

Letter to the Editor

## Airport runway extension and juggling the figures

Posted: Sunday, August 15, 2010 1:00 am | *Updated: 8:11 am, Sun Aug 15, 2010.*

The FAA published figures July 29 reveals runway 4/22 to be 5,500 feet, not 4,775 feet, and the activity to be 50,005 landings and take-offs annually. Not the originally 140,000 numbers fraudulently provided to the FAA in 2005 to assist in getting a superfluous control tower. Has not the airport survived very nicely for decades without a tower? Especially true during the peak General Aviation activities of the '70s and '80s, which has now decayed by almost 50 percent.

Granted, a few large aircraft need to regulate fuel load to comply with performance figures. These probably use the airport on rare occasion. If they are to fly non-stop to Europe or Asia they would be terribly inconvenienced by having to refuel enroute. Rich folks don't like to be bothered with things like that, unlike what the average working stiff puts up with. A corporate King Air 200 twin turbine can take off, loaded, in 1942 feet and land in 1760, while a Cessna 172 needs but 865 feet and 520 feet. Standard weather conditions prevailing, but less distance with any amount of headwind or less weight. Looks like what we have now is more than ample in length for the vast majority of activity. Historically proven.

Now, I've got a great idea for the officials to work on. Dredge the Tred Avon all the way to Easton Point so very, very large boats can dock here? I'm sure they could juggle the figures, like they are doing, and have done, at the airport, to make it sound like a wonderful money making opportunity and asset to the community.

We've got a wonderful airport that more than exceeds our little community's needs. Let it be. Don't insult our citizens intelligence or test our voting power.

JOHN HRUBAN,

Easton

Retired NTSB aircraft accident investigator

---