10 we are here to do is to update the public on
11 the status of the negotiations that have been
12 ongoing with the Solberg family, the owners of
13 Solberg Aviation, since late summer 2005.

14 Secondly, we are here to provide
15 information to the public via our consultants,
16 who I will introduce momentarily, regarding
17 the site itself, and regarding their
18 perception and their opinion with regard to
19 any potential impacts to the site and to the
20 Township and its residents under various
21 development proposals that have been discussed
22 in the course of these negotiations with
23 regard to the airport.

24 Finally, we are here to open up the
25 microphone to you, the public, to pose

1 questions to our consultants and to the
2 Committee, and also to give you the oppor-
3 tunity to present comments on any portion of
4 the presentation or any aspect of the issue of
5 the Solberg Airport, its future development
6 and anything else related to that issue.

7 This public information meeting is
8 something that the Committee feels strongly is
9 necessary. There has been a lot of informa-
10 tion bandied about, I guess, back and forth
11 over the years, and it has sort of ebbed and
12 flowed with the times, since I have been a
13 member of this Committee and attended numerous
14 meetings that were heavily attended by the
15 public, and there has been a great interest in
16 this.

17 Holding this public information
18 meeting is also consistent with the professed
19 desires of Solberg Aviation to have as much
20 public involvement in this process as
21 possible, as reflected most recently in Mr.
22 Solberg's November 2, 2005, letter that was
23 sent out to all of the residents in which he
24 states, among other things, "That is why," he
25 stated, "We are as interested as you are in

1 preserving the quality of life that we enjoy,
2 and that is why we have promised the residents
3 of Readington that we would never make any
4 major changes to the airport without complete
5 public involvement."

6 So it is with that in mind, and I
7 would say the Committee is in complete
8 agreement with that position, and that is that
9 we do need as much public involvement as
10 possible. Passions have run quite high on
11 both sides. I hate to use the words "both
12 sides" of this issue, but passions have run
13 high on this issue, and that is why we need
14 your input and your help. We felt that it was
15 in the best interests, and we continue to
16 think it is in the best interests of the
17 public that we provide to you as much
18 information as possible with regard to this
19 issue.

20 I would like to make it very clear
21 that one thing we are not here to do this
22 evening is take any action whatsoever with
23 respect to this issue. In order to take any
24 action with respect to any of the proposals
25 that have been discussed with respect to

1 expansion or not of the airport, or to
2 initiate any actions consistent with the
3 Township's authority or power of eminent
4 domain, our purpose here this evening is
5 purely informational.

6 In August, following the August 22nd
7 Township Committee meeting on the bond
8 ordinance that was withdrawn, the Township and
9 Solberg Aviation agreed to pursue good faith
10 negotiations to develop a preservation plan
11 for the airport and the open space surrounding
12 the airport with several elements in mind.
13 One was to meet the longstanding Township
14 goals for open space and natural resource
15 preservation. I would take this opportunity
16 to point out to the public that open space
17 preservation, natural resources, critical
18 habitat preservation are issues that have been
19 of a concern to this Township for many, many,
20 many years. Readington Township has a long
21 and profound history of open space
22 preservation and quality of life preservation
23 that dates back to the late '70s, when the
24 first Open Space Committee was formed.

25 Secondly, the second element of one of

1 our goals is to maintain the Solberg Airport,
2 to preserve the Solberg Airport and its rather
3 unique heritage.

4 Finally, to ensure the preservation of
5 the quality of life that we, in Readington,
6 have come to enjoy.

7 It was against this backdrop that the
8 negotiations commenced, and the framework
9 under which the negotiations commenced, and
10 the atmosphere under which the negotiations
11 commenced was, in my viewpoint, positive.

12 In August, the August 22nd meeting, I
13 think we all left here feeling like, "Okay,
14 let's take pause, let's take a look at what we
15 have, let's take a look at both sides of this
16 issue or all sides of this issue, more
17 accurately, and let's see what we can do here.

18 Let's roll up our sleeves and let's try to
19 come up with a plan that meets the goals that
20 I have just enunciated.

21 So it was an optimistic night, at
22 least from that standpoint. I know that Mr.
23 Solberg felt that way, I was happy to hear him
24 say at that meeting with regard to the fact
25 that we had withdrawn the bond ordinance and

1 agreed to commence good faith negotiations, I
2 was happy to hear him say -- and this is from
3 the transcript of that meeting -- that, "It is
4 a win for open space preservation. Now
5 residents of our town can continue to enjoy
6 the open space that we preserved without
7 spending additional tax dollars. We are
8 determined to make sure no development
9 occurs."

10 And he went on to say that evening
11 that keeping the property green and open will
12 be a cornerstone in our future negotiations
13 with the Township.

14 It was also at that time that a letter
15 went out from the Solberg family, again, that
16 continued the positive and optimistic
17 atmosphere that had been seemingly established
18 at that time when the Solberg family stated in
19 the letter that went out to residents, "We
20 were pleased to discover the majority of
21 residents in Readington are happy with the way
22 things are." And they closed by stating, "We
23 have no intention of doing anything that would
24 hurt Readington or damage their special
25 quality of life."

1 So again, optimism ran high, and the
2 negotiations started.

3 Earlier I had enunciated several goals
4 the Township, in negotiations, sought to
5 advance, and if the negotiations resume, which
6 it is my hope that they do, that there will
7 continue to be, those would continue to be our
8 goals. But I also wish to make it very clear
9 that among those goals is not now, nor has it
10 ever been, a desire to wrest control of a
11 family-owned business, one that has been owned
12 by a family for upwards of 60 years. I am
13 approximating, but I think that is a fairly
14 good number. So the negotiations started, as
15 you will hear from last year's Mayor, Mr.
16 Gatti, Frank Gatti, who, along with
17 Committeewoman Julia Allen, participated in
18 some hearings with the Solbergs. Several
19 meetings were held.

20 Unfortunately, we were not able to
21 come to an agreement, or we have not been able
22 to come to an agreement as of yet that in the
23 Committee's view would satisfy the goals that
24 I have already enunciated. And the goals that
25 in our view seem to be what this community

1 wants, and that is preservation of our quality
2 of life, maintenance of the Solberg Airport,
3 maintenance of the open space surrounding the
4 Solberg Airport, continuation of the Balloon
5 Festival, continuation of all of the wonderful
6 events that take place on that site, and
7 continuation of the operation of the business
8 by the family that has operated it for some 60
9 plus years.

10 The negotiations started and discus-
11 sions went back and forth, and negotiations
12 came to an impasse recently, as Mr. Gatti will
13 speak to momentarily. And the reason that the
14 negotiations came to an impasse is that it
15 appears that Solberg Aviation remains
16 committed to lengthening the runways, widening
17 the runways, increasing the thickness of the
18 runways with a view towards attracting a
19 corporate jet business environment and
20 facility.

21 I received -- Solberg Aviation was
22 represented in these negotiations by Attorney
23 Lawrence Berger of Morristown. I received a
24 telephone call from Mr. Berger about a week or
25 two ago, and he asked me, he confirmed what I

1 had already learned as to where the
2 negotiations stood, and indicated to me that
3 the problem, as he saw it, and -- backing up a
4 step, it is unclear to this Committee what Mr.
5 Berger's role is in this issue. It is unclear
6 whether he is a stakeholder, and we just
7 didn't, quite frankly, know that. But he
8 indicated to me in a telephone conversation
9 that Solberg Aviation cannot have a viable --
10 cannot run a viable business without the
11 ability to sell jet fuel.

12 He also indicated to me, much to my
13 dismay, that he, he didn't say he, strike
14 that, that Solberg Aviation was prepared to
15 throw as much money as necessary at the next
16 election in order to wrest control of two
17 seats on the Township Committee. And I asked
18 him why would they want to do that, a perhaps
19 somewhat loaded question, I don't know. And
20 his answer to me was so they can get what they
21 want.

22 More recently, former Mayor Gatti had
23 a couple of telephone conversations with Thor
24 Solberg, where he confirmed to Mr. Gatti that
25 he, too, Solberg Aviation was ready and able

1 to throw as much money as they could at the
2 next election and try to gain control of the
3 two seats that would become available in
4 April. Now, it is neither fitting nor
5 appropriate to discuss politics in a Township
6 Committee meeting, but for purposes of this
7 issue, I thought those are pieces of
8 information that this Township needs to have.

9 The conversation, unfortunately, ended
10 with Mr. Solberg indicating to Mr. Gatti, "Let
11 the war begin."

12 I think I speak for the entire
13 Committee when I say I am disheartened by a
14 rhetoric of that nature. We are not
15 interested in letting a war begin, that is not
16 our goal. So we are prepared to move forward
17 with negotiations and, hopefully, they can
18 resume. But they have reached an impasse for
19 the reasons I have just stated, and Mr. Gatti
20 will flesh that all out for you shortly. So
21 that is the status of the negotiations
22 tonight.

23 I would also like to point out that I
24 am disappointed that the Solbergs have chosen
25 not to attend tonight's meeting. They were

1 informed of the meeting on January 3rd
2 verbally by Mr. Gatti.

3 MR. GATTI: That is correct.

4 MAYOR SHAMEY: But they were sent a
5 letter, Mr. Berger was sent a letter, and I am
6 saddened by their non-attendance. But I am
7 not going to dwell on it.

8 You are here? I can't see that far
9 back. I'm sorry, Mrs. Nagle, would you like
10 to come up and participate in this meeting?
11 We can't hear you.

12 MRS. NAGLE: I am here to observe
13 tonight.

14 MAYOR SHAMEY: You don't wish to
15 participate?

16 MRS. NAGLE: The comments you just
17 made are --

18 MAYOR SHAMEY: I can't hear a word
19 that you said. Why don't we wait, and then
20 you will have an opportunity to be heard; is
21 that okay?

22 In any event, and I apologize, I
23 didn't know you were here, I couldn't see that
24 far back, and I think Mr. Nagle is here as
25 well. If my eyesight is okay. If you would

1 like to come up front so you can see and hear
2 better, I would welcome that.

3 There will be a screen coming down
4 with quite a bit of information presented and
5 you will have a much better view. We did
6 reserve seats for you and Thor and Lorraine.
7 There are seats right in the front, and you
8 will see a whole lot better and I would like
9 you to do that.

10 So now we must turn our attention to
11 what options we have to meet the longstanding
12 goals of this community, absent an agreement
13 with the Solbergs. But also, keeping in mind
14 that the Township Committee remains willing
15 and able to resume negotiations.

16 Tonight we will be hearing from
17 independent experts in various fields,
18 environmental and aviation and such, to detail
19 what our situation is today and what our
20 options are. I will outline who they are in a
21 moment.

22 The most important thing to me and to
23 this Committee, and I think for all of us on
24 the Committee, is to retain decision-making
25 power over development of the site here in

1 Readington. Hopefully, in conjunction with
2 the owners of the property, so that it is by
3 mutual agreement, an agreement that serves the
4 best interests of all of the residents and
5 respects the property rights of the owners at
6 the same time.

7 The thing with airports is they are
8 unique, and once an airport is approved to
9 handle certain types of aircraft, once an
10 airport receives funding from the Federal
11 Government, that is the FAA, a great deal of
12 control, if not total control is lost to the
13 Township. Once those funds are received from
14 the Federal Government, restrictions become
15 much more difficult with operations and such,
16 and I am not an expert in that field and we do
17 have an expert here in that area. I will
18 leave it at that. We will hear his
19 presentation and have an opportunity to
20 address questions to him.

21 Solberg Airport is already listed as a
22 reliever airport in the FAA's National Plan,
23 and again, we have an experienced aviation
24 planning expert who will report on that. We
25 have several environmental experts who will

1 speak to these points and will also speak with
2 respect to the impact of various development
3 proposals that have been discussed during the
4 course of these negotiations.

5 In addition, we have an acoustical
6 expert, a noise expert who will speak to the
7 impacts from the various proposals that have
8 been discussed. Finally, we will hear from
9 anyone who would like to direct questions or
10 make a statement. The chief goal of this
11 Committee is to make sure whatever course of
12 action we eventually take, we will retain
13 decision-making power over future development.

14 I believe that Readington should be planned
15 by Readington and not by the Federal
16 Government, nor by the State Government, and
17 when I say Readington, I mean Readington and
18 all of its residents.

19 So what we are going to do tonight, we
20 are going to leave the stage and we are going
21 to have a series of presentations. We will
22 start with Mr. Gatti, who will outline the
23 series of negotiations that took place, and
24 some of the details with respect to those
25 negotiations. We will hear from Tom

1 Auffenorde -- did I pronounce that correctly?

2 MR. AUFFENORDE: Yes.

3 MAYOR SHAMEY: From Ecosciences, an
4 environmental firm. We will hear from Dr.
5 Wade Wander, who is an expert, generally, in
6 the area of threatened and endangered species.
7 We will hear from Township Planner Michael
8 Sullivan briefly with respect to a planning
9 report he prepared five years ago, perhaps,
10 roughly, and we will hear from John Erdreich,
11 who is with Ostergaard Acoustical Consultants,
12 who is an expert in noise and vibration. We
13 will hear from an aviation expert by the name
14 of Rich Golaszewski, and what I envisioned
15 here and what we have discussed prior to the
16 meeting was to have each of the consultants
17 make a brief presentation with respect to the
18 site itself, and then, after hearing Mr.
19 Golaszewski's presentation with respect to the
20 various proposals in advance, to give their
21 input and expertise and opinion as to the
22 impacts of those various development
23 scenarios.

24 We will then open it up, open up the
25 microphone for questions, first of the

1 consultants and, as a matter of logistics, the
2 best way to do this would be to first ask
3 residents if they have any questions of the
4 consultants with respect to their
5 presentations, because while doing so, the
6 screen can remain down, in case anyone needs
7 to refer to it. There will be a microphone up
8 front here for the residents, and there is a
9 microphone over here for the consultants to
10 respond. Once that has been concluded, and
11 there is no longer a need for the screen, we
12 will return up here and take questions and
13 comments from the public. That is we, the
14 Township Committee.

15 I would ask for your patience, I would
16 ask, because we are going to try your
17 patience, because there will be a lot of
18 detailed information presented. We requested
19 that it be presented succinctly and as
20 concisely as possible, and in as
21 understandable a fashion as can be mustered
22 for non-experts such as myself.

23 When it comes time for questions of
24 the experts and the Committee, and if Mr. or
25 Mrs. Nagle wish to be heard, questions for

1 them. I ask again for your patience. I ask
2 you be courteous, I ask that we speak one at a
3 time and that is the only way we will get
4 anything done here this evening.

5 And finally, to repeat, this is an
6 information session only. There will be no
7 public action taken this evening. With that,
8 if you will give us one moment to go down
9 there, so Mr. Gatti can get set up and we will
10 proceed with the presentation. Thank you very
11 much.

12 (Off the record.)

13 MR. GATTI: Good evening, everyone,
14 back in August when it was announced that the
15 Township and the Solbergs were entering into
16 negotiations, a 60-day time frame was set as a
17 guideline. Tonight, 150 days later, we are
18 giving the residents an opportunity to hear
19 where we stand and to separate the facts from
20 the fiction about this airport.

21 The Township negotiating team
22 consisted of Julia Allen, myself, and Jay
23 Rhatican, our attorney from Connell Foley. We
24 met with the three members of the Solberg
25 family, that being Thor, Suzie and Lorraine,

1 as well as Larry Berger, their friend and
2 long-time business partner, at least that is
3 how he was introduced to me. At this time, I
4 can say at each meeting we were greeted warmly
5 and respectfully by the Solberg family, and
6 both sides took negotiations very seriously.
7 And we did our best to think outside of the
8 box and, at the appropriate time, we consulted
9 with experts and businesses in the area on an
10 as-needed basis.

11 Tonight some of these experts are
12 here, and you will hear what they have to say,
13 and you will also have an opportunity to ask
14 questions. In total, we met six times
15 formally with the Solberg family, and that
16 would be September 8th, September 22nd,
17 October 14th, December 14th, December 17th and
18 January 2nd, which was our last meeting.

19 In addition, I had an opportunity to
20 meet with the family on an informal basis on
21 Saturday, and it gave me an opportunity to
22 understand further what we are all looking to
23 do and state our positions.

24 As Mayor Shamey had initially said
25 earlier in the comments, the objective of the

1 Township Committee is to preserve the open
2 space, preserve critical and sensitive
3 environmental issues of the tract; promote
4 sound planning, which this Township has done
5 for many years; preserve the airport
6 character, as well as the surrounding area.
7 And I will say that I have heard since August
8 22nd from many residents in this Township
9 about the quality of life and how they want it
10 preserved.

11 Next. Just to recap where we were in
12 August, this was the Township's means of
13 achieving those objectives. The Township was
14 looking to acquire the 726 acre property, and
15 it was to include 75 acres of airport and 650
16 acres of open space. The Township was
17 prepared to raise sufficient funds for the
18 acquisition of this property at market value.

19 Most of the funds were to be refunded with
20 State preservation grants.

21 The Township was to permanently
22 preserve the airport and all of the open space
23 surrounding the airport. The airport would
24 stay in its current configuration, licensed
25 runways would be kept at the existing lanes

1 and the Township would contract out the
2 management and operation of the airport. And
3 the safety improvements would be made only to
4 benefit the current aircraft type.

5 Next slide, please.

6 Where did negotiations begin? Again,
7 this is back in August, the Solbergs' initial
8 position was that the airport was not for
9 sale. Solberg Aviation wanted to retain
10 ownership, unrestricted. Solberg acknowledges
11 that an unspecified development plan exists
12 for safety improvements. Open space
13 surrounding the airport as it exists today
14 would be at no cost to the Township taxpayers,
15 but Solberg Aviation wanted it to remain
16 unrestricted.

17 Next slide.

18 When we spoke, the early negotiations
19 with the Solbergs were that the goals of the
20 Township and Solberg Aviation would be to find
21 the common ground and to move forward. The
22 Township would buy the open space in fee or
23 the development rights. We would minimize the
24 impact of the surrounding communities, limit
25 the activity, apply curfews, noise limits and

1 develop standards for noise and create
2 buffers.

3 It was at this point that we started
4 consulting with some of the experts that are
5 here tonight, and, as I said, we shared with
6 them the plans that were given to us by the
7 Solberg negotiating team.

8 This was the initial proposal given to
9 us on September 22nd, it would, we felt, allow
10 for airport expansion, runways would be
11 expanded to handle jet traffic up to 5600
12 feet, which the 5600 feet was greater than the
13 1999 conditional approval which was given by
14 the FAA. Again, we were looking to minimize
15 the impact to the surrounding community by
16 maintaining a 65 decibel day/night level, and
17 I guess that will be discussed by one of our
18 experts, the sound expert later on, as to what
19 that actually means.

20 We would establish noise restrictions
21 and curfews for operations, and we agreed at
22 that meeting there would be no Stage 1 or
23 Stage 2 aircraft, and the aviation expert will
24 discuss what that means.

25 We were also told they would be

1 looking to build one million square feet of
2 hangar/office space on a hundred acres of
3 land. The Township would have the ability to
4 preserve half of the open space, which would
5 be roughly 350 acres. At that time, the price
6 was not disclosed or not decided upon, and
7 whether it was going to be fee or development
8 rights, again, that was not disclosed or not
9 yet decided upon by the family. Or whether it
10 would deed restrict the open space. But that
11 was also to be determined.

12 On October 14th, the meeting,
13 basically, was to try to get our feelings on
14 how to limit noise impact to the community,
15 how do we place noise restrictions on the
16 airport owner; how do we monitor the
17 restrictions; who enforces the restrictions;
18 and what is the best way to convey the open
19 space, whether it would be through easement
20 purchase or fee simple. The Township
21 expressed at that time that it was easier to
22 get funding for open space from the State if
23 it was a fee simple purchase. And Julie wants
24 to explain what the difference is. I will
25 allow her the opportunity, what the difference

1 is between fee and easement purchases, at the
2 conclusion of my presentation.

3 Next slide.

4 Now, the next time we met was December
5 4th, but I would like to point out that during
6 this time, we did have telephone contact with
7 the Solbergs and we did exchange a few e-mails
8 during that time. On that date, we countered
9 with a proposal that we would like to maintain
10 the airport for general aviation use, to
11 retain the existing runway length, allow
12 building of the hangars, and the Township was
13 also to upgrade the entrance. We also
14 discussed allowing a restaurant on site, and
15 the Township -- we discussed the opportunity
16 to put a museum on site honoring Thor Solberg,
17 Sr. for his accomplishments in the aviation
18 industry. And we also expressed a desire to
19 preserve approximately 650 acres.

20 What got us to this point was we asked
21 whether the consultants, that the consultants
22 at that time advised us that an airport can
23 function at this size; however, given the
24 current state of the airport, there were
25 certain upgrades that needed to be made.

1 At that time, we were told that less
2 than 5600 feet is a non-starter, but we agreed
3 to continue and to think and decide and go
4 back to our experts. And it was at that
5 meeting we decided, all parties agreed to
6 think about the following: The amount of open
7 space to be conveyed; the price of the open
8 space; the ownership of the open space,
9 whether it would be fee purchase or easement;
10 noise restrictions; what type of noise
11 restrictions and limitations we would like to
12 preserve, put around the airport to preserve
13 the community. We asked that they reconsider
14 the length of the runway, and also reconsider
15 the amount of hangar space. And the Township
16 requested that Solberg come back with a more
17 reasonable offer, at least on the runway
18 length.

19 Next slide.

20 At the December 17th meeting, the
21 counter by Solberg was to expand the runway to
22 5,000 feet with no restrictions, no curfew for
23 operations, and the only agreement we had was
24 no Stage 1 or 2 jets. They did concede on the
25 amount of office space, dropping from one

1 million square feet of hangar space to 500,000
2 square feet, which is estimated to be about
3 250 aircraft, not including the tie-down
4 areas, which would also exist. And to give a
5 point of reference, currently there are
6 approximately 85 to 100 aircraft based at the
7 airport. I would also like to point out that
8 at this time, there is a jet based at that
9 airport as well. It is a Lear Jet Model 30A,
10 I don't know how often it flies, but there is
11 a jet based there.

12 At that time, we were told that the
13 price for the open space would be \$36 million,
14 that was not needed for the airport. And they
15 also agreed at this point that they would be
16 willing to stage this type of development over
17 a period of years, or a period of time.

18 So we left and we met again on January
19 2nd, 2006, and the Township proposed the
20 following: We offered them \$22 million, and
21 Solbergs would retain the airport as it exists
22 today. We would allow them to pave the
23 licensed runway to 3,735 feet, make safety
24 improvements that would only benefit the type
25 of aircraft that is there today; increase the

1 hangar space from the current 30,000 to
2 150,000 square feet, and the airport is
3 preserved with a permanent deed restriction on
4 the open space. And the Balloon Festival and
5 other events that take place currently at the
6 airport would continue.

7 In addition, the Township requested to
8 acquire 650 acres of open space with restric-
9 tions on future development or future
10 expansion of the airport. The open space
11 around the airport is preserved in perpetuity,
12 and the offer of \$22 million was made for the
13 land and deed restrictions to be reimbursed
14 largely by State grants.

15 The existing environmentally-sensitive
16 land of the tract would be protected, which
17 would achieve our goal, and the character of
18 the community and existing airport would be
19 preserved.

20 Finally, if that was not acceptable,
21 the Township also gave an option two, and the
22 option two was to purchase the entire tract of
23 land for \$27 million. Okay. That offer was
24 rejected, and it was at this point that we are
25 and we were told we have nothing further to

1 talk about. I think that is unfortunate.

2 As Mayor Shamey said, we are hoping
3 this meeting tonight gives us the opportunity
4 and cause to determine what is the best way
5 for us to go ahead, whether the community will
6 give us a green light, or what, or give us
7 some ideas of what is the best method to
8 pursue here.

9 So now we have a summary of where we
10 stand. This is a side-by-side comparison of
11 the proposal that is made and where we
12 currently stand.

13 The Solbergs would retain the airport
14 as it exists today. They would be paving the
15 runway to 3,735 feet, 150,000 square feet of
16 hangar space and safety improvements made only
17 to benefit the current types of aircraft up
18 there. On the Solberg side, the airport would
19 be allowed to develop as a regional business
20 airport handling jets, fully improved 5,000
21 foot main runway, fully improved cross-winds
22 runway, limited restrictions on operations as
23 well as 500,000 square feet of hangar space.
24 That is predominantly where we stand right
25 now.

1 The airport is preserved with the
2 permanent deed restrictions from the
3 Township's position, the Township requires
4 approximately 650 acres of open space. The
5 space around the airport is preserved in
6 perpetuity, and the existing environmentally-
7 sensitive land of the airport is protected.
8 The offer of \$22 million for the land, again,
9 would be largely reimbursed by State grants.

10 On the Solberg side, the remaining
11 open space would be preserved. Solberg offers
12 the sale of development rights on the open
13 space, not developed by any expansion, and the
14 asking price is \$36 million. So that pretty
15 much goes through exactly what happened
16 through the negotiations. I would just like
17 Julie to come up and just explain the
18 difference to the community as to what the
19 difference is between fee purchase and
20 easement purchase. Thank you.

21 MRS. ALLEN: Thank you, Frank. A fee
22 purchase, when you are talking about land
23 preservation or any other type of land
24 purchase, is you purchase the land in its
25 entirety. The buyer of the property owns the

1 property 100 percent. When the buyer of the
2 property purchases only an easement, they only
3 own a restriction on the property, so in the
4 case of conservation, it would either be deed
5 restricting the property to conservation, or
6 deed restricting the property to airport use,
7 or deed restricting the property to
8 agricultural use. So that would be the
9 difference. And we can talk about this again
10 when there are questions. Thank you.

11 MAYOR SHAMEY: Ladies and gentlemen,
12 this is Tom Auffenorde from Ecosciences. Tom,
13 it is all yours.

14 MR. AUFFENORDE: Good evening, ladies
15 and gentlemen, as Mayor Shamey mentioned, we
16 are going to quickly summarize a lot of
17 information here, so I will move quickly
18 through my presentation. Again, I am Tom
19 Auffenorde from Ecosciences. Ecosciences is
20 an environmental regulatory firm that has been
21 around since 1973. I want to quickly go
22 through my qualifications, and then summarize
23 what my involvement has been on this property.

24 I have a Master's and Bachelor's
25 Degree in biology, and for the last approxi-

1 mately 20 years, I have been employed by
2 Ecosciences and my duties consist primarily of
3 wetland delineation, regulatory compliance,
4 interfacing with the regulatory agencies,
5 impact assessment of projects, and threatened
6 endangered species surveys.

7 We were retained in 2000 to conduct a
8 wetland delineation on the property, as well
9 as to working with a surveyor to quantify not
10 only wetlands, but slopes, woodlands, flood
11 plains and agricultural production areas on
12 the property. And the context of this work
13 was for an appraisal of the property.

14 This slide is an air photo of the
15 site. Readington Road is in this location
16 (indicating), the southern boundary, Pulaski
17 Road is up here (indicating), and this is
18 Lightfield and Thor Solberg Road on the
19 eastern part of the property.

20 The property sits on a divide between
21 two drainage areas, the northern portion of
22 the property from about this direction
23 (indicating) drains northward via some unnamed
24 tributary to Chambers Brook, and Chambers
25 Brook is a tributary in the north branch of

1 the Raritan River, and those tributaries are
2 approximately in this location (indicating).
3 There is one here, it comes down through here,
4 crosses the runway and drains out this way
5 (indicating). The southern portion of the
6 property drains to Holland Brook, which is a
7 tributary of the south branch of the Raritan
8 River, and there is a tributary running
9 through here, one coming out of this woodland
10 here (indicating), and running down through
11 here. Holland Brook is in this portion of the
12 property (indicating).

13 Next slide.

14 The features that we quantified are
15 shown graphically on the next couple of
16 slides. I want to thank your Township
17 Planner, Michael Sullivan, of Clark, Caton &
18 Hintz, for presenting these slides, and you
19 will see them again during his presentation as
20 well. The wooded areas are shown in green.
21 There are 194.9 acres of woodlands on the
22 property. The yellow areas are open fields or
23 agricultural production areas. They are
24 primarily used for hay. Those areas total
25 536.5 acres. You can also see on this slide

1 the runways. These are the paved runways, the
2 airport facility is here and the cross-winds
3 runway is in this location (indicating).

4 There is a map associated with Holland
5 Brook on this part of the property, and that
6 totals 15.3 acres.

7 Next slide.

8 This slide shows the wetlands area and
9 wetland buffers, which are areas also
10 associated with wetlands. The wetlands areas
11 tend to be associated with the unnamed
12 drainages on the property. The transition
13 areas are shown in the lighter blue. Without
14 getting into too much detail, most of the
15 wetlands on the property we anticipate to have
16 a 50-foot buffer, which is the intermediate
17 wetlands. There are also accessory resource
18 wetlands, which are transit waters or habitats
19 for endangered species. Since we did our
20 original work, the Department of Environmental
21 Protection, which regulates activities in
22 wetlands, has adopted the use of a threatened
23 endangered species mapping the State
24 developed, it is called Landscape Project
25 Mapping. That mapping shows wood turtle

1 habitats, which is a wetlands species,
2 basically, in this part of the property, and
3 extending about out to here (indicating).
4 Based on that information, we anticipate that
5 these wetlands here, here and here are going
6 to have 150-foot buffers in this area. There
7 is also a grassland bird habitat on the
8 property, which you will hear more about from
9 the next speaker, but those are upland
10 species, not wetland dependent, so they will
11 not affect the size of the wetlands' buffer.

12 We identified 33.9 acres of wetlands
13 on the property.

14 Finally, the maps that we documented
15 in our report also identified slopes on the
16 property. There is 2.2 acres of slopes
17 greater than 15 percent, typically steep
18 slopes on this property, and those are
19 scattered throughout the property, but they
20 tend to be associated with the areas sloping
21 down to the drainages on the site.

22 That concludes my presentation, and
23 that quantifies the features that we looked at
24 when we were doing our work for the
25 appraisals.

1 A VOICE: Can I ask a question?

2 MAYOR SHAMEY: Give me a moment. What
3 our plan was, was to have each consultant make
4 their presentation, and then we will open it
5 up to questions of the consultants but, yes,
6 you can ask the question, but you have to hold
7 off a little bit.

8 A VOICE: I wanted to know which
9 runway was going to be developed.

10 MAYOR SHAMEY: I ask that you hold off
11 on your question for a moment, and next we
12 will hear from Dr. Wade Wander from Wander
13 Ecological.

14 MR. WANDER: Just a brief correction,
15 my wife over there is Dr. Sharon Wander, I
16 don't mind those mistakes. You can tell I am
17 the only field person, I am the only one not
18 wearing a tie.

19 We were retained to look for
20 threatened and endangered species on the
21 Solberg property. We did our site
22 investigations in 2000 and 2001. We have
23 evidence of about a dozen endangered
24 threatened or otherwise rare species of
25 wildlife using the property to one degree or

1 another. And what I am going to do now is
2 just show some slides about each one of the
3 species that we did find or for which there is
4 evidence for, and then just a brief discussion
5 of that particular species.

6 You heard Tom -- incidentally, if I
7 stand here, can people see the slides? You
8 heard Tom mention about the streams on the
9 property and the fact that the Landscape
10 Project Mapping indicated the presence of
11 suitable habitat for wood turtles. This is a
12 wood turtle. It is classified as threatened
13 in the State of New Jersey, and it is,
14 basically, a terrestrial turtle, more so than
15 other turtles. But nonetheless, it tends to
16 be more frequent along corridors and streams.

17 Although we have not seen wood turtles on the
18 property, we do expect wood turtles to occur
19 there in the vicinity of the streams, because
20 the habitat is suitable.

21 This worked perfectly at home. Next
22 is the Copper's hawk. Of these two hawks
23 here, it is the one on the right. The larger
24 one on the right. This currently is
25 classified as threatened in New Jersey with

1 respect to its breeding status. The new list
2 which is coming out this year will upgrade it
3 to special concern status, and I know that,
4 because I am on the committee that determines
5 what species received classification and what
6 species didn't.

7 This would be an inhabitant of
8 forested areas of the property. We do not
9 have any personal observations of Copper's
10 hawk on the site, but the Copper's hawk is
11 certainly suitable.

12 Keeping in the vein of hawks, the next
13 one is a Northern Harrier. Some of you may
14 know this as a Marshall hawk, that is the old
15 name. Northern Harrier has been reported, we
16 have had personal observations of Northern
17 Harriers on the property in migration. It
18 also occurs during winter, but it is not
19 necessarily found on the property, but it is
20 classified as endangered in New Jersey.

21 This is another view of the Marshall
22 hawk or Northern Harrier. I am showing a
23 couple of different slides, because you may
24 have seen this bird around the airport. It
25 occurs in a variety of different plumages.

1 This happens to be an immature bird, which you
2 can tell by its very cinnamony underparts.
3 Again, it is endangered and occurs during
4 spring and fall migrations. During winter, it
5 does not breed and is primarily an inhabitant
6 of the open grasslands, where it hunts for
7 usually small mammals. Owls, there are two
8 species of owls that have been reported on the
9 property that are classified. The first is
10 the long-eared owl. These are the ears, which
11 aren't really ears, but just feather tufts.
12 This was reported by my colleagues at
13 Ecosciences, they found a winter roost of
14 long-eared owls. They typically roost in
15 rather dense conifer plantations, more
16 typically dense rows of red cedars. And the
17 population of long-eared owls has become
18 prevalent in New Jersey, so this is a site of
19 interest. The long-eared owl is threatened in
20 New Jersey. I don't expect they nest on the
21 property, but it is possible they are,
22 basically, a winter resident.

23 The short-eared owl is the other
24 species. This is classified as endangered,
25 and this is very much an inhabitant of open

1 grasslands. Where it comes out during the
2 day, it roosts on the ground in tall grass
3 areas and it comes out at dusk, just as the
4 Northern Harriers are going in for the night,
5 the short-eared owls come out and they hunt
6 capriciously (sic) or at night for small
7 mammal prey. This is classified as
8 endangered. It does not nest at the airport,
9 but simply appears during migration and in
10 winter.

11 Uplands sandpiper, that is endangered
12 in New Jersey. As far as we know, it does not
13 nest at the airport. There is only two or
14 three locations in the state where this
15 species does nest, and they are all airports,
16 incidentally. But this may be expected during
17 migration, and it is also classified as
18 endangered during migration as well. It is
19 very much an inhabitant of short to medium
20 grass areas.

21 The eastern meadowlark, another
22 grassland species. Currently, it is not
23 listed, but the new list, when it comes out
24 this year, it will be classified as special
25 concern. Endangered is the species we are

1 most concerned about, threatened, a little bit
2 less so, and special concern species are
3 thought to be declining. If the decline
4 continues, then they may be classified as
5 threatened or endangered as the data warrants.

6 The bobolinks nest at the airport. We
7 have had as many as ten territorial males.
8 They arrive in May, set up their nesting
9 territories and then usually are gone by the
10 end of July. This is a male bobolink, and it
11 is classified as threatened in New Jersey.
12 And this is the female, very much sparrow-
13 like.

14 The next is the Vesper sparrow. This
15 is classified as endangered, another
16 grasslands species. I don't expect it to nest
17 at the airport, since the habitat isn't
18 precisely suitable, but it probably occurs
19 during migration and it is possible that it
20 does nest.

21 The Savannah sparrow, another one of
22 these little brown birds, we did, in fact,
23 have a few territorial male Savannah sparrows
24 at the airport. This is classified as
25 threatened in New Jersey.

1 The grasshopper sparrow, five to ten
2 pairs, perhaps even a little more at the
3 airport. This also is classified as
4 threatened.

5 Last, but certainly not least, in
6 2001, we had an observation of a Henslow's
7 sparrow, which is arguably the rarest of the
8 grassland birds in New Jersey. We just had
9 one single observation. I don't know if it
10 nested, it is possible, as there is a suitable
11 habitat on the airport property. That would
12 certainly be big news, indeed, if it were to
13 nest. It might occur as a migrator. All of
14 these grassland birds I have shown you are the
15 grassland species, that is the only habitat in
16 which they occur. That ends my presentation
17 for the moment. Later on, we will be talking
18 about potential impacts.

19 MAYOR SHAMEY: Next we will hear from
20 Township Planner Michael Sullivan of the firm,
21 Clark, Caton & Hintz.

22 MR. SULLIVAN: Good evening, my name
23 is Michael Sullivan and, as Mayor Shamey said,
24 I am a Township Planner. I am with Clark,
25 Caton & Hintz from Trenton, New Jersey, and

1 I'm a professional planner in the State of New
2 Jersey and certified by the American Institute
3 of Certified Planners. And also, I am a
4 certified landscape architect in New Jersey
5 and Pennsylvania. I have been the consulting
6 Township Planner here for about seven and a
7 half years.

8 Back in 2001, I was asked by the
9 Township Committee to prepare a report, which
10 would examine the lands within the 750-acre
11 study area, which we talked about tonight, and
12 the purpose was to see if the public
13 interests, public feelings and objectives
14 would be advanced through the ownership and
15 interest and control by the municipality.

16 This report examined the physical
17 characteristics of the site, in order to reach
18 those goals and reach those physical
19 characteristics with respect to the municipal,
20 County and State policies that relate to land
21 use. The result of my report was that I did
22 find that several public benefits could be
23 realized from municipal ownership of the study
24 area. So I will give you a very, very brief
25 synopsis of my report from 2001.

1 outlined in red.

2 A VOICE: Can you slow that down a
3 little?

4 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. This the subject
5 study area, the olive green parcels are open
6 spaces and the lighter green are preserved
7 farmland.

8 What it shows is that, as we talked
9 about before, 668 acres of the 726-acre area
10 is in farmland assessment, or was in 2001.
11 The study area is contiguous to preserved
12 farmland and open space. And this corridor
13 that is coming up from the center of town, 397
14 acres of this subject property, 55 percent of
15 the subject area is comprised of prime
16 farmland soils, which is the soil most
17 suitable for farmland, based on their soil
18 type. 276 acres of the subject property, or
19 38 percent, are comprised of farmlands soils
20 of statewide importance.

21 This is our agricultural soils map.
22 The darkest greens are the prime farmlands.
23 What you will see is a study area that is
24 largely comprised of agricultural open space
25 that has soils that are highly suitable for

1 agriculture.

2 Now, Readington Township's Master
3 Plan, the Hunterdon County planning documents
4 and New Jersey State Plan are all very
5 favorable for farmland preservation. So the
6 conclusion of our report was that acquisition
7 and control of this site to preserve the
8 agricultural lands from the open space, would
9 advance the Township, County and State
10 objectives.

11 The report also looked at a series of
12 natural environmental characteristics. Among
13 these was vegetative cover. This slide shows
14 green areas, which are wooded areas, and these
15 yellow areas, which are open fields. The
16 light areas are the developed areas, which are
17 related to the airport facility itself.

18 We found there were approximately 195
19 acres of woodlands and, as has been talked
20 about tonight, these woodlands are habitats
21 for specific animals.

22 There is also 450 acres of cropland,
23 and that also relates to habitat as well, the
24 grassland and birds that we talked about.

25 We have also talked about wetlands

1 tonight. There are approximately 78 acres of
2 fresh wood or wetland and transition areas,
3 which are the buffers that go along with that.

4 We also found that there are several streams
5 on site, they were mapped by Ecosciences, and
6 all of these environmental characteristics are
7 important in Readington Township, and
8 Readington Township's planning documents, the
9 Master Plan and the subelements of the Master
10 Plan and associated studies, all for the
11 conservation and the protection of elements
12 such as this. And this is not uncommon with
13 the Hunterdon County planning documents and
14 the New Jersey State Plan.

15 The next slide, I have gone back to
16 the vegetation slide, because I want to talk
17 more specifically about the wildlife habitats
18 that Wade Wander discussed, and I want to use
19 this, because a lot of the species they refer
20 to deal with the cropland species, and there
21 is a lot of cropland on the site, or areas
22 that are not wooded, but are assessed as
23 agricultural. This entire property or nearly
24 this entire property is identified by the
25 State as a natural heritage site. It

1 represents some of the best remaining habitats
2 for rare species in the State. And those
3 species were what Mr. Wade Wander was speaking
4 about.

5 The State of New Jersey has a clear
6 policy on this. These are areas that shall be
7 considered the topiary or for the preserva-
8 tion of biological diversity in New Jersey.
9 These sites become degraded or destroyed, and
10 we may lose some of the most unique components
11 of our natural heritage. That is a very
12 compelling policy at State level, and it is
13 synchronized with Readington's policy on
14 habitat and Readington's habitat in the
15 Township. And it is also consistent with
16 other policies with County policies, with
17 respect to habitat protection.

18 Going further on that, the American
19 Planning Association has issued a series of
20 guidelines for land use policies when a
21 habitat is related to it, so acquisition and
22 control of the site would be advancing not
23 only the State, County and local objectives,
24 but also the American Planning Association
25 recommended habitat policies.

1 A VOICE: The Stenographer can't hear
2 you.

3 MR. SULLIVAN: We also looked at the
4 study area in terms of the historic
5 preservation. This is a church in the Village
6 of Readington, which is a small village to the
7 southeast, south of the study area.

8 Next slide.

9 While we have been looking at the
10 study area from the context of natural
11 characteristics and physical attributes, this
12 shows the relationship of the study area to
13 the center of Readington Village there, which
14 is a historic district in the town. This
15 compromises what we would call the environs of
16 the Township. The environs is the undeveloped
17 portion that separates it from other places,
18 and that is important. If the Town were to
19 acquire or to control the study area, they
20 would assure that that context would be
21 preserved for Readington Village. And we
22 think that that is certainly in line with the
23 historic preservation agenda that was
24 established in Readington's Master Plan, as
25 well as the State plan.

1 This looks a lot like the last one, to
2 come back and finish up the talk. There is
3 also another objective, which would be met by
4 the Township acquiring and controlling this,
5 and that is the preservation of the airport.
6 The Mayor has said it is their intent to
7 maintain the airport in this state. In 1998,
8 there was a report by the New Jersey General
9 Aviation Study Commission, which identified
10 small private airports in the State as a
11 vanishing breed. They were being lost when an
12 airport is controlled by a private entity and
13 not publicly. They found that the increasing
14 land values were making a conversion to a
15 development scenario such as residential or
16 commercial, more attractive than keeping the
17 airport. And the purpose of that report was
18 to identify airports where this may be
19 occurring, and also, in my estimation, when I
20 read the report, to serve as the basis for
21 funding for public acquisition of the airport.

22 So if Readington were to acquire and
23 control this, then that could prevent a future
24 conversion by a private entity to something
25 other than an airport, such as, this is

1 predominantly an agricultural and residential
2 zoning district, which would permit one house
3 for every six acres. The sum total of what I
4 have been talking about is the character as
5 well. All of the elements on the site, the
6 woodlands, the agricultural fields, the stream
7 corridors are elements that Readington has
8 identified in the planning documents as
9 integral to the most desirable part of the
10 character of this town. It is a rural and
11 agricultural character.

12 And by Readington acquiring or
13 controlling this site, they can ensure that
14 that character is preserved, and preservation
15 of community and scenic character is a
16 legitimate planning purpose that is
17 established in the Municipal Land Use Law, and
18 it is carried out through State planning, and
19 also, it is carried out in Readington's Master
20 Plan. And the acquisition of this site would
21 certainly help Readington control and preserve
22 community character in this part of the
23 Township.

24 Now, I want to conclude my discussion
25 here, I will read a paragraph. I thought

1 about a way to paraphrase it, and I couldn't
2 find a way I could do it any better, so I will
3 read it to you, so bear with me.

4 "The conclusion of this report was
5 that municipal acquisition of the study area
6 would result in an interwoven series of
7 benefits that would be greater than the sum of
8 the individual parts. Under municipal owner-
9 ship, Readington could act as a comprehensive
10 land steward for this unique and diverse
11 parcel. This role would include balancing
12 ecological, commercial, transportation, open
13 space, historic preservation and recreation
14 purposes. Commercial uses, such as the
15 airport, can be used to manage conflicts with
16 wildlife habitat areas and other environ-
17 mentally sensitive areas. Similarly, the
18 development of passive or recreation
19 activities could be directed to the most
20 appropriate locations, including the extent of
21 critical natural resources and the location of
22 the facilities necessary for continued
23 operation of the airport. With the
24 acquisition of the area, Readington could
25 ensure that all of these various public

1 interests are balanced, while effecting and
2 managing land uses when considered as a whole,
3 will look for a unique benefit to the public."

4 Thank you.

5 MAYOR SHAMEY: Thank you, Michael.

6 Ladies and gentlemen, next we are
7 going to reverse the order here, we will have
8 Mr. Rich Golaszewski from GRA Aviation
9 Consulting firm, and after Mr. Golaszewski, we
10 will hear from our noise expert. Is that okay
11 in terms of switching the two? Okay.

12 After we conclude the next two, and I
13 would again ask for your patience, I know
14 there is a lot of information being presented,
15 but it is important information. We will then
16 open it up for questions for the consultants.

17 Thank you.

18 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Thank you, Mayor
19 Shamey, we will move this out of the way so we
20 can use the other projector here, hopefully.

21 My name is Rich Golaszewski, and I am
22 with GRA, Incorporated. We are a transporta-
23 tion consulting firm, and I have been doing
24 aviation consulting for my entire professional
25 career of about 30 years. We were asked to

1 look at the proposals for development at the
2 airport, and we have looked at the airport
3 Master Plan, which was completed a while back,
4 and the most recent airport layout plan which
5 the airport submitted to FAA. The key issues
6 here are the community's goals and really how
7 best to meet them.

8 Now, my expertise is in the aviation
9 industry. I am not a planner, per se, but I
10 look at overall trends. I look at airport
11 economics, regulatory and policy constraints.

12 What happens if you take Federal money, what
13 are they looking for, and I have done work in
14 the aviation business for airports, airlines,
15 air traffic control, both in the United States
16 and elsewhere, and my largest current clients
17 are the Federal Aviation Administration and
18 NASA.

19 Let's just talk for a minute about
20 what is an airport business. What are the
21 Solbergs trying to preserve or achieve. An
22 airport business is much like a marina. There
23 are airplanes that are based there, and the
24 airport is looking to rent them parking space,
25 hangars, sell them fuel and other services.

1 Also, they sell services to other aircraft
2 that visit the area, and that really is the
3 airport business. They may perform
4 maintenance, night training, if you want to
5 think of it in that way. It is a place where
6 airplanes come and the airport charges for its
7 services.

8 We have heard some talk about
9 corporate jets, and I want to talk about the
10 current airport has about 3,000 feet of paved
11 runway, and that is really what is available
12 for a high-performance aircraft. There is
13 another 750 feet of sod runway, but you
14 wouldn't operate a high-performance aircraft
15 on a dirt runway. What do you need for
16 various aircraft types? I will show you some
17 of these in a minute. Basically, if you have
18 4,000 feet, you can handle very light jets and
19 turboprops, and when you get to 5,000 feet,
20 you can handle medium-size jets, and when you
21 get to 6,000 feet, you can handle the very
22 large business jets and the relative proposals
23 are anywhere out to five, 6,000 feet, so these
24 are relevant plans to look at.

25 They also look for an instrument

1 approach, lighting, fuel, facilities in the
2 airport, 24/7 availability. If someone will
3 operate a jet into here, this is what they are
4 looking for in terms of facilities at the
5 airport.

6 When I started to think about how to
7 look at this problem, I thought, well, how
8 could this thing possibly turn out. Where
9 could this end up. And I have defined, I
10 think, four cases of where this could end up,
11 and I think, as a community, you have to think
12 about what is the long-term play. You are all
13 residents here, you are probably here for some
14 time to come. You don't want to worry about
15 just what is development going to be tomorrow,
16 but where could it possibly go and how is it
17 affected by these various proposals and
18 negotiations that I have heard about.

19 Well, you can have case one, nothing
20 happens. The world stays the way it is, and I
21 will talk a little more about that. You can
22 have case two, the community agrees to let the
23 Solbergs take the runway out to 5,000 or even
24 5,600 feet. The community could reach an
25 agreement with the Solbergs on very limited

1 development of the airport where Solberg would
2 retain ownership and operation of the airport,
3 or in case four, the community could acquire
4 the airport and, thereby, control its further
5 development. But that is, basically, about
6 where this thing could end up, if you say what
7 are the proposals on the table, what could
8 logically happen. Well, let's look at what
9 could happen, briefly, in case one.

10 This is one agreement, and this has
11 many possible outcomes. The Solbergs are the
12 proprietors of the airport. Generally, they
13 will be governed mostly by State and Federal
14 regulations governing safety. They will have
15 to pass environmental approvals, but they
16 could take the airport out to 5,600 feet,
17 pending approval. The family would continue
18 to run it, they may or may not choose to find
19 a sponsor, a public body, which could be the
20 State or County, not only the Township. So
21 they could receive Federal grants to pay for
22 some of the buildings. Building a new runway
23 is a very expensive undertaking. It is not
24 clear to me that you can make all of that back
25 if it was just private money.

1 They could sell the airport to a new
2 owner, who could choose to maintain it as an
3 airport or choose to take the land and develop
4 it in another way. So that is one end of the
5 spectrum. Nothing really gets agreed to, it
6 is business as usual, and the thing just kind
7 of plays out.

8 Case two, the Township and the
9 Solbergs have had discussions about agreeing
10 to some form of development. But putting a
11 cap on where the airport would go, and one
12 negotiating point they are talking about which
13 is roughly where the airport layout plan is
14 today, is roughly a 5,000 foot runway. The
15 Solbergs asked for a 5,600 square foot runway.

16 They would like to build up to 500,000 square
17 feet of hangars and other uses. A Boeing 747
18 is about a little less than 50,000 square
19 feet, nose to tail wing, and while you could
20 park them closer, that is to give you some
21 idea of scale. Now, that is 10, 12 or more
22 Boeing 747s that could fit in something that
23 is 500,000 square feet, or you could put a
24 hundred small jets in. And the airport, quite
25 likely, would develop along the lines of the

1 current plan, which is a regional airport
2 serving small jet aircraft.

3 Case number three, the Township and
4 the Solbergs could agree to a more limited
5 development, which is limited to handling the
6 current aircraft types. It could be developed
7 with or without FAA money. If there is FAA
8 money, I will talk about what comes with that.

9 And the offices and hangars would be sized,
10 to really do the business on the airport. How
11 many airplanes are there, what kind of people
12 choose to locate there. This is likely going
13 to require expenditures of Township money,
14 which possibly could be reimbursed, just in
15 order to get the Solbergs to agree to forego
16 further development beyond this point. And
17 that seems to be the crux of the negotiations
18 at the moment.

19 Or, in the fourth case, the community
20 could end up acquiring the property. They
21 could repair the existing runway, they could
22 develop whatever at the airport needs to be
23 developed in terms of offices or small
24 hangars, and they could probably contract out,
25 as they said, maintenance and operation of the

1 parked around the airport. There is a hangar
2 and other buildings there, but that is,
3 basically, the airport as it exists today.

4 Now, what do they want to do? Step
5 one, they want to build a new runway to
6 replace the existing paved runway, and they
7 are proposing that that runway be 4,890 feet
8 long. So what they will do is put a new paved
9 runway in here that is not quite twice as long
10 as the existing paved runway. The existing
11 paved runway will then become the taxiway to
12 this new runway, and this would be all of the
13 parcels that could be developed, and this is
14 per the airport layout plan by the Solbergs.

15 Eventually, they want to pave this
16 crossway runway also, and according to their
17 Master Plan, they would want to extend the
18 main runway well beyond what we have today.

19 Now, if you look at the property, this
20 is the safety area on the south end, and down
21 in there, there are the Township ball fields
22 and parks and they would be in the safety zone
23 of this new runway. So you can kind of see
24 what is down off of the top of the airport and
25 the runway would be in line with those, and

1 this is the clearance zone for the instrument
2 approach in red, and the general safety area
3 around the airport in orange.

4 Can you show the whole thing, please?

5 This is kind of the protected zone.
6 This is a school up here in this corner but,
7 as you can see, the airport's protected area
8 runs fairly well beyond the runway. And this
9 is land under which there are certain
10 restrictions about what activities can take
11 place in there, really, for safety reasons.

12 Now let's look at Morristown, for
13 example. Let's look at another airport that
14 has developed very much to become a regional
15 jet airport. It is a much bigger airport, it
16 has many more based aircraft, but I will show
17 you that you have to think about where this
18 will go.

19 Morristown Airport is located here
20 (indicating), and you can see it has two paved
21 runways, the main runway is approximately
22 6,000 feet, and there are all sorts of hangars
23 developed here. Let's talk -- I am going to
24 talk to you about the kinds of aircraft and
25 number of flights at Morristown Airport, but

1 it is a fairly substantial developed area.
2 The main runway is 900 feet long, the Solbergs
3 request something less. They want a 5,600
4 foot runway, and the types of activities they
5 will handle aren't that different, that is one
6 end of the spectrum. Let's look at Somerset
7 County and see what sort of an airport that is
8 smaller would be, and what it would look like.

9 Somerset Airport is there (indicating), and
10 the main runway that is paved is 2,700 feet
11 long and it, generally, handles the types of
12 aircraft that operate at Solberg Airport
13 today. I don't think there are any jets at
14 Somerset, but it does handle single engine and
15 multi-engine airplanes. You can see some of
16 the engines, some mostly small, single engine,
17 much like we see at Solberg Airport today, and
18 that is sort of the other end of the scale.

19 Let's say this thing stayed sort of
20 where it is today, you would end up with
21 something that looks like this. It's main
22 runway is, as we said, about 2,700 feet long,
23 and it is a very nice looking facility and
24 serves its market fairly well.

25 Let's go back now to the other slides,

1 and what I have done here is, I just wanted to
2 show you briefly that these are airplanes that
3 can operate on a 3,700 foot runway. This is a
4 Beechcraft King, these are the kind of
5 airplanes that can operate on a 3,700 foot
6 runway. It includes some very small jets, not
7 very heavy, and really turboprops, so that is
8 kind of what you would expect for airplanes
9 that could operate out of a 3,700 foot runway.

10 Go to the next one.

11 If you go to a 4,800 foot, which is
12 about where we are talking about, you are
13 talking about handling sort of mid-sized
14 business jets, Lear 40, or Bombardier
15 Challenger. So these are large, that is up
16 around 40,000 pounds. So those become fairly
17 substantial, 4,800 feet.

18 Let's go to the next one.

19 If you go to 5,600 feet, you can put
20 an EMBRAER Legacy Shuttle. This is the same
21 as a regional jet. If you have taken
22 Continental out of Newark on a 35 footer, that
23 is what you are on. It could handle up to a
24 Gulfstream 450 under certain weight, and
25 altimeter and temperature limits, which is

1 similar to a 50-seat regional jet in terms of
2 size and weight. So with a 5,600 foot runway,
3 that can operate a fairly large aircraft.

4 This is kind of what we are talking
5 about, developing hangars and space, so this
6 is kind of the other end of the spectrum of
7 let's create a regional jetport, and these are
8 the kind of things you could expect to see.

9 Let's talk about some of the airports.

10 We talked about Somerset, its main runway is
11 2,700 feet, it has 197 small airplanes based
12 at the airport, about 40,000 based operations,
13 and Readington Township's main runway is 3,000
14 feet that is paved, but the 3,400 by 200 is
15 something else. It has 77 based aircraft and
16 roughly 40,000 annual operations, so they are
17 fairly comparable. I have taken two other
18 airports in the area, Trenton/Mercer, the main
19 runway is 6,000 feet, and at Morristown it was
20 5,900. Trenton/Mercer has 118 airplanes, but
21 with the longer runway it has 20 jets based
22 there. Morristown has 57 there. Both of
23 these have 200,000 operations a year. What
24 you do in 5,000 feet, I couldn't find an
25 example close by, but I found one down in the

1 Chicago area, Palwaukee, its main runway was
2 5,000 feet long and it has 50 jets based there
3 out of 300 aircraft. So while you might say
4 5,600 feet is not a big airport, you can put a
5 lot of activity in 5,600 feet, if you choose
6 to.

7 Where are the FAA and the New Jersey
8 Department of Transportation on this? Well,
9 the airport itself is an FAA National Plan of
10 Airport Systems. What that means is that FAA
11 has accepted that this airport is important to
12 the national aviation system. That makes it
13 eligible should people choose to apply for FAA
14 funding. There has been no application
15 submitted yet, as far as we know, that
16 application can tie up some uses of airport
17 land. If you take FAA money, all of a sudden,
18 the agreements you signed to get that money
19 really take away a lot of what the local
20 communities can control at the airport.
21 Because if you are signing a contract with the
22 Federal Government, you agree it will be an
23 airport for 20 years; you agree not to
24 discriminate among the kinds of aircraft that
25 operate. If they can safely operate there,

1 you have to let them operate there. But the
2 FAA will never take over or force the airport
3 to expand. But their job is to develop a
4 national airport system, and they will provide
5 funding in return for controls. The airport
6 also is under the New Jersey State Aviation
7 System Plan, and I understand the State wants
8 to buy the airport, they said they want to
9 preserve it and use it as a jetport. So these
10 are kind of where higher levels of government
11 are at the moment.

12 What about airport economics? Well,
13 the business is really driven by the revenue
14 you can raise, and the FAA recognizes it is
15 very difficult for a small airport to be self-
16 supporting. So if this airport stays very
17 small, there may be some need for the
18 community, in return for restrictions on
19 development, to provide some form of
20 compensation. If Solberg wants to require the
21 airport to relocate the runway or make really
22 major capital improvements, it will probably
23 require outside funding. I just don't see
24 that you could build a new runway 10 or 12
25 miles and pay for it out of what you make on

1 selling fuel as airplanes start to locate
2 here. So it will really either take FAA
3 money, DOT money, local government or some
4 other benefactor.

5 Some others will come in and they will
6 be required to fund some major improvements.
7 It would be under a restricted agreement with
8 the community, or else, if no agreement is
9 reached. Thank you.

10 MAYOR SHAMEY: The last consultant, I
11 thank you for your continuing patience, is the
12 noise expert, and then we will field questions
13 from the public for the consultants. Please
14 bear with us.

15 MR. ERDREICH: Thank you, Mayor
16 Shamey. I am John Erdreich from Ostergaard
17 Acoustical Associates. I have a Ph.D. in
18 acoustics. I have been the past president of
19 the National Council of Acoustical Consultants
20 and served the Township of Readington in the
21 capacity of an advisor on acoustical issues
22 for ten years or more on and off.

23 In 2001, we were asked by the Township
24 to conduct a series of noise surveys in the
25 vicinity of the airport. And the purpose of

1 the surveys was to characterize the noise
2 environment of the airport so that in the
3 eventuality of a future development, there
4 would be a baseline with which to compare the
5 effects of development with the existing
6 conditions. So what we did was, over a period
7 of three seasons, fall, winter and spring, we
8 set up noise monitors at various locations
9 surrounding the airport, on Honeyman Lane, on
10 Judge Thompson Road, and also at 30 Hillcrest
11 Lane. And what we did then was, we had these
12 devices measure the sound and store the sound
13 levels every minute for over a week. We came
14 up with a picture of the noise environment at
15 these locations.

16 So what I would like to do is just
17 give you an idea of what we found in the
18 environment and give you a comparison with
19 some of the other aircraft that we have
20 measured at different airports, including
21 flights that we measured from Solberg Airport
22 in the vicinity of Hillcrest Park. So if we
23 can have the next light, these are the levels
24 of sound that we measured at several
25 locations, and what you can see is that there

1 is a very narrow range of sound. Basically,
2 we measured the background sound level, and we
3 found the residential areas approximately 42
4 to 45 decibels with a variation of plus or
5 minus of 3 plus or minus 2. Plus or minus
6 5db. So it is fairly quiet to begin with.

7 Now, there was a mention early on that
8 one of the goals of the Township was to
9 maintain the day and night sound level of the
10 decibels of 50db contour. Let me just say
11 that the day/night sound level is an average
12 sound over a period of a year, and it makes
13 adjustments for nighttime and daytime. These
14 levels we are showing here are just daytime,
15 and the problem with that day and night sound
16 level, and it is recognized in the
17 environmental impact assessment done for the
18 airport, is that people don't object to the
19 average annual sound level, but people are
20 affected by it, and what they object to is an
21 airplane flying over their house. It is a
22 short-term noise issue, and the environmental
23 impact assessment, which was prepared by the
24 airport, also recognizes that, and they showed
25 other measures of sound, including the maximum

1 sound level. So what I would like to do is
2 just look at a couple of aircraft fly-over
3 levels to give you a sense of what you are
4 seeing in this area.

5 These are some measurements we made at
6 Hillcrest Park. We were 32 feet from the end
7 of the runway, and what we found was the
8 background level was on the order of 34 to 37
9 decibels. This is even quieter than the
10 residential area. There wasn't a lot going on
11 in the park at the time, and the maximum sound
12 levels from these aircraft or flights was
13 around 70db, 73db, and they lasted for between
14 one and a half and three minutes. Now let's
15 compare that with other aircraft or flights
16 that we have seen from other airports. These
17 are some measurements, one of my engineers
18 made this in Morristown this past week. He
19 measured takeoffs from the back of a Cadillac
20 dealer, 1,100 feet from the edge of the
21 runway, the takeoffs were from north towards
22 the south towards Columbia Turnpike. He also
23 measured some landings coming in over the end
24 of the runway. This was 3,400 feet from the
25 end of the runway.

1 What we found was for these levels, we
2 found that 1,100 feet from the runway we were
3 seeing averages of 57 decibels but, again,
4 these were further distances off the side of
5 the runway, so they are not directly
6 comparable to the levels that we saw at
7 Hillcrest Park. This is the background level.

8 The maximum levels that we saw were 78, 86,
9 77db, but the durations seemed to be shorter.

10 Now, that doesn't make a lot of sense
11 until you think, until you realize that what
12 we are measuring is the time that this
13 aircraft noise is above the background level,
14 because the background level at Hillcrest Park
15 was so much lower than the background level
16 near Morristown Airport, they only appear to
17 be of shorter duration.

18 Landing sounds was on the order of 88
19 to 94 decibels, and again, this is
20 approximately 3,200, 3,400 feet from the
21 beginning of the runway at Morristown.

22 Next slide.

23 Measurements at Princeton Airport,
24 again, the background was 51, 43 decibels, the
25 maximum levels, this is taken off the side of

1 the runway, were 74 to 75db, and again, the
2 durations were a little shorter. Again, the
3 reason for that is the background sounds were
4 somewhat higher. So that, basically, what we
5 are looking at here is that in Readington,
6 where we have relatively quiet areas to begin
7 with, the impact or the audibility of aircraft
8 operations will be stronger again, because of
9 the difference in the rural quiet nature of
10 the environment and, first of all, for that
11 reason; and second of all, because if we start
12 to run larger aircraft, such as those running
13 out of Morristown, we have higher levels to
14 begin with, substantially higher levels.
15 Thank you.

16 MAYOR SHAMEY: Ladies and gentlemen, I
17 thought we would take questions from residents
18 first, from members of the public of the
19 consultants, and I thought what we could do is
20 do them one at a time. With that in mind, I
21 will ask you to come up and use this mike. We
22 have another mike, also. You will have the
23 ability to use this mike to ask the questions,
24 and they will have a mike over here.

25 With that in mind, does anybody in the

1 audience have a question of Mr. Auffenorde, he
2 is from Ecosciences. His testimony was the
3 wetlands. I don't see any hands.

4 Should we go to experts for the
5 residents? We do have a question. Come on
6 up. Could you state your name and residence
7 address?

8 MRS. KIRBY: I am Karen Kirby. My
9 question is, I am assuming the larger planes
10 fly, the deicer may be used and, as we are all
11 on wells, how does that affect the ground
12 water where we live? Does that fall into
13 play? I don't know, I am not sure if deicers
14 would be used.

15 MR. AUFFENORDE: I don't know the
16 answer to that question.

17 MRS. KIRBY: I assume it would affect
18 water, if it was used.

19 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: You are right, in
20 certain weather conditions the airplanes will
21 be deiced. Generally, at the airport, if it
22 has deicing, current practice is to design
23 some retention basin to capture the stuff
24 closer to the airport. It doesn't mean the
25 deicing fluid as the airplane takes off and

1 goes away from the airport, it won't shed
2 fluid on the surrounding land. Beyond that, I
3 cannot say a lot, it is not my area of
4 expertise. Fast airplanes, jet airplanes
5 require deicing, and it will be an issue.

6 MAYOR SHAMEY: On second thought,
7 let's do it this way. Let's take questions
8 from residents of any of the consultants.
9 With that in mind, are there any other
10 residents who would like to ask a question of
11 any of the consultants?

12 Mr. Dudzinski?

13 MR. DUDZINSKI: My name is Ed
14 Dudzinski. I heard earlier that Thor's
15 initial proposal was for a 5,600 foot runway
16 and that exceeded the 1999 FAA approval. What
17 is the current FAA approval to expand the
18 runway? How far can it be expanded?

19 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: The current approval
20 was 490 feet today, they could not justify
21 going to 5,700 feet based on the current and
22 projected near term utilization of the runway.

23 At some point in the future, though, the
24 Master Plan does envision a further expansion.

25 Now, whether it will ever meet that standard,

1 we will have to see.

2 MR. DUDZINSKI: That is the current
3 approval by the FAA, if they came up with the
4 funds to expand the airport, could they do
5 that on their own without further approval
6 from Readington Township?

7 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: If the Solbergs
8 chose to accept an FAA grant, they would be
9 the airport's sponsor. It is a privately-
10 owned public-use airport. They would, of
11 course, have to pass the normal environmental
12 and other reviews required, but the process
13 would be in motion, and the end of that
14 process would be to provide them grant money.

15 I believe the national plan has somewhere on
16 the order of \$12 million targeted for this
17 airport.

18 MR. DUDZINSKI: I am confused still.
19 You said you would have to follow the
20 procedure, does that mean go before the
21 Planning Board, comply with environmental
22 impact statements and everything that is
23 required before a Planning Board?

24 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I am not a land use
25 expert, certainly, at local government level,

1 but for FAA, they certainly have to actually
2 do the environmental work, do the wetlands
3 work, do all of the endangered species work,
4 historic area work. Presuming they could get
5 through all that, they are approved for 4,890
6 feet, and that is where FAA is willing to go
7 at this point.

8 MR. DUDZINSKI: What I am trying to
9 understand is that if the Town and Solbergs do
10 not reach an agreement, and the Solbergs come
11 up with funding, can they just expand on their
12 own? Is there an eventuality that the Town
13 has no power to stop them? I am not sure I
14 heard the answer.

15 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I am not an
16 attorney, but my understanding is that the
17 State restricts what Townships can do as far
18 as limiting airports via zoning, and that is
19 as far as I can go.

20 MR. DUDZINSKI: Thank you.

21 MAYOR SHAMEY: Anyone else? There is
22 one in the back. All the way in the back,
23 please.

24 MS. STOVELL: My name is Maureen
25 Stovell, I am on Morningstar Road.

1 In terms of noise, noise in the flight
2 path that comes out of Solberg Airport, I
3 notice at my house that I do hear the
4 airplanes coming out of Solberg, but I more
5 hear the jets coming out of Newark. For the
6 sound expert, what is that level? What is the
7 level? Do you know what the jets create when
8 they come over from Newark?

9 MR. ERDREICH: I would guess that the
10 jets are fairly high at that point, and they
11 are probably creating about 50db.

12 MS. STOVELL: They rattle my windows,
13 the other doesn't. I am trying to get a
14 feeling for what the differences are.

15 MR. ERDREICH: I am surprised by that.

16 MS. STOVELL: You can hear them pretty
17 well. I am wondering how that would compare,
18 because I am noticing, if you are saying we
19 are hearing 70 decibels in the area at
20 Hillcrest Park from the current Solberg
21 airplanes, but if you went up to Morristown
22 where there are smaller jets, it is only 75 or
23 80, not a huge difference, but where I am
24 hearing noises is actually from Newark Airport
25 more than anything else. I was wondering why.

1 MR. ERDREICH: The other thing you
2 have to understand is that a jet produces much
3 lower frequency noise as the engines
4 accelerate than a propeller plane, the
5 frequency noise would cause the rattling of
6 the house. But again, can you guess how high
7 the aircraft out of Newark would be?

8 MS. STOVELL: No. I know they are
9 fairly high, I know the smaller airplanes kind
10 of buzz, and I hear the others doing that.
11 However, does that affect one's hearing and
12 things of that nature?

13 MR. ERDREICH: I can find that number,
14 but again, one of the possibilities may be
15 that the aircraft out of Morristown --

16 MS. STOVELL: It could be, I don't
17 know where they are, but they are large jets
18 and flying high enough and we can hear them.

19 MR. ERDREICH: I would be speculating
20 at this point.

21 MR. KLOTZ: My name is John Klotz. My
22 question is for, I believe, Mr. Golaszewski.
23 Do I have your name right?

24 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Yes, you do.

25 MR. KLOTZ: In your presentation, you

1 spoke of a safety area that would extend over
2 one of the Township properties, Hillcrest
3 Park. I believe that is a safety area, having
4 to do with the instrument landing system, that
5 they would be proposing for the new runway
6 there.

7 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Yes, that is right.
8 An instrument landing system, because
9 airlines are flying in the clouds, generally,
10 and require a much larger safety area than a
11 runway that is used for visual approaches in
12 relatively good weather.

13 MR. KLOTZ: It is further my
14 understanding from reading that, those safety
15 zones are not permitted over places of public
16 assembly, such as a park, under the FAA
17 guidelines; is that correct?

18 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I think that the
19 restriction, although I can check for you and
20 get you a good answer, is a restriction is
21 what you can put in it. It doesn't mean you
22 can't have people there, it means you can't
23 construct anything, you have to limit the
24 height of trees. It is really to prevent an
25 aircraft that is low from hitting something

1 inadvertently, so you are trying to protect
2 the landing surface.

3 MR. KLOTZ: Again, my understanding is
4 that places of public assembly are also
5 precluded in that safety zone. But taking
6 that a step further, on the airport layout
7 plan that I have seen, which to my
8 understanding is the one that has been
9 approved, there is a very clear note on that
10 that says an easement is to be acquired for
11 that safety zone over the Township-owned
12 property at Hillcrest Park. Would that still
13 be correct?

14 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I think so. I think
15 you could do it with an easement, because what
16 you are trying to do is prevent construction
17 in there. Airplanes land over golf courses,
18 there can be things that have people there.
19 It is just that you can't create physical
20 structures, because that is the purpose of
21 what they are trying to protect here. There
22 are areas closer in, a safety overrun area,
23 and you couldn't put anything that had any
24 assembly of people in it. So there is a whole
25 class of distances from the end of the runway

1 that had varying degrees of restriction. The
2 closer in, the fewer things you can do there.

3 MR. KLOTZ: Okay. Again, my concern
4 is that I don't believe the current Township
5 authorities, who are the owners of that
6 property, would grant such an easement, so it
7 sort of makes the point of trying to get it
8 moot at this point, it certainly would require
9 a significant change of the Township's
10 governing body in order to get a governing
11 body that would approve such an easement.
12 Would that be correct? I don't need to ask
13 that of you, that is my opinion.

14 Additionally, on that Master Plan,
15 there are drawings of the runways as you
16 showed them in your pictorials. There is also
17 a tabular data field showing the latitude and
18 longitude of each runway end point. If those
19 runway end points are plotted onto a map, such
20 as the one that you had, they are signifi-
21 cantly different than the runways as they are
22 drawn on the existing airport layout plan.

23 Did you, in fact, correlate those
24 tabulars, that tabular data with the drawing?

25 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: No, we used the

1 drawing data.

2 MR. KLOTZ: I would suggest you go
3 back and re-look at that, because there are
4 significant differences there.

5 MR. GATTI: Can I ask one question? I
6 have one question for Rich, and it goes along
7 with the last question: The preliminary or
8 the approval that took place in 1999, the
9 conditional approval of the Airport Master
10 Plan, could you, after the environmental
11 assessment, can you just discuss what the next
12 step would be before actual funding of the
13 airport takes place? I think that goes along
14 with the coordinate question the last
15 gentleman asked, because that would be
16 checked; is that correct?

17 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Basically, you would
18 have to do this, what is done in the Master
19 Plan or layout plan, it, in actuality, is a
20 little rougher. Approximately, you are not
21 doing final engineering on drawings suitable
22 to do construction with, so all that work has
23 to be done and approved. You have to go
24 through a formal environmental review process,
25 the FAA capacity project will look at the

1 benefit cost, and there will be a whole bunch
2 of other things done. The question becomes at
3 what point, what can the community control
4 versus what is controlled by the Bureau of
5 Aviation at NJDOT versus what is controlled by
6 FAA in safety regulations, so different things
7 will come into play. Some of those are under
8 local control and some of them are not.

9 MAYOR SHAMEY: Go ahead.

10 MR. VERNON: My name is Ray Vernon,
11 and I am on Rockefeller Mills Road at the
12 other end of the Township, but you are talking
13 about animals that may or may not exist on the
14 property. That is one thing. You talked
15 about the water and the wetlands, you want
16 farming, but yet you are still going to get
17 runoff in the water from the farming, and you
18 said if they had deicing, they would have to
19 have a containment. That is not a problem as
20 far as wetlands go.

21 The other thing is why was a school
22 and a playground put in the flight path of the
23 runways? Where was the Township's planning on
24 that? I have to ask these questions, because
25 nobody is, you know, nobody seems to want to

1 ask these questions.

2 MAYOR SHAMEY: I can help you out with
3 the school. Give me a minute.

4 Do you have any questions while we are
5 looking through this thing?

6 MR. VERNON: Yes, the other thing is
7 the fact that if they were to expand, which
8 may or may not be a good thing for the
9 Township, it would also be more jobs, which is
10 needed around here, and that is a really good
11 place for their jet airport, because they have
12 no access off of a major road. It is all back
13 country roads to get there, isn't it?

14 You have a problem with the Balloon
15 Festival to bring people in.

16 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I will speak to your
17 last point, if the airport is expanded and
18 suitable for jetports, certainly, there are
19 large corporations in the area, they would
20 look at the next best alternative, and the
21 next best alternative is Morristown or
22 Trenton. Now you operate a jet aircraft, it
23 is closer for people to go there to access,
24 for accessibility matters. You don't need a
25 high-speed road if you are taking a corporate

1 executive on a business jet.

2 MR. VERNON: One other thing, how come
3 Solberg and Alexandria weren't also used in
4 your study? They weren't shown. The other
5 two local airports, small airports, you did
6 comparisons for different things. I was just
7 wondering. I saw twin turboprops come out of
8 Sky Manor --

9 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: In our report to the
10 Township, we have looked at additional
11 airports in the area we chose to focus on, we
12 decided to concentrate on the small
13 independents rather than the larger end.

14 MAYOR SHAMEY: As to the school siting
15 issue, I can't speak to the Hillcrest Park
16 issue, because I don't know, but as to the
17 school siting issue, there is a document that
18 I have that is dated June 7, 1999, and at the
19 time that the conditional approval was
20 obtained by the FAA for the Master Plan, a
21 request was made of the County Department of
22 Education to do a review of the potential
23 impact of the siting of the school that we are
24 speaking of tonight. In particular, the
25 potential impact upon that and whether the

1 State Department of Education would have
2 granted approvals for this school based upon
3 the proposed expansion of Solberg Airport.
4 And at that time, a letter was sent to then
5 School Superintendent Faith Spitz, from the
6 Hunterdon County Department of Education, and
7 they were asked what effect the proposed
8 expansion of Solberg Airport would have had on
9 the State Department and County Department of
10 Education's decision to approve this as a site
11 for the school. And the answer came back in
12 pertinent point as follows, and that is that
13 approvals by the Department of Education could
14 not have been granted based upon the current
15 proposed expansion of Solberg Airport.

16 Further, that the recommendation would not
17 have been made if Solberg Airport had advised
18 all parties that expansion would occur on one
19 of the small grassy runways closest to the
20 school. So, in terms of impact on the school,
21 of primary concern is the cross-winds runway.

22 That would have the greatest effect on the
23 school, as well as the middle school. The
24 short answer to your question is that our
25 school district made a substantial investment

1 in this site going back to the beginning,
2 going back to when the middle school was
3 built, and when this school was built. A
4 substantial investment was made in land
5 acquisition and also construction in years, if
6 not decades, in terms of the middle school, if
7 the proposed expansion of Solberg Airport came
8 down the line. So it is not like a decision
9 was made let's stick this school in the flight
10 path, in the airport safety hazard area. I
11 hope that answers the question with regards to
12 the schools. I have a copy of that if you
13 would like it.

14 The Hillcrest Park area, one other
15 thing on that from Mr. Golaszewski.

16 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Basically, the
17 reason Hillcrest Park is impacted is two
18 reasons, okay, they are proposing, as you will
19 recall, they will not build over the existing
20 runway, they will move the runway. Also, the
21 runway is being approved for much higher
22 performance aircraft, and that affects the
23 size of the safety zones off the end of the
24 runway. The runway will also be located
25 closer by 300 feet in this direction to

1 Hillcrest Park. So what you can see is here
2 is the old runway that you can see now, and
3 you can see the park down at the bottom. So
4 that is quite a distance.

5 Now, when you put the new runway over
6 it, it brings it much closer to those parks,
7 and because it is being approved for larger
8 aircraft, the safety zone has to be bigger.
9 They are also proposing a view landing system,
10 which makes the safety zone on this end much
11 larger, so part is in the airport layout in
12 the proposal.

13 MAYOR SHAMEY: Just a follow-up
14 question for Mr. Golaszewski, you are familiar
15 with the 1997 Master Plan; is that correct?

16 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Generally.

17 MAYOR SHAMEY: It is my understanding
18 that that plan called for having this by way
19 of condemnation, if no other way a portion of
20 the park --

21 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I can't recall that
22 exactly, let's not speculate.

23 MAYOR SHAMEY: Maybe one of the
24 residents can help out with that when it comes
25 to public comment.

1 Any further questions from the
2 residents? This is for our consultants.

3 I see several hands in the back.

4 A VOICE: Good evening. My name is
5 Bolger, I am a 30-year resident of the
6 Township, and I have been to probably all of
7 the meetings and I have seen all of the
8 reports. What is frightening about this
9 presentation tonight is that if we take this
10 as the final version, we have heard words like
11 "5,600 feet". We have heard that we have the
12 possibility of going 5,000, but if we take
13 this as the final version, is there anyone
14 here among you experts that does not see a
15 rather devastating impact on this Township
16 from quality of life, security reasons, loss
17 of value? No one has discussed that, the loss
18 of value of our properties, which would be
19 substantial. Absolutely devastating to the
20 residents of this Township. No one has
21 mentioned that.

22 Does anyone see anything good that can
23 come out of this? If this is the final, like
24 they said, let's go to war. We have been at
25 war. Nobody is taking our point except the

1 Township Committee, thank God. We have just
2 been through a rather nasty election, and we
3 are now hearing threats about the next
4 election? Can any of you tell me anything
5 positive about this and how does this have a
6 positive impact on my life and all of the
7 other people here who pay a lot of taxes? And
8 that is the question I have for anyone.

9 MAYOR SHAMEY: What I would like to do
10 is, if we can limit questions for the
11 consultants to specific areas of their
12 expertise.

13 MR. BOLGER: I said if this is the
14 final version that you handed out and you
15 gentlemen all made presentations tonight from
16 your point of view, can you tell me anything
17 positive that can come out of there on this
18 side of the sheet? Can anyone tell me that
19 from your point of view? I heard that we are
20 going to lose air quality, we are going to
21 lose endangered species and water quality
22 impact, an impact of increased noise. Can
23 anyone find anything good about this? It is a
24 business question.

25 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: The only answer I

1 can give you is that the proposed development
2 will substantially change the character of the
3 airport and its surroundings. I mean, that is
4 fairly clear from the expansion of the runway
5 and the type of airplanes that will use it.
6 It will be very different from what you have
7 today. I will let the other experts speak to
8 environmental impact or other issues.

9 MR. ERDREICH: As I have said, we have
10 a relatively quiet environment now and going
11 from 80 aircraft based at the airport to 350
12 will increase the operations and increase the
13 impact.

14 MR. AUFFENORDE: Implementing the
15 Master Plan will have impacts. We haven't
16 quantified them, but there will be wetland
17 fills, woodlands will need to be cleared to
18 maintain the light restrictions in the safety
19 zones, so there will be impacts to the
20 environmental features as well.

21 MR. GATTI: I have another question.
22 My question has to do with one of the things
23 we discussed -- well, two things. One of the
24 things we discussed at the meeting was a
25 longer runway, it enables a pilot to take a

1 another. You wouldn't need to put a physical
2 structure. Other than that, the comment about
3 the larger runway, airplanes could land
4 further down it, I guess, thereby containing
5 the noise impact. Really, that only applies
6 to those small airplanes that don't need the
7 runway length. When you operate a jet, you
8 operate it on a three degree glide slope.
9 Generally, you try to land on the threshold,
10 because you know the runway, to stop, you need
11 the maximum safety zone for an overrun, and
12 just good practice is you land at the
13 threshold. If you are flying a high
14 performance aircraft, that is. Aircraft can
15 land long if they have that. It creates
16 problems.

17 MR. WANDER: Just getting back to that
18 gentleman's last question, can we see anything
19 good coming out of this? The answer from the
20 endangered species standpoint is no, but this
21 gives me an opportunity to talk briefly about
22 potential impacts. Most of the species we
23 showed you on the slides, the breeding
24 grassland birds, which we call area sensitive
25 species, which means they require large tracts

1 of open grasslands in which to successfully
2 nest and rear young. Although it is difficult
3 to quantify, typically what we have seen is
4 when these large areas become fragmented or
5 chipped away, we lose species altogether. Or,
6 we have a decline in the population of the
7 other species. Again, this particularly is
8 true of the breeding grassland birds. The
9 other potential impact, of course, is with
10 more operations, more takeoffs, more landings.

11 With faster aircraft you can expect increased
12 mortality due to direct collisions with the
13 aircraft by at least several of the bird
14 species.

15 MAYOR SHAMEY: Any other questions
16 from residents? Go ahead. If anybody has a
17 question.

18 MRS. FLYNN: Mary Grace Flynn, 8
19 Wheatfield Road. I have a question for
20 Michael Sullivan.

21 The State recently decided on
22 affordable housing rules, that means the
23 Township is required to provide housing based
24 on a formula for all development. Can you
25 tell us for worst case scenario for airport

1 expansion, around how many affordable housing
2 units would the Township be required to
3 provide?

4 MR. SULLIVAN: That is a really good
5 question. First, I don't know what the ratio
6 would be. Just to follow up, you are correct,
7 the Council on Affordable Housing requires a
8 growth share, and on any non-residential
9 growth within the Township, the airport would
10 be considered non-agricultural growth. There
11 would be a number of affordable units or
12 obligation to provide affordable units on
13 behalf of the Township that would be created
14 by the development. I don't know what the
15 ratio is for airport facilities, okay. The
16 way it is broken down in COAH regulations is
17 by use, an office use for every 8,000 square
18 feet, roughly, you would create one affordable
19 unit.

20 MRS. FLYNN: Every 8,000 square feet
21 one affordable unit?

22 MR. SULLIVAN: I believe that is it.
23 When you get up to a warehouse situation,
24 which may be similar to an airport use, it
25 would be much less, but I don't know the exact

1 ratio, so I can't answer that. I don't know
2 what the exact Master Plan proposal is at this
3 point. I wasn't brought in to review the
4 Master Plan. I am relating this to my 2001
5 report, but I can get you the answer, if I can
6 get the number of square feet that is proposed
7 within the Master Plan and look at it with
8 respect to COAH regulations and see how it
9 fits in the ratio.

10 MRS. FLYNN: How much does the
11 Township have to pay for affordable housing
12 units?

13 MR. SULLIVAN: The benchmark we use
14 for the provision of affordable units would be
15 what would be required for a regional
16 contribution agreement or transfer to another
17 district, and that is, at this point, \$35,000.

18 But the provision of a residential unit
19 actually would be significantly higher than
20 that if you were actually to construct it.

21 MRS. FLYNN: My other question is, we
22 heard people asking about who trumps who in
23 terms of local, State and Federal governments.
24 Can you help us?

25 MR. SULLIVAN: The State would trump

1 the County, the Federal Government the State,
2 and the municipality is down there on the
3 bottom. I don't know how it would work, and I
4 looked at Sharon when this came up before to
5 see what sort of pre-emption there is. If
6 this was a pre-emption of local zoning or a
7 rule, I don't know.

8 MRS. FLYNN: In the case of schools,
9 the Planning Board, does the Planning Board
10 have approval of what the school will look
11 like and where it is going to go?

12 MR. SULLIVAN: No.

13 MRS. FLYNN: Or is that cedeed to
14 the State?

15 MR. SULLIVAN: The State, the public
16 education reviews the plan for that, and that
17 is a referral for use.

18 MRS. FLYNN: The Planning Board has no
19 say in that type of use for a school?

20 MR. SULLIVAN: Correct.

21 MAYOR SHAMEY: The next one? We will
22 get to everybody.

23 MR. (inaudible): Dennis (inaudible),
24 Judge Thompson Road.

25 We have lived in the Township for 27

1 years. Right now, the way the planes land,
2 Judge Thompson Road is almost like on the
3 flight pattern, and the planes, I would like
4 to ask if this is legitimate, the planes go
5 two to 300 feet above our houses. Is that
6 okay? Is that allowable now?

7 The question leads to the next thing,
8 when this changes, I wish they could put the
9 map up and extend the runway out. Judge
10 Thompson Road, again, will be affected, and
11 how low will the jets fly now, they are only a
12 few hundred feet, if that, above our houses.
13 How low will the jets fly there?

14 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I don't think I can
15 give you a precise answer without really
16 looking at it. Generally, airplanes fly on a
17 three-degree slope when landing, so we could
18 calculate that for you, but I would assume if
19 they are landing over you now, and hitting the
20 end of the runway, they are probably in some
21 sort of glide, some angle approach, and there
22 is certainly no restriction from doing that.

23 MR. (inaudible): So right now it is
24 two to 300 feet above us. What will a jet be?

25 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: That is for the

1 cross-winds runway, which is not paved in the
2 early phases, but it is proposed to be paved
3 later on, I assume, just looking at the
4 picture, a couple of hundred feet.

5 MR. ERDREICH: The measurement we made
6 at Morristown, 3,200 feet from the end of the
7 runway, a jet that was landing produced 98db.

8 I don't know how high it was, but it was
9 3,200 feet from the end of the runway. That
10 is pretty low.

11 MR. AURIEMMA: Can you show us where
12 the affected areas from the cross-winds runway
13 would be? Assuming the other one was paved,
14 and what would be maybe 80 decibels? What
15 roads would be affected? What areas would be
16 affected? Can we do that for both the cross-
17 winds runway and the main runway?

18 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: How many feet out,
19 what would be a good number?

20 MR. ERDREICH: The measurement we made
21 at Morristown, as I showed it in my
22 presentation, was 3,200 feet from the end of
23 the runway for a landing jet, and it was
24 producing, as I recall, 98db. So we are not
25 3,200 feet from Judge Thompson Road, we are

1 not 3,200 feet from the school on the west end
2 of the cross-winds runway, either. So you
3 would have fairly high noise levels for a
4 substantial distance from the end of the
5 runway, if you are landing jets.

6 MR. AURIEMMA: For both the cross-
7 winds and the main runway?

8 MR. ERDREICH: If we can measure, take
9 3,200 from the end of the runway, if you can
10 do that -- right here, this 3,200 feet out.
11 This is Readington Road.

12 MR. AURIEMMA: You are saying Glenmont
13 would be significantly impacted, Mitchell,
14 Pulaski, Menlo, can we name the others that
15 would be affected?

16 How about the other way?

17 MR. SULLIVAN: That looks like it fits
18 right into Holland Brook School.

19 MR. AURIEMMA: Can you explain what
20 98db means? How loud is that? Can you make a
21 reference?

22 MR. ERDREICH: Yes. It is louder than
23 your personal lawn mower, when you are cutting
24 the grass and you are standing, if you are
25 standing this far from your lawn mower engine,

1 it is not 98db yet. It is probably on the
2 order of 85 to 90db.

3 Now, the other thing to keep in mind
4 is that, again, the noise surveys we did in
5 2001 and 2002 showed sound levels in this area
6 of only 45 decibel average. Now we are saying
7 3,200 feet out from Morristown for these jets
8 landing, we were measuring in the 95s, but
9 that is not saying we are down to 85 or 80 or
10 70, and you have to go much further out to get
11 down to the level of your ambient.

12 MAYOR SHAMEY: As a noise expert, what
13 effect would it be when a teacher is teaching
14 and a jet takes off, what would that be?

15 MR. ERDREICH: We faced this in a
16 number of cases, if you are outside in the
17 schoolyard and teaching a gym class, you can't
18 communicate when the jet flies over. If you
19 are inside and a jet flies over at 98db, then
20 what we do in airports -- in schools around
21 the major metropolitan airports, is we have
22 had school quieting programs, which brings the
23 noise level down from landing aircraft or
24 takeoffs to 50db inside of the classrooms.
25 Even then, there is a bit of a disruption, but

1 that requires major changes in school windows,
2 putting in acoustical rated windows and
3 frequently requires beefing up the roof of the
4 school, so you can control the noise through
5 the roof and into the upper floor classrooms.

6 Both the Port Authority and the FAA sponsor
7 these schools around the country because of
8 those problems.

9 MR. AURIEMMA: Who normally pays for
10 that?

11 MR. ERDREICH: The question is who
12 normally pays for them. In this area, the
13 Port Authority has paid for them, I guess, for
14 political reasons. In other areas, the FAA
15 has had programs to pay for those school
16 programs.

17 MAYOR SHAMEY: Mrs. Nagle?

18 MRS. NAGLE: Suzie Nagle. I can be
19 last, I don't care.

20 MAYOR SHAMEY: Anybody else who wants
21 to ask questions? One more time. Raise your
22 hands. This is for the consultants, and we
23 will take public comment and questions from
24 the Committee from up on stage.

25 MRS. NAGLE: Then I am premature,

1 then. My comment to the presenters is thank
2 you, and I will talk to you later.

3 MR. GOODWIN: Bill Goodwin. I live on
4 Bacchelor Road, and I would like to thank you
5 for the good presentation. It gave us a
6 perspective of what the various size of the
7 airport expansion will produce. But my
8 question is, when you looked at the various
9 aircrafts that could land on the runways, was
10 that based on the FAA recommended planning
11 length?

12 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: We took them
13 generally from manufacturer data. Now, for
14 actual operations, landing and takeoff lengths
15 are a function of weight of the airplane.
16 These were all sea levels, on a very hot day,
17 you know, you need more runway, simply because
18 of density, altitude considerations, but these
19 are actual data from sea level day landings.

20 MR. GOODWIN: I heard, it is hearsay,
21 but I heard that commercial aircraft sometimes
22 land on scheduled flights on airport runways
23 that are smaller than the represented length.

24 Does that happen, and if so, how much give is
25 there in that?

1 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I have seen the 747
2 use a thousand foot runway, it was very
3 lightly loaded, but that is under part 91 or
4 general night rules. A commercial airliner
5 flying under commercial rules has certain
6 standards they have to meet, and you can't
7 violate the regulations. But generally, if
8 the pilot thinks it is safe, then he can
9 really get below manufacturers' recommended
10 distances, because manufacturers' distances
11 are, generally, set to be somewhat
12 conservative. They consider the runway
13 surface may not be perfect, it may be sloped.
14 So there are a lot of issues that really
15 affect what you could do.

16 What we are trying to say is these are
17 typical aircraft that can operate on these
18 runways. Could they get something bigger in?

19 Sure. Would a prudent operator do that? I
20 am not sure. So you can't say exactly these
21 are exactly those, these are sort of manufac-
22 turers' recommendations. They are a fair
23 baseline.

24 MAYOR SHAMEY: Yes, sir.

25 MR. BRITWELL: Jim Britewell,

1 Pleasant Run. I have two closely related
2 questions for the aviation consultant.

3 How much can we expect residential
4 property values to decline if they put in a
5 5,600 foot runway? It seems to me there must
6 be some way to clock that based on experiences
7 with previous airports, proximity to noise or
8 other factors that could be extrapolated. My
9 question is of the consultant. Has that type
10 of study been done? Could that type of study
11 be done in this situation, and the information
12 made available to the Township residents? And
13 likewise, for the noise or acoustic
14 consultant, would it be possible to create a
15 plot of projected noise level for the
16 different runway approaches, so the residents
17 can see how they will be impacted?

18 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: To answer your first
19 question, we haven't studied any impact on
20 property values yet. The general rule of
21 thumb, and it is most likely for commercial
22 airports, this is an exception, because you
23 are going from a very quiet surrounding to a
24 noisier surrounding, but the general rule of
25 thumb is for a one decibel increase in noise,

1 on average, one percent decrease in property
2 values. Those studies are based on commercial
3 airports.

4 I haven't studied it at this airport,
5 and I haven't seen a study I can quote you
6 with any authority at this point.

7 MR. BRITWELL: So if I understood you
8 correctly, what you are saying is since the
9 background noise here is quiet, here we can
10 expect the Delta to be larger. We are not
11 near Newark Airport in an industrial zone, we
12 are in a quiet residential area, so the impact
13 would be greater. You are talking about the
14 net change and the change in value.

15 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: It is an opinion of
16 how much the noise increases and how that
17 affects property values.

18 MR. ERDREICH: With regard to your
19 second question about whether we can predict
20 the noise levels, there is a federally-
21 accepted computer model algorithm for making
22 those calculations. What it requires is
23 knowledge of the aircraft mix, the flight
24 paths and other operating conditions, and
25 having all that information, then we can

1 calculate using what is known as the
2 integrated noise level of what the average,
3 the annual average day/night sound levels will
4 be around an airport. Again, if you have a
5 jet flying over your house once, that is not
6 going to be taken into account by the noise
7 model.

8 MAYOR SHAMEY: There are two people
9 against the wall there. Okay.

10 MR. MASON: Paul Mason. I am a 25
11 year resident. Is there any particular reason
12 you excluded Teterboro Airport from your
13 comparisons? It is a little more infamous, I
14 think, to most people.

15 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Teterboro's runway
16 is 7,000 feet, it is a much more active
17 airport.

18 MR. MASON: I wanted to be sure,
19 because they are more infamous, especially in
20 the last year. Are you familiar with the
21 development history of airports like
22 Morristown and Teterboro? Are we facing the
23 same pattern, somebody came in that had a
24 small airport, the town grew up and now they
25 want to expand it? Eventually we end up with

1 a crowded situation like we have in Morristown
2 and at Teterboro.

3 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: It is pretty much
4 accepted, it is fairly far down nowadays that
5 there is a shortage of airport capacity.
6 Morristown is pretty much at capacity,
7 Teterboro is pretty much at capacity. So you
8 have to ask yourself, with economic growth and
9 people buying more airplanes, where they will
10 go, and you look at what is out there and you
11 say Morristown is pretty full, Trenton is the
12 next place you can go. If this airport is
13 expanded and could handle more sophisticated
14 aircraft, you will likely see them. We
15 haven't done a forecast yet, but you would
16 like to see it as the next place, it is a
17 matter of access and facilities.

18 MR. MASON: But 35 and 50, some
19 passenger airplanes now become commercial
20 traffic, do they not?

21 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: They can be. What I
22 pointed out was some of the large business
23 jets are as big as those airplanes. I was
24 trying to give you people some scale of what
25 you are used to flying on or seeing. It is

1 hard to deal with that in the abstract.

2 MR. MASON: Thank you. Has there been
3 any mention of cargo aircraft? Can you speak
4 to that, the size of viable cargo aircraft
5 coming in?

6 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I haven't studied
7 it, if there is a cargo market here or not,
8 but Federal Express operates single engine
9 turboprops to make deliveries.

10 MR. MASON: Last question from me:
11 There was some statement made I think in one
12 of your slides, that in the smaller airports
13 they have to go jet in order to maintain
14 viability. Are we actually to take from that
15 that this airport is operating in the red and
16 is being funded from some other source? It is
17 not a viable airport, or it couldn't remain as
18 a viable operation.

19 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I think what I can
20 safely say is that this kind of airport would
21 have a hard time funding development on solely
22 private funds that it had to raise, okay.
23 Does the airport operate, can it continue to
24 provide a living to the Solbergs if they don't
25 have to put a lot of new money into it?

1 Perhaps.

2 MR. MASON: Thank you.

3 MR. HOPPER: Vernon Hopper, 8 South
4 Branch Drive. I have one curiosity question
5 tonight.

6 All this data and all these numbers
7 you guys presented to us tonight were from
8 2000 or 2001. How come we don't have updated
9 data? The area changed in five years, and in
10 these numbers you presented to us, they could
11 have increased or decreased. You talk about
12 noise and that stuff.

13 MR. ERDREICH: There hasn't been a
14 need to do a new noise survey in the area, and
15 that is why it hasn't been done at this point.

16 I don't know that there is much change in the
17 acoustic environment since 2002. Again, that
18 is only four years.

19 MR. HOPPER: And also, how much would
20 big corporations benefit from this airport, if
21 it is expanded?

22 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I think they are the
23 logical people who might choose to base an
24 aircraft here. By the way, our airport
25 activity data is current, it is the most

1 recent available from FAA, and Solberg and
2 other airports.

3 MR. HOPPER: I hope something gets
4 solved, I've lived in this area for 25 years
5 now, and I have to go to every single meeting
6 in the past, and it seems like everything is
7 at a stand-still, like it is today.

8 MR. SULLIVAN: I would like to respond
9 to the question of the age of the report I
10 prepared, and that is that the physical
11 characteristics of the property have not
12 changed significantly in this time with
13 respect to the agricultural lands, the
14 wetlands, the stream corridors, the woodlands
15 and the extent of the improvements in any
16 measurable amount. On the other side, the
17 land use policies the Town has have remained
18 significantly intact, and if they have
19 changed, they haven't been enhanced to further
20 support the conclusions in this report. We
21 are still working under the same plan and
22 policies. The new State plan, there hasn't
23 been a lot of changes from a policy
24 standpoint, either.

25 MR. AURIEMMA: As a follow-up to that

1 question about corporate jets, when you do
2 have corporate jets and, basically, you are
3 saying that would be the major business, would
4 you then expect more helicopters if the
5 corporation is picking up their executives and
6 transporting them to their home location?

7 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I would have to look
8 at who is around here and who operates what.
9 But, yes, if there is a highly important
10 person at Merck and they are going to ferry
11 people over here to put them on an airplane,
12 then you will see a helicopter flight to do
13 that. The facility itself can handle
14 helicopters today, and I understand there are
15 helicopter operations. There are not just
16 corporate jets that you will see, there is a
17 new phenomenon of jets that people are talking
18 about, then there will be a lot of those. I
19 don't know if you people are familiar with
20 fractional ownership, but a lot of people are
21 buying an eighth of a share of a cargo
22 airplane or a sixteenth of a share of an
23 airplane, and it doesn't require the kind of
24 money that a large corporation has. If you
25 are fairly well off, you can do it, and people

1 are buying that and the airplanes come in and
2 pick them up where they are and take them to
3 where they want to go.

4 MR. GATTI: Can I interject along the
5 lines of very light jets? My question is what
6 would be the required runway length for it,
7 and my other question is how do you determine
8 the length of a runway, and is it determined
9 by the aircraft mix, is that based on the size
10 that is needed today?

11 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: The very light jets
12 really vary, there are some very small ones
13 that can operate on 3,000 feet, and some of
14 the ones we showed you today could operate on
15 3,700 feet. You know, as you add runway
16 length, more and more different kinds of
17 airplanes become possible. The runway length
18 is set for planning purposes by what they call
19 the design aircraft, and that is the aircraft
20 that is designed to have the largest amount of
21 operations, it is expected to have 3,500
22 annual operations at that airport. So they
23 are designing aircraft and they are assuming
24 an aircraft that requires 4,890 feet, because
25 that is the length that they got approved for.

1 As you saw on the charts, that is a medium-
2 sized business jet.

3 MR. SMITH: Ken Smith. First, to
4 actually answer one resident's question here
5 as to the nature of Morristown Airport, in
6 1955, my grandfather was the executive who was
7 running the Morristown Airport. At that time,
8 he had a very small staff. He was the guy out
9 mowing the grass. So in the last 50 years it
10 has grown tremendously.

11 My first question to the noise expert
12 is, and I remember back in school we spoke
13 about OSHA requirements for hearing protection
14 and certain db levels. I remember you had
15 hearing protection; is that correct?

16 MR. ERDREICH: You are partially
17 correct. If you worked in an environment with
18 90dbs, you had to have hearing protection. If
19 that environment continued for a total of
20 eight hours, that is. So it is a level and a
21 duration.

22 MR. SMITH: We are getting close to
23 that level, I am hearing 90dbs for aircraft.

24 MR. ERDREICH: But you are only
25 hearing a couple of seconds of the aircraft

1 versus eight hours for OSHA. It is a
2 completely different issue, and we are not
3 talking about hazardous to hearing.

4 MR. SMITH: My second question is
5 noise restriction. I read an article recently
6 about a case between the City of Burbank
7 versus Burbank Airport, and Burbank attempted
8 to put noise restrictions on the airport. The
9 case went to the Supreme Court and the Supreme
10 Court said municipalities could not restrict
11 noise at an airport.

12 MR. ERDREICH: There have been several
13 cases recently, and I was involved with Cave
14 Creek, Arizona, where they tried to change the
15 flight patterns. Again, the FAA has been
16 prevailing. There was one case, perhaps --

17 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: There have been a
18 number of cases, as has been indicated, where
19 it has been found that a local community can't
20 restrict various kinds of aircraft operations.

21 If an airport accepts Federal money, then it
22 can't discriminate among aircraft. But the
23 noise rules for the airplanes that have been
24 phased out, what they call Strain 3 airplanes,
25 apply to large transports over 70,000 pounds.

1 Really airline aircraft. There are still a
2 small number of Stage 1 and Stage 2 business
3 jets that airports have sought to restrict.
4 The most recent case, I believe, they were
5 able to restrict Stage 2 at certain times of
6 the night, but there is a whole Federal
7 process that you have to go through called a
8 Park 161, if you want to restrict aircraft
9 operations based on noise.

10 MR. ERDREICH: Reagan Airport was shut
11 down at night, if you can get them to move
12 into Readington, you have it made.

13 MR. SMITH: What is the difference
14 between Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3, I don't
15 understand the differences.

16 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Basically, it is the
17 level of noise that the airplane puts out.
18 Stage 1 is the earliest airplane jets that
19 were built. They are very noisy. It would be
20 the equivalent of a 707 or a very old DC8.
21 Stage 2 airplanes were the ones made in the
22 early '70s and the '80s, the DC9s. Stage 3
23 airplanes are the ones with the bypass turbo
24 engines, which came out in the mid '80s and
25 are coming out now. People are now designing

1 beyond Stage 3, but all those restrictions
2 apply to airplanes 75,000 pounds or more.
3 Where they are being phased out, you can't
4 operate a Stage 2 or larger anymore in the
5 United States, it does not apply to smaller
6 jets.

7 MR. SMITH: One last question: In
8 looking at the Master Plan in the past, I
9 pulled out a copy of the 2005 and put together
10 all of the aircraft that could operate within
11 a 5,000 foot runway, and I remember being
12 surprised to see an air bus 18W with a hundred
13 passengers. Is that a different class that
14 needs a thicker runway to operate? Can it be
15 expanded in the future from 5,000 feet?

16 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: There is an air bus
17 318 corporate version, you have to have the
18 runway width and the load-bearing strength.
19 Those would be the constraints, so with
20 something that large, is the roadway wide
21 enough or the taxiway wide enough for it, and
22 is the runway thick enough to carry the load,
23 since it is a much heavier airplane. But if
24 it was built to handle those loads and all
25 those conditions, you could land a 318 at

1 5,000 feet and take off. Would it be
2 typically expected here? Probably not.

3 MAYOR SHAMEY: Any other questions for
4 the consultants?

5 Yes, sir.

6 A VOICE: I have a question for John
7 Erdreich. John, you once explained to me that
8 with an industrial zone property to a
9 residential zone property, there were certain
10 noise limits. I don't remember what it was, I
11 thought it was between seven in the morning
12 and ten at night, and it drops even lower from
13 ten at night to seven in the morning. Was
14 that 65dbs dropping to 50?

15 MR. ERDREICH: The State code
16 specifies that noise from a commercial or
17 industrial source to a residential can exceed
18 the 65 to 70 a day and 50db at night.

19 A VOICE: Does this apply to the
20 airport?

21 MR. ERDREICH: No.

22 A VOICE: The airport is exempt?

23 MR. ERDREICH: Yes, it is a Federal
24 operation.

25 MAYOR SHAMEY: Any other residents'

1 questions for the consultants?

2 Any Committee questions?

3 MR. GATTI: Yes. Earlier in my
4 presentation, I discussed that there would be
5 a limitation on Stage 1 or Stage 2 aircraft.
6 Can you explain what that would mean, given
7 the negotiations?

8 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: As long as you don't
9 take Federal funds, then you may be able to
10 reach an agreement with the airport operator
11 that they will not allow Stage 1 or Stage 2
12 airplanes to land at the airport. And what
13 the sanction is, you basically wouldn't serve
14 them. You wouldn't sell them fuel, you would
15 refuse service. But once you take Federal
16 money, then it becomes a Federal issue and it
17 is a question of whether you have the right to
18 restrict them.

19 But if the airport is private, if the
20 airport were privately owned and not open to
21 the public, you can restrict anything.

22 If it is privately owned and open to
23 the public, but takes no Federal money, then
24 you can probably reach an agreement, because
25 the Federal enforcement comes through taking

1 Federal money. If the airport takes Federal
2 money, then you are pretty much governed by
3 what the FAA rules are for noise restrictions,
4 and it will be a matter that ends up in court,
5 probably.

6 MR. GATTI: Would that type of
7 discussion of Stage 1 or Stage 2 be
8 applicable, given the type of discussion we
9 had concerning this type of airport?

10 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Sure, it only
11 becomes an issue if you have a runway long
12 enough to put those kind of airplanes on it.
13 If you are talking about a 3,000 foot runway,
14 it would be fairly hard, I think. The
15 earliest lower jets are still Stage 1, but I
16 don't know, I have to check to see if they can
17 get in within 3,000 feet.

18 MR. GATTI: Thank you.

19 MAYOR SHAMEY: Anybody else on the
20 Committee?

21 MR. AURIEMMA: In addition to that
22 question, can the airport be expanded with
23 private monies and then switch over to a
24 Federal grant to expand it even further?

25 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Sure.

1 MR. AURIEMMA: So then that doesn't
2 lock us in, that doesn't lock us in in
3 perpetuity, then?

4 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Basically, if the
5 airport can produce a credible sponsor,
6 whether it is a private owner or another
7 public body, and it doesn't have to be the
8 Township, another public body could act as the
9 airport sponsor and, by doing so, make an
10 application for Federal funds. Now, the grant
11 of Federal funds will depend upon the merits
12 you are applying for.

13 MR. AURIEMMA: I saw it in the
14 presentation, you had the main runway at 100
15 feet and the cross-winds runway at 75 feet.
16 Why is the main runway a hundred? Is there a
17 significance to that number?

18 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Actually, the
19 current main runway is 50 feet wide, I think
20 they are proposing wider. The cross-winds
21 runway is 200 feet wide.

22 MR. AURIEMMA: Paved?

23 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Paved.

24 MR. AURIEMMA: The proposal is 75 feet
25 wide for the cross-winds and the main runway,

1 the proposal is 100 feet.

2 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: It is designed based
3 upon the class of aircraft you will operate
4 there. The wider the runway, the larger class
5 of aircraft you can operate there.

6 MR. AURIEMMA: By limiting the width
7 of the runway, that would limit the type of
8 aircraft that would land?

9 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: By limiting runway
10 length and width to certain distances, yes,
11 you can limit what can safely operate there.

12 MR. AURIEMMA: My last question is,
13 when I am on the New Jersey Turnpike near
14 Newark Airport and I see a jet coming in for a
15 landing, I hear a loud whining sound. Now the
16 jet is not being accelerated at that point,
17 his wheels are exposed and I see the flaps are
18 down, the large flaps are down on the wings.
19 Why is it making that loud noise, when he is
20 not actually accelerating? And my next
21 question is all related to noise. I did see
22 on a presentation where the landing is
23 actually noisier than the takeoff. We have
24 been talking about noise on takeoff being at
25 certain levels, but I noticed the landing is

1 even louder than the takeoff. Does that all
2 tie in with what I saw on the Turnpike?

3 MR. ERDREICH: Well, as far as what
4 you observed on the Turnpike, when you are
5 close to the aircraft you will hear the sound
6 that is produced, you will hear the high
7 pitched noise from the turbo. As you move
8 further away -- there was a question several
9 hours ago about aircraft possibly out of
10 Newark and why they were low frequency. The
11 further away you are from the source, the more
12 the high frequency noises will be attenuated,
13 the low frequencies coming through, and what
14 you are hearing is the high pitched whine from
15 the engine turbos. Rich can answer that
16 question, but my understanding is that when
17 the aircraft lands, it has to land under full
18 power.

19 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: I think what
20 happens, I will take the two questions, this
21 is the air flap noise. The flaps are down,
22 the wheels are down and some of the most
23 modern airplanes, the aircraft noise can be
24 greater than the other noise. The plane
25 lands, and it is on a three-degree slope.

1 When the airplane takes off, it takes off, and
2 there is no limit what it can climb at, so,
3 generally, you will get a lot more exposure on
4 landing, simply because the approach is much
5 shallower than the takeoff.

6 MR. AURIEMMA: So doesn't that, in
7 some respects, necessitate the Stage 3 part of
8 the aircraft, because what you are saying is
9 you can't limit the noise on the landing
10 regardless of the noise from the engine. We
11 did see that that landing is noisier than the
12 takeoff. Does Stage 3 have to do with the
13 noise from the engine?

14 MR. GOLASZEWSKI: Basically, Stage 3
15 is engine noise, it is measured separately
16 from landing and takeoff.

17 MR. ERDREICH: I agree.

18 MAYOR SHAMEY: Anybody else on the
19 Committee?

20 Ladies and gentlemen, we will take
21 public comments now. Give us three minutes to
22 put the screen up and return to the stage.

23 (Off the record.)

24 MAYOR SHAMEY: If there are questions,
25 the answers to which you are not satisfied

1 with, those questions can be e-mailed or
2 mailed in or faxed in to the Municipal
3 Building, and we will pass them along to the
4 consultants. Make sure you give us contact
5 information, and we will make sure the
6 consultants research your particular question
7 and provide you with a more satisfactory
8 answer, if you felt the answer you received
9 was unsatisfactory.

10 Secondly, former Mayor Gatti's
11 presentation is posted on the Township
12 website, which is at [www](http://www.readingtontwd.org), or will be posted on
13 the Township's website, which is
14 www.readingtontwd.org.

15 One last thing, there was a handout
16 passed out this evening that the majority of
17 them have an overlay. I will let Vita explain
18 it.

19 MS. MEKOVITZ: Some of them had an
20 overlay, but those of you who didn't get an
21 overlay, it really only showed -- it was an
22 easier way of showing the second page, which
23 is the long-term plan. So basically,
24 everybody has everything. You can look at it
25 a little easier.

1 MAYOR SHAMEY: Before we take public
2 comments, there are a couple of points that I
3 remain unclear about that I would like to look
4 into further, and that is the issue regarding
5 Hillcrest Park. I think there were some
6 conflicting opinions as to whether the park
7 remained where it is under full buildout as
8 proposed, and I think we need to examine that.

9 There was also a question with respect
10 to local zoning control, already proposed
11 expansion, and I think this is something we
12 need to look at a little further, because as
13 of right now, the airport exists in the
14 residential zone. It is a pre-existing non-
15 conforming use. However, there is a State
16 statute called the Airport Safety and
17 Hazardous Zoning Act, which requires the
18 municipality to pass an ordinance creating the
19 airport safety zone around the airport and,
20 thereby, making the airport a conforming use.

21 We don't have such an ordinance, but I would
22 never vote in favor of such an ordinance,
23 because I have spent quite a bit of time
24 researching it, and I think the legislation,
25 in my view, is flawed. It has been challenged

1 legally, so that might be something that they
2 may do some day. I pray that is not the case,
3 but that is kind of a partial answer to Mr.
4 Dudzinski's question.

5 With that, we will take public
6 comment, and we will go row by row as we
7 normally do.

8 The crowd has dwindled. Those of you
9 who hung in there for this, I know it was a
10 lot of information to digest, and we are all
11 probably still digesting it, so again, I would
12 encourage your follow-up questions.

13 With that being said, I ask that you
14 limit your comments to a reasonable period of
15 time. I don't think we need a specific time
16 period, but if it starts to drag on, I will
17 ask you to wrap it up.

18 Why don't we start with the front row.

19 I don't think the Court Reporter has any
20 questions, and the Reporter from the Hunterdon
21 Review hasn't any questions, so the second
22 row. Anybody in the second row left? All the
23 way to the right, does anyone have any
24 questions? Any comments, rather?

25 MR. DUDZINSKI: Ed Dudzinski again.

1 MAYOR SHAMEY: Before you start, Ed,
2 why don't you do this? If people would start
3 queuing up here for public comment, that is
4 okay as well.

5 Can I get a show of hands of how many
6 people have comments?

7 MR. DUDZINSKI: I appreciate everybody
8 that came in tonight and the Town Committee.
9 I learned a lot of information tonight, and it
10 was certainly helpful. I appreciate everybody
11 that gave presentations. But I think it would
12 be helpful, though, because I am trying to
13 wrestle with the issues myself, I am going
14 through a learning curve, trying to understand
15 how did this unfold. I guess my question is,
16 it seems like negotiations broke off, the
17 Township Committee decided to have a public
18 session, so we could come in and find out what
19 is going on. But it is always best when the
20 other side is also here.

21 I would like to see another meeting,
22 if possible, where Thor Solberg and his
23 sisters can come in and have an opportunity to
24 have a discussion back and forth, because from
25 what I heard earlier on from the letter sent

1 on November 2nd, he is saying he lives in this
2 community also, and he wants to do what is
3 right by the Town. He wants to preserve the
4 quality of life. That is the goal the
5 Township Committee has, as well.

6 I heard everything that you have had
7 to say, it is very informational. It would be
8 helpful to have Thor and his sisters here, as
9 well, to give their side of the story. It is
10 very difficult hearing one side without the
11 other side.

12 So my recommendation to the Township
13 Committee would be don't just schedule a
14 meeting and invite Thor to the meeting, work
15 with Thor and say let's see if we can find a
16 common time to have a meeting, if we are all
17 pulling the same, or because we are in a town
18 and want to have a safe quality of life, let's
19 have the residents here, both sides, so we can
20 get a clearer, better picture of the whole
21 situation.

22 MAYOR SHAMEY: That is a good point,
23 and that was the intention of tonight's
24 meeting. Thor, for whatever reason, chose not
25 to appear. So I don't know what to say, I

1 think it is a great idea, and I wish he was
2 here.

3 MR. DUDZINSKI: I don't know, I saw
4 some account in the paper where they said they
5 didn't know a meeting was going to take place.

6 MAYOR SHAMEY: He was advised of the
7 meeting on January 3rd, the date of our
8 reorganization meeting. He had telephone
9 conversations with Mr. Gatti about the
10 meeting, and received a letter from the
11 Township about the meeting, and declined to
12 appear.

13 MR. AURIEMMA: He received a certified
14 letter for the family to appear, and I think
15 you can see the place and the names for the
16 Solbergs over there, and they decided not to
17 attend.

18 MR. DUDZINSKI: January 3rd to this
19 date is a long time. I don't know if he had
20 other plans or was going to be traveling.

21 MAYOR SHAMEY: We will put it this
22 way, Ed, we never received a request to
23 postpone it. We just received nothing, not
24 coming. If the request had been made to
25 postpone it, we certainly would have

1 entertained that and probably postponed it.

2 MR. DUDZINSKI: It is what it is.

3 Let's move forward. But maybe another attempt
4 could be made with Thor and his sisters to
5 have another meeting where we can have
6 everybody together, so we can understand both
7 sides of the story.

8 MAYOR SHAMEY: I think that is a good
9 suggestion, and I would leave it to the
10 Solbergs to suggest such a meeting. We worked
11 feverishly to put this meeting together, and I
12 am speaking for myself, and I would say Mrs.
13 Nagle is here and she is going to speak, I
14 believe, but I agree with you completely,
15 completely. We will await word as to whether
16 the Solbergs requests such a meeting.

17 MR. DUDZINSKI: Thank you.

18 MAYOR SHAMEY: Let's move across.
19 Anybody else in this row that this gentleman
20 just spoke in? Moving across the room. Why
21 doesn't somebody raise their hand, whoever
22 wants to speak and come up. We will continue
23 to go row by row.

24 MR. MASON: Paul Mason again. Just my
25 summary impression, tonight is lost to me,

1 like the Township has to make a choice of
2 whether we want a Morristown-like operation in
3 the middle of our township or not. I would
4 also say to the Township Committee to not
5 neglect to look into the impact of cargo
6 operations with the attendant warehouses and
7 18-wheeler truck traffic, because, although
8 the card has been played, it may very well be
9 part of the game plan.

10 Lastly, I would urge the Township
11 Committee to view the last election statements
12 by those of us who chose to vote, where we
13 stand on this. Thank you.

14 MAYOR SHAMEY: Just come up if you
15 want to speak, that is the most efficient way
16 to do this.

17 MR. (inaudible): Dennis (inaudible),
18 Judge Thompson Road. I want to thank you very
19 much, we have lived in the town, we want to
20 continue to live in the town. It is just very
21 scary for us when I see the plans and the
22 flight patterns. Thank you.

23 MR. DORI: My name is Joe Dori, and I
24 live on Woodland way. I did have a question,
25 I thought we were going to be able to ask

1 questions of the Township.

2 MAYOR SHAMEY: Go ahead. If it gets
3 protracted --

4 MR. DORI: It should be simple, but I
5 heard one of the choices is the Township
6 acquiring the airport and continuing to run it
7 as it exists. If the Township does acquire
8 the land and runs the airport, is the
9 intention to do it locally, that you are going
10 to continue the airport in perpetuity, or will
11 it be a situation where, in the future, if the
12 Township decided they didn't want the airport
13 there, they change it?

14 MAYOR SHAMEY: We have discussed
15 various options, but at no time, at least in
16 my memory, have we contemplated closure of the
17 airport.

18 MR. DORI: Could it be an option that
19 would happen? My question is because I can
20 see ten years from now a different Township
21 Committee saying we really don't like this
22 concept, let's close it.

23 MAYOR SHAMEY: I suppose that is a
24 possibility, but I believe it is fairly
25 complicated to close an air facility. I am

1 not an expert in that field, sir, but it is
2 not something -- I am speaking for myself --
3 that I would like to see happen.

4 MR. MELLIS: My name is John Mellis,
5 and I've lived here in White House Station for
6 34 years. It was a very well-orchestrated
7 show, by the experts, that is, but now if the
8 other side was here also with their experts,
9 every expert has another expert who thinks in
10 a different way and presents the same things
11 in a different manner. Now, in every court we
12 have the criminal with his attorneys before we
13 sacrifice him. Now here we have you people
14 that everybody is against the Solbergs, so
15 let's see what the Solbergs have to say. We
16 heard the experts that we paid for this
17 meeting here. There is no court in this world
18 that the criminal is not there with his
19 attorneys to provide that. But to try to
20 confiscate the land, tomorrow you might try to
21 confiscate my land, my house. I mean, you can
22 fine us, so to try to confiscate land, I think
23 it is -- you are right, the airport should not
24 be capable to take the 747s, but do not
25 confiscate land, because tomorrow they could

1 confiscate your land. That is what I have to
2 say. And the Solbergs should be able to
3 answer those theories with their own experts.

4 Thank you.

5 MAYOR SHAMEY: They were given that
6 opportunity, and they agreed to contact the
7 Township and request such an opportunity. If
8 Solberg Airport would like to make a
9 presentation to the Township, I can't speak
10 for the Committee, but perhaps that can be
11 arranged. The opportunity existed here
12 tonight but, for whatever reason, they did not
13 want to take us up on it. I don't know why.
14 But this is not a criminal trial, sir, if they
15 would like to make a presentation to the
16 Township, they need to contact us. They need
17 to say we want to make a presentation to the
18 Township of what we want to do and how it will
19 impact the Township. We are here, ready to
20 listen. We are here tonight and ready to
21 listen tonight. So that opportunity remains,
22 and we will wait and see what happens.

23 MR. MELLIS: You are absolutely right,
24 but people should hear both sides of the
25 story.

1 MAYOR SHAMEY: I totally agree with
2 you. Thank you.

3 MR. AURIEMMA: Also, I think I heard
4 you say everyone is against the Solbergs, and
5 that we are looking to confiscate the land. I
6 didn't hear anything in this presentation that
7 talked about we were against the Solbergs or
8 looking to confiscate anybody's land. The
9 purpose of the presentation was to show what
10 was asked for, and the purpose of the
11 presentation was to discuss the right-sized
12 airport for our Township. That was the
13 purpose of this meeting.

14 MR. FOSTER: My name is Steve Foster,
15 and I live over just off Higginsville in the
16 Three Bridges area.

17 First, thanks to the Committee and the
18 Solbergs for hanging in there and having the
19 conversations to date. As a citizen who
20 watched very cantankerous behavior in the
21 spring and summer, I appreciated that effort.

22 I am sorry they weren't here this evening,
23 and I would look forward to hearing from them.

24 I hope not with shots over the bow in a
25 stand-alone situation, but I would like to

1 hear their point. I learned a lot from the
2 experts tonight, and I am concerned about one
3 thing, the approach path. The flight path,
4 whatever you call it, where the increased
5 aircraft track would come, where it will be
6 extended to, where it was before, I would
7 imagine.

8 I am remembering back to the diagram
9 that you had with the red lines around it for
10 the buffer zone, and I am wondering if such a
11 diagram could be made over our Township to
12 show which homes and community areas are going
13 to be affected by the flight paths in and out
14 on both of the runways. There may be a lot of
15 people in the Township that think the people
16 most affected are these living right around
17 this area, and they are mistaken. I, for one,
18 do not want to have to close my windows all
19 summer because of jet traffic coming in with
20 cargo for Fed Ex and UPS, overnight, to
21 warehouse their materials overnight at hangars
22 at the airport, and if that is a point, it
23 behooves the Township and the citizens to
24 understand clearly people as far away as
25 Ringo's might be affected or Three Bridges, et

1 cetera. And that it isn't just those of us
2 that might live right here at the airport.

3 MAYOR SHAMEY: Maybe you can send that
4 in to the Township, and we can pass it along,
5 and we can pass it on to the Solbergs, and
6 they can provide an answer as well, and that
7 is a fair and balanced way to answer the
8 question.

9 MR. FOSTER: Like many other people, I
10 want to respect the Solbergs, they have the
11 right on their property to run their business,
12 but I would hope that they respect that. I
13 don't have to give up my property and my way
14 of living and noise around my home in order
15 for them to make a living, and somewhere in
16 the middle is the truth.

17 The last point is that a lot of good
18 work was done tonight, but I hope there are
19 lot of people who could not come tonight or
20 did not understand the purpose of the meeting
21 tonight, or weren't interested in the depth of
22 knowledge that was shared tonight. I would
23 hope the Committee would take very seriously
24 the need to communicate some summary in a fair
25 way directly to the rest of the folks who

1 weren't here, via printed material, if it
2 needs to be, so that the whole Township is on
3 the same page, at least from the position that
4 you presented this evening, and the issues
5 that you left us being concerned about, the
6 noise, traffic, the four options, the sense
7 that the Township might be being pushed into a
8 corner to make a decision now or forever
9 abdicate its ability to control the situation.

10 You have to let people know where we
11 are, and there were several hundred people
12 here, but there are several thousands of
13 people in the Township and everybody has to be
14 aware of it. So thank you for the extra work.

15 MRS. NAGLE: My name is Suzie Solberg
16 Nagle, 2 High Ridge Court in White House
17 Station. I have been a resident of Readington
18 longer than I would like to admit.

19 First of all, I want to thank you
20 also, the Township Committee, for presenting
21 the information tonight. I won't comment on
22 the fact of when we were told and who was
23 told. There was some disagreement on that.
24 But I am still hopeful we can learn from the
25 presentations tonight and move over to an

1 amicable resolution.

2 I think that we need to be focusing
3 and just keeping on track on the issues of
4 open space, quality of life in Readington
5 Township, the airport preservation and the
6 safety for both the people on the ground and
7 people flying.

8 I will present Mr. -- I believe his
9 name is Dudzinski's suggestion to my other two
10 partners about us making a presentation, joint
11 with you or separate, whatever, and the
12 airport is open seven days a week. I am there
13 every day during the week, and I can be there
14 on the weekend, if anybody wants to talk to
15 me. I am always available. My number is in
16 the phone book, and I am easily accessible.

17 I haven't talked to my other two
18 partners about this, but I would like the
19 negotiations to continue, and possibly we can
20 consider having a non-binding arbitration and
21 I wonder if you would consider that.

22 MAYOR SHAMEY: We will discuss that
23 when we meet the next time as a Committee.

24 MRS. NAGLE: I think, obviously, the
25 airport is very important to the community,

1 you have a letter addressed to him, it doesn't
2 get opened.

3 MAYOR SHAMEY: I don't know if it was
4 addressed to Solberg Aviation.

5 MRS. NAGLE: It is addressed to Thor
6 Solberg, Jr.

7 MAYOR SHAMEY: And a copy to Mr.
8 Berger.

9 MRS. NAGLE: I did not get that, I got
10 that last night. That is when I saw it.

11 MAYOR SHAMEY: Can I ask you a
12 question? If it is putting you on the spot,
13 don't answer it. Is he your attorney in this
14 matter? What is his role?

15 MRS. NAGLE: Mr. Berger is as
16 represented, an attorney by education and by
17 profession, he is a land developer and he has
18 been also a business partner of ours in one
19 venture and a business consultant.

20 MAYOR SHAMEY: I will tell you, his
21 comment to me was quite unsettling, his
22 comments were quite unsettling.

23 MRS. NAGLE: I don't know what he said
24 to you, I was not part of that conversation.

25 MAYOR SHAMEY: Basically, he was going

1 to help him buy the Township Committee.

2 MRS. NAGLE: I can't comment on Mr.
3 Berger's comments, especially when he is not
4 here to defend himself, but there were some
5 other comments made, and I wasn't aware of any
6 of that, either.

7 MAYOR SHAMEY: That is where the
8 disconnect is. Maybe we can get our
9 communications better or improved.

10 MRS. NAGLE: For the sake of the whole
11 community, we have to.

12 MAYOR SHAMEY: I mean, as to you and
13 your two partners, it seems like information
14 needs to get to each of you, and that is not
15 happening, it seems.

16 MRS. NAGLE: We sent an e-mail to Mr.
17 Rhatican and he got that information.

18 MR. RHATICAN: If I may, just to
19 clarify, our office had sent a letter to Thor
20 Solberg Aviation to the attention of Thor
21 himself with a copy to Mr. Berger by fax, and
22 that was sent, I don't know, the early part of
23 last week. I did get an e-mail from your
24 husband yesterday expressing that he had not
25 seen it and, frankly, it was my presumption if

1 it was addressed to Solberg Airport, it would
2 be distributed among the partners, we
3 presumed.

4 MRS. NAGLE: Well, Thor is not around,
5 so he didn't get the letter, and we didn't
6 open his letter, it was addressed to him.

7 MAYOR SHAMEY: Well, all future
8 communications we can send to all three of
9 you.

10 MR. RHATICAN: Yes, in my correspon-
11 dence by e-mail -- any future correspondence
12 will go to everybody. Am I right with the
13 address?

14 MRS. NAGLE: P.O. Box 15.

15 MR. RHATICAN: The same address but
16 three different persons?

17 MRS. NAGLE: Thank you.

18 MR. GATTI: Suzie, I want to thank you
19 before you leave the podium. I want to thank
20 you for the hospitality. I thought you and I
21 were communicating, I don't know if the other
22 members heard what we were talking about, your
23 partners there, but I would like to go on the
24 record and say you and I did speak about this
25 meeting on January 3rd.

1 MRS. NAGLE: After I called Vita.

2 MR. GATTI: And Thor and I did speak
3 about this meeting on January 4th, and I did
4 express at that time that I felt it would be
5 good to advise the community in accordance
6 with the letter that was sent out by Thor to
7 get as much public input as possible, that it
8 would give you an opportunity to challenge our
9 experts, bring your own experts and to have an
10 open discussion about it, and get public input
11 from the community on it and figure out what
12 the next step is.

13 MRS. NAGLE: That is why I was here,
14 to receive the public input.

15 MR. GATTI: Exactly, that is why I
16 would like to say, as a group, a committee, we
17 should figure out what the next step would be
18 and continue negotiations in some fashion or
19 another.

20 MRS. NAGLE: I think all three of us
21 are willing to continue the negotiations.

22 MR. GATTI: Okay, I'm sorry I didn't
23 answer your e-mail, I am just busy. It is a
24 bad time of year in my profession.

25 MAYOR SHAMEY: Any further public

1 comments? Could you come up?

2 MR. HOPPER: Vernon Hopper. I just
3 hope by 2006 this airport issue will be
4 resolved. I have been in this Township for
5 25 years, I have seen many elected officials
6 up there like you guys, and it is going back
7 and forth, back and forth, and I think a lot
8 of people who lived in this community as long
9 as I have or longer, have been hearing the
10 same thing. So, hopefully, the Township
11 Committee, I appreciate your hard work on it
12 for the last couple of years, and I guess you
13 are keeping up on it and, hopefully, you and
14 the Solbergs will have, basically, an
15 agreement to satisfy everybody in the
16 community. So I thank you for your time and
17 effort.

18 MAYOR SHAMEY: Thank you.

19 MR. ZWERLING: Eric Zwerling, I live
20 in Readington. I want to thank you for the
21 extremely informative presentation we had
22 tonight. I put together some comments that
23 are slightly different based upon the
24 information we received tonight, but I will go
25 ahead with them. There is not a person in

1 this room who wants to change the Solberg
2 family's way of life. But none of us want an
3 expanded Solberg Airport to change our way of
4 life, either. Readington is a remarkable
5 oasis of peace and quiet, and many of us live
6 here for that reason.

7 In the past, Solbergs have sought to
8 increase the size of their airport. Now we
9 learn the negotiations failed because of their
10 unyielding desire to expand. Much more
11 ominous is the heavy-handedness in the
12 election last November, which proved their
13 political desire to replace the current
14 Township Committee with one that would be more
15 compliant to their expansion desires. Before
16 the election, one of their representatives was
17 quoted as saying after the last election, "It
18 would only take one more election to overturn
19 the Township Committee." Even after the
20 election, they continued their bias and
21 disinformative political dealing, which shows
22 they have not given up their goal to overturn
23 the Township Committee. Make no mistake, they
24 will be back and, in fact, we heard that they
25 have emphatically stated that is exactly what

1 their plan is.

2 In the past, they have always said
3 they only want to be left alone to operate the
4 airport as currently configured. If that is
5 so, they should voluntarily sell the
6 development rights to the property, cash out
7 any number of millions of dollars at State
8 expense, and we can all sleep at night knowing
9 their current lifestyle and ours has been
10 permanently preserved. But we now know that
11 is not what the airport advocates and their
12 associates want. On site, they want a 5,600
13 foot runway and a million feet of hangar. Off
14 site, one of the directors or partners of the
15 Solbergs published an article in the "Courier
16 News" which called for the rezoning of
17 residential properties around the airport so
18 it can grow into a mixed use zone, airport and
19 industrial park, surrounding the airport with
20 businesses, rental car offices, hotels, long-
21 term parking facilities in the heart of quiet,
22 rural Readington. This vision for Solberg
23 Airport would completely alter the nature of
24 Readington forever, at the expense of the
25 whole community, while benefitting only a few

1 investors and property owners. The airport
2 industrial park would seriously affect
3 hundreds of thousands of people. The impact
4 zone of an expanded airport would measure
5 several square miles.

6 This past election was a clear
7 referendum on industrial park expansion, every
8 single voter knew the choice before them and
9 these voters resoundingly rejected the
10 provision of airport expansion and land
11 development. The results were heroic and
12 unambiguous, considering how much time, how
13 much work it took from countless volunteers,
14 and every single voter who made a significant
15 effort to log a write-in vote. This community
16 spoke very loudly on November 4th. The people
17 of Readington clearly support this Township
18 Committee and sincerely thank them for this
19 courageous and principled stand to protect the
20 greatest township in the county. We ask them
21 to do whatever it takes to resolve this with
22 finality.

23 MR. GATTI: This was the "Courier
24 News" editorial written by whom?

25 MR. ZWERLING: It was the editorial on

1 January 9th written by a Mr. Simmel.

2 MR. GATTI: Who doesn't live in our
3 community.

4 MAYOR SHAMEY: We have known him for
5 years, and he has a lot of big ideas of
6 rezoning the township he doesn't live in. He
7 lives in Westfield, so I am not that concerned
8 about what he thinks of our zoning.

9 MR. ZWERLING: I understand that, but
10 he is a partner in Solberg.

11 MAYOR SHAMEY: He is not a partner, it
12 is an organization called Partners in Solberg
13 who were pilots. He is a flight guy, but he
14 has been telling us what to do here in
15 Readington for years, and he doesn't live
16 here.

17 A VOICE: I don't know if I should say
18 anything after that, but I see the Township
19 here and the Solbergs here and a heck of a lot
20 of room in between for negotiations. I'm
21 sorry the Solbergs had to leave already, there
22 is a lot more room for you guys to get
23 together, negotiate and come up with
24 something, because I don't see any movement on
25 either side on this. You are both in the

1 trenches and not moving.

2 I think the idea of an arbitrator
3 might be good, it sounds like all sides need
4 looking from the outside in to see what we can
5 do here, rather than each side kind of
6 presenting its own information, but not
7 walking any further towards a compromise.

8 MAYOR SHAMEY: Thank you.

9 MR. LAMMONS: My name is James
10 Lammons, and I just purchased my house on
11 11 Apple Tree Road this past April. I grew
12 up in New York City, I know what airplane
13 noise is. When I drive down Readington Road
14 and Hillcrest, I smile because it is so
15 peaceful here and that is the reason why I
16 moved to Readington. The last thing I want
17 now is jet noise. I appreciate all of the
18 work you have done, please continue to do so
19 and know we are 100 percent behind you. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. BRITWELL: Jim Britewell,
22 Pleasant Run.

23 Based upon the remarks the consultants
24 made earlier in response to my questions, I
25 would like to ask the Township Committee to

1 sponsor an acoustic study and a study of land
2 values in the Township, if the proposed
3 Solberg expansion would go into effect with an
4 approximately 5,000 foot runway. It sounds
5 like it is possible to do. I would like to
6 see that information distributed to every
7 resident in the Township that would be
8 affected by this. It seems like a pretty good
9 way to spend Township money. Maybe we can cut
10 back on recycling, have some stickers put on
11 it and let Raritan carry it off. I notice the
12 consultants compared our airport to Palwaukee
13 Airport in Chicago. I lived in the Fox Run
14 Apartments right off the airport, where the
15 Village of Readington would be in relationship
16 to the Solberg runway, and putting a runway
17 expansion of that size would dramatically
18 change the quality of life in the Township.
19 It is absurd for the Solbergs to send out a
20 letter saying they will not change the quality
21 of life in Readington, when they are proposing
22 an expansion like this. I don't see how they
23 can possibly hold those two thoughts in their
24 head at the same time.

25 So I would like to encourage the

1 Township Committee to do what they can. I am
2 not sure I would favor arbitration, because I
3 am not sure I want an arbitrator to decide a
4 nice compromise is a 4,500 foot runway, which
5 will accommodate smaller jets, not the real
6 big ones. I am not sure that is something we
7 want in Readington Township, either. Thank
8 you.

9 MAYOR SHAMEY: Any further public
10 comments?

11 Do we have a motion to adjourn this
12 meeting?

13 MR. GATTI: So moved.

14 MRS. MUIR: Second.

15 (Whereupon, all members vote in the
16 affirmative.)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, JACQUELINE KLAPP, a Certified
Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public of the
State of New Jersey, holding License No.
30X100034700 do hereby certify that foregoing is a
true and accurate transcript as taken to the best of
my ability.

JACQUELINE KLAPP, CSR 30X100034700

