

2025 Airport Master Plan Questions & Answers

**Note: These questions were taken from a document titled "QUESTION FROM RESIDENTS - AIRPORT MASTER PLAN 04-23-2025". Not all of the questions in the document were related to the Airport Master Plan, and those unrelated questions will be answered and posted separately on the MRRA website.*

1. Your report indicates in 2022 that the economic impact of the Airport was 21.7 million dollars, far outpacing all other general aviation airports in the State of Maine. Could you please break down in detail the \$21.7 million figure to confirm how such figure was calculated?

The economic impact study was conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, as part of the State's new Airport Systems Plan. To ensure accuracy, because MRRA did not complete the calculations, we recommend you direct your question to the source.

2. At the meeting, the economic impact was explained as increased hotel services and rental car utilization. Can you please describe how you arrived at those figures, and share with the community any survey data you have for pilot visitors and their passengers? What data sources were used?

The economic impact study was conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, as part of the State's new Airport Systems Plan. To ensure accuracy, because MRRA did not prepare the report or the numbers, we recommend you direct your question to the source.

3. Could you provide a breakdown on the take-off and landings, and what the size and purpose of the plane trips are? For example, how many are personal trips/business trips? How many flights include more than one pilot and one passenger?

The Aviation forecast chapter which will be available online once it is completed will provide an estimated breakdown of aircraft type. For privacy reasons it does not include a breakdown of destination or use. Brunswick does not track number of passengers per aircraft.

4. Could you provide a breakdown of where the plane trips are arriving from and where they are traveling to?

The Aviation forecast chapter which will be available online once it is completed will provide an estimated breakdown of aircraft type. For privacy reasons it does not include

a breakdown of destination or use.

5. Could you please provide the number of plane visits with the plane remaining at the airport overnight, what is the breakdown of more than one night?

This is not a statistic that the Airport tracks.

6. Could you please explain why the Brunswick Airport economic impact is significantly different by an order of magnitude from all other General Aviation Airports.

The economic impact study was conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, as part of the State's new Airport Systems Plan. We recommend you direct your question to the source.

7. Your Report on page 1 indicates a grand total employment impact of 149 on page 2 a direct job number of 77. Could you please itemize each of these jobs as currently existing, by position and salary. Could you explain the rationale for what an employment impact as which is doubling the direct job number.

The economic impact study was conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, as part of the State's new Airport Systems Plan. To ensure accuracy, because MRRA did not conduct the analysis, we recommend you direct your question to the source.

8. Of the 77 jobs listed: please advise how many jobs are directly tied to worker safety, how many jobs to environmental; how many jobs are tied to emergency services including fire and rapid response crews.

The economic impact study was conducted by the Maine Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, as part of the State's new Airport Systems Plan. We recommend you direct your question to the source.

11. The annual report to the Governor references the Customs and Border Protection facility will assist in stimulating economic growth by facilitating the flow of goods and services across our borders and creating jobs. Could you please break down this forecast and explain how a new customs station that is not intended for cargo achieves this goal?

MRRA has decided to delay the Customs project. The decision to delay the Customs facility to another year is to focus resources on higher-priority projects—such as: managing AFFF removal and firefighting system reconfiguration, the rehabilitation of the inboard runway, reduction of the outboard runway, and T-hangar construction—reflects a strategic prioritization of infrastructure improvements that address immediate operational or safety needs at the airport.

The customs facility was allowed for in MRRA's enabling legislation and contemplated in the original Airport Master Plan. These projects will enhance the airport's capacity, efficiency, and safety standards, which are critical for maintaining its functionality and

supporting long-term growth. A U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) facility would significantly benefit the local economy by streamlining the processing of international travelers, thereby attracting more global business and tourism.

The presence of a CBP facility enables direct international flights, allowing passengers to clear customs locally rather than at larger hub airports. This convenience can draw more international visitors, who spend on local goods and services such as hotels, restaurants, transportation, and retail, boosting the local economy. Additionally, the facility would create jobs, including CBP officers, support staff, and related service roles, further stimulating economic activity through wages and local spending. Regarding the annual report to the governor, which states that the CBP facility will stimulate economic growth by facilitating the flow of goods and services across the border, the reference to “goods and services” does not imply large-scale cargo operations. Instead, it refers to the economic activity generated by international passengers. For example, a CBP facility supports the processing of passenger baggage and personal goods. These activities facilitate trade and tourism without requiring dedicated cargo operations, such as those involving large freighters or extensive logistics infrastructure. The economic impact stems from enabling smoother cross-border travel and small-scale trade, which supports local businesses and job creation, rather than handling bulk cargo shipments.

15. The feasibility study and the consultant's estimate for the Customs Facility calls for an average of only three flight operations per week and only three people on board each flight. Given the low number, what are the projected Customs fees from these visitors and how does that justify a \$7,000,000.00 spend on a customs facility. What is the expected impact of a new customs facility in Brunswick on the airports in Portland and Bangor?

Please refer to question 11. The justification is not solely the revenue brought by fees. The fees detailed in the feasibility study are the minimum required to operate the facility, not a cap on fees.

17. In slide 12 of the presentation, a total of 11 planes will be the traffic increase over 20 years. Please outline the justification for an expenditure of this magnitude for less than an increase of one plane per year. Please break down the expenditure per plane over the 20-year span.

The eleven aircraft increase shown in slide 12 shows the increase in based aircraft only. It does not reflect the number of total operations expected at the airport and it does not correlate to the number of aircraft served by the customs facility. Furthermore, MRRA has decided to delay the Customs project. The decision to delay the Customs facility to another year to focus resources on higher-priority projects—such as the rehabilitation of the inboard runway, reduction of the outboard runway, and T-hangar construction—reflects a strategic prioritization of infrastructure improvements that address immediate operational or safety needs at the airport. These projects will enhance the airport's capacity, efficiency, and safety standards, which are critical for maintaining its functionality and supporting long-term growth. A U.S. Customs and Border Protection

(CBP) facility would significantly benefit the local economy by streamlining the processing of international travelers and goods, thereby attracting more global business and tourism. See question 11.

18. Since the onboarding of the new executive federal administration, what exact budget changes have occurred affecting the Airport Master Plan? What are the exact amounts and specific development projects affected? How has MRRA adjusted its financial forecast for the airport in light of the changes to federal funding opportunities?

There have not been any changes affecting the Airport Master Plan since January 2025.

19. On page 3 of the Airport Master Plan 2024, it is indicated under the Grant History section that the “remainder of funding for BXM has been raised locally or paid directly by MRRA. Where exactly is this funding coming from both sources “MRRA” and “raised locally”? What are the exact amounts for each source of funding? What percentage of the airport’s funding has been from federal or other grants? Will the airport still be “in the black” without projected grant money?

The FAA Airway Trust fund contributes 90% of the funding for airport improvement program eligible projects at the airport. The aviation fuel sales at the 32 airports across the State enable the State of Maine Aviation program to appropriate 5% of the funding for these projects. The remaining 5% match funding that MRRA contributes is paid for through land leases, fuel flowage fees, and other airport use fees. The Airport would still be in the budgetary black without project grant money.

25. Now that we know more about the dangers of PFAS, how will the updated Airport Plan address these toxic risks?

The Airport Master Plan will include Alternatives that review and address future environmental considerations pertaining to facility development. MRRA will not allow for the introduction of any development containing PFAS systems in the future.

26. Will the Plan be updated to include a formal process to prioritize the environment and public health in all future Airport projects?

The FAA requires that a formal environmental review is conducted for every construction project when the airport accepts federal funds. In addition, all development projects must be reviewed and approved by the Town of Brunswick. Also, any construction project involving soil disturbance requires review and approval of the Navy and in some cases DEP, in accordance with the deeded land use controls. Regardless of whether the project impacts previously disturbed or newly disturbed land, the environment and public health is always a priority. EPA is also overseeing work at the facility to remove AFFF from all fire suppression systems in all hangars.

27. Is it in the best interest of Brunswick to move ahead with development before we have a full

understanding of PFAS contamination and any needed remediation?

Please refer to question 26.

28. Other than the removal of AFFF firefighting foam, what specific adjustments are being proposed to the original Airport Master Plan to account for the rapidly evolving threats from PFAS that exist on site?

The PFAS issue nationally is continually evolving. MRRA continues to work with the Navy, EPA, Maine DEP, and the RAB regarding the existence of PFAS substances on the former base.

The Airport Master Plan is proposing the reduction of impervious surfaces, increasing the amount of photovoltaic systems, adding vehicular and aircraft charging stations, and setting guidelines for future hangar construction without PFAS/AFFF systems. Please refer also to question 22.

39. As detailed on page 38 of the 2024 Airport Master Development Plan, what are the exact processes for ensuring that potential recreational areas on the Landing are free from toxins that could cause harm to people exposed to them?

There will be ongoing consultation with the Navy, EPA, DEP and RAB while pursuing any project because of the existing environmental condition of the property which has been carefully regulated since the Navy began to convey property to MRRA.

40. The Airport Master Plan Update does not mention the Town of Brunswick's Climate Action Plan. How is the Update consistent with the Climate Action Plan, and how will the airport work with the Town to address environmental concerns due to increased airport traffic?

The smaller and more energy efficient aircraft using BXM have a significantly smaller impact to the environment than the historical operations during the years as a Naval Air Station. As new aircraft are developed, especially electric aircraft, BXM will support their development and encourage environmentally friendly operations.

49. As stated in 2.19 on page 40 of the 2024 Airport Master Development Plan, “The primary environmental issues most commonly associated with or near airports are noise, air quality, wildlife and water quality; however, all categories of environmental conditions identified by the FAA and NEPA should be examined.” And furthermore, “however, it is understood that it is not the intent of the master plan to complete the federal and state environmental review process.” Provide in detail all aspects of all environmental review processes, requirements, and needs for every aspect of the potential implementation of the Airport Master Development Plan. For every aspect of the stated and unstated (potential) Airport Development Plans, state what the exact environmental review processes are for each parcel of land, what the overseeing agencies are that must be consulted by law and in good stewardship, and what the public input process in this is for every proposed project. For existing projects under consideration, what are the exact detailed environmental assessments that each consulted agency has given MRRA regarding each project and parcel

under development consideration. Additionally, what are the exact environmental conditions identified by the FAA and NEPA?

Before constructing new development at an airport, the airport must follow both the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) processes to ensure safety, compliance, and environmental protection.

The FAA process typically involves submitting an Airport Layout Plan (ALP) update and seeking FAA review and approval for proposed development to ensure it meets safety standards, airspace requirements (under 14 CFR Part 77), and eligibility for federal funding.

Under NEPA, the airport must evaluate the environmental impacts of the proposed project. This is done through a Categorical Exclusion (CatEx), Environmental Assessment (EA), or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), depending on the project's scope and potential environmental effects. The process includes public involvement, interagency coordination, and documentation to support informed decision-making.

FAA Order 1050.1F – Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures provides FAA-specific procedures for complying with NEPA, including how to prepare CatExs, EAs, and EISs.

50. How will every species noted on page 46 of the Airport Master Development Plan be affected by each aspect of proposed airport development? What procedures are being followed for assessing this, and which of those are required by law?

FAA Order 1050.1F – Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, provides FAA-specific procedures for complying with NEPA, including how to prepare Categorical Exclusions, Environmental Assessments, and Environmental Impact Statements.

51. Of the two chapters of the Master Plan update released so far, the only mention of PFAS is on Chapter 2, page 33, as follows: “In 2023, the Brunswick sewer district provided PFAS testing on Brunswick Landing, including Hangar 6 on the airport parcel. The inspection found no leaks or any entry of per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) into the sewer system.” This information is outdated and incorrect. First, why does the Plan fail to mention the spill of 1,450 gallons of PFAS containing AFFF concentrate mixed with 50,000 gallons of water in August, 2024? The lack of any mention of this accident is a glaring omission given the lasting environmental effects that continue to devastate our community. Second, the Plan’s quoted statement above is incorrect: testing has confirmed PFAS entry into the sewer system, contamination of the Hangar 6 oil-water separator, as well as a (minor) leak in Hangar 5.

The Master Plan Chapters 1 and 2 were completed and posted on the MRRA website for review prior to the August 2024 spill. An addendum to Chapter 1 referencing the spill and

impacts has been created and is currently in the internal review process. When complete it will be added as an appendix to the Airport Master Plan.

54. Cargo operations: at the 4/16/2025 public meeting, it was stated that BXM will not operate any cargo operations. However, MRRA's 2024 annual report to the governor states the new customs facility would "facilitat[e] the flow of goods and services across our borders" (page 5 of 17). What is the distinction between "cargo" and "goods and services"? For example, is MRRA using a specific weight limit or other definition when it says there will be goods and services, but not cargo?

Passengers of aircraft carry goods or items they have purchased and the aircraft operators utilize services such as purchase fuel or purchase meals for their passengers. As previously stated, in the next 20-year planning period, the Airport is not planning to operate the airport for cargo operations.

55. AFFF: In the 4/16/2025 public meeting, MRRA promised not to use AFFF in the future, but Chapter 2 still refers to foam in the hangars. Will the Master Plan update be corrected to reflect the oral statements given at the meeting? If not, which is binding - the written Master Plan Update or oral statements by MRRA?

The Master Plan Chapters 1 and 2 were completed and posted on the MRRA website for review prior to the August 2024 spill. An addendum to Chapter 1 referencing the spill and impacts has been created and is currently in the internal review process. When complete, it will be added as an appendix to the Airport Master Plan.

56. Why does the Master Plan characterize Brunswick as a "city" when it is a town?

This has been corrected.

58. Section 1.9 of the Plan states, "The City's goals and objectives for this update of the Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan are described in the following sections." However, the Plan makes no mention of Brunswick's Climate Action Plan. How were the Town of Brunswick's goals and objectives collected? Please explain the sources used that are being attributed to Brunswick.

The goals for the Master Plan were developed by the Technical Advisory Committee assigned to the process. Representation for the Town, Airport, MRRA, and greater community is included on the TAC.

59. The Grant history presented in the Master Plan does not indicate any grants for Stormwater upgrades? Why was no funding prioritized for this expense? How does the airport anticipate ongoing operations with the decrepit stormwater system currently in place?

PFAS removal and mitigation is a top priority at MRRA. We understand the importance of upgrading the stormwater system and its impact on the local community. MRRA previously included stormwater infrastructure investments on the Airport's Capital Improvement Plan but they were not aligned with the funding priorities for FAA at the

time.

60. What is the vision for future stormwater operations?

The Airport has a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which is a written document that outlines how the Airport will prevent the discharge of pollutants from stormwater runoff into local water bodies. The document is being updated and is essentially a blueprint for minimizing environmental impact during Airport operations and construction. The Airport has always had a SWPPP as it is required by the Clean Water Act.

62. On page 6 of the Airport Master Development Plan 2024, it is indicated that “the Airport is on track to become a central location for Space operations in the region and will bring Space-related businesses to the local community. Where is this detailed in the Master Plan, what specific projects does this include, and what are the environmental impact assessments for each project?

Specific projects projected for the Airport will be included in later chapters of the Master Plan, with potential environmental impact included.

63. On Page 6 of the Airport Master Development Plan 2024, it is indicated that “There is interest in developing better facilities for itinerant traffic, as well as developing better facilities and services for emerging technologies such as Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and space flight systems. What are the details of these projects in the Master Plan and what are the exact environmental impact assessments for these projects, including noise abatement to the local population?

Specific projects considered for the Airport will be included in later chapters of the Master Plan, with potential environmental impacts included.

64. Given the existing toxicity on the Landing due to the August 19 forever chemical disaster from the release of AFFF fire-fighting foam, and the pre-existing contamination from Superfund sites, how exactly does MRRA plan to ensure that the airport is developed in accordance with the Town and Community, Determine a Sustainable Implementation Plan, and Affirm that the Airport continues to be an economic driver for the community, especially when people are concerned for their well-being due to toxicities that harm economic development and dampen interests in visiting the Landing? As is stated in 1.9.1 Goals section of the Airport Master Plan 2024.

As stated, MRRA will not permit future facilities constructed with fire suppression systems that utilize AFFF. Facilities will be developed in accordance with local and state law.

65. In the Airport Master Plan 2024, it is noted in section 2.2.2 Local Procedures and Voluntary Noise Abatement that “There are no noise abatement procedures at BXM.” What noise abatement procedures and environmental impact assessments will be undertaken for each and every project considered in any released or unreleased portions of the Airport Master

Development Plan? And for future projects not yet listed?

The FAA requires airports to inform themselves and to evaluate whether the proposed project would have a significant affect on the human environment prior to development. Aircraft noise is considered and for each FAA funded project, the airport must submit screening documentation to the FAA. For each project, the FAA determines, based on the criteria set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), if the project will trigger additional levels of review.

66. As indicated on pages 14 and 16, there appears to be major safety concern that Runway 1L-19R is indefinitely closed, yet is occasionally opened to operations when 1R-19L is closed for maintenance. Since the markings on Runway 1L-19R are faded and have not been maintained. It is further described that “Since the runway is closed there is no need to maintain the markings except to indicate that the runway is closed.” Please explain exactly the safety concerns associated with a closed runway with faded markings for operational use and what exactly you plan to do with this runway moving forward.

Specific projects projected for the Airport will be included in later chapters of the Master Plan, with environmental impact included.

67. What exactly are your plans for air traffic control moving forward?

Specific projects projected for the Airport will be included in later chapters of the Master Plan, with environmental impact included.

68. As noted on page 26 of the Airport Master Development Plan 2024, “BXM does not have published departure procedures”. What is the plan and exact departure procedures for BXM moving forward with the Master Development Plan? How does each project considered for development impact air traffic control and what are the exact detailed procedures planned for a potential increase in any air traffic associated with BXM?

Departure procedures at Airports are developed by the FAA for safety. It is not anticipated that the proposed development within the twenty-year planning period will trigger the need for departure procedures at BXM.

69. What are the exact considerations and community input mechanisms for considering “research, development, and testing of commercial rockets” on the landing? Since there are no existing noise-abatement procedures, how exactly will this impact the community, and what does the community input process look like when considering noise pollution and additional concerns?

The Airport has invited the public to each of the Master Plan development meetings. MRRA encourages the public to take advantage of this opportunity and to attend the development meetings. Representatives from the Maine Space Corporation are usually in attendance and would welcome questions and be happy to answer questions as they have previously.

70. In section 2.12 of the Airport Master Development Plan 2024, it is indicated “at this time, Brunswick does not have scheduled air carrier services or scheduled cargo operations”. Does this mean that Brunswick will not consider this moving forward, and carrier services and scheduled cargo operations are not eligible to be considered in the Airport Master Development process? Would they be eligible for consideration? If so, what are the exact conditions, environmental impact assessments and community input that would be included in that decision-making process? What considerations would be made of traffic and road accessibility?

As stated, the Aviation Forecast submitted to the FAA is a General Aviation forecast, not a commercial service (passenger) forecast, and not a cargo forecast. This forecast is a projection and it is the intent of MRRA for the next 20-years. In 20-years, if reconsideration is made then questions regarding current environmental and road accessibility can be answered.

71. On Page 33 of the 2024 Airport Master Development Plan, its noted that “Hangar 4 and the surrounding apron are still owned by the US Navy but are considered part of the airport. The Navy is scheduled to convey this last remaining airport segment to MRRA in the fall of 2024.” Who currently owns, operates, and oversees procedures for Hanger 4? Include a detailed description of who owns every part of the Landing and who is responsibility for existing and potential future pollutions and toxicities found on the Landing.

Hangar 4 resides within the confines of the Airport Layout Plan. MRRA is the owner and sponsor of the airport and is responsible for the maintenance of the airport.

72. What are the exact archaeological assessment protocols for each parcel being considered for further development, what agencies and people are being consulted in this process?

The FAA requires airports to inform themselves and to evaluate whether the proposed project would have a significant effect on the human environment prior to development. Aircraft noise is considered and for each FAA funded project, the airport must submit screening documentation to the FAA. For each project, the FAA determines, based on the criteria set forth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), if the project will trigger additional levels of review.

73. At the 4/16/2025 public meeting, a Customs and Border Facility was discussed. Why is the Customs Facility not mentioned anywhere in the two Chapters of the Airport Master Plan Update made public so far? To receive its TIF funding, MRRA separately provided the Town with budgetary details about the Customs Facility showing millions to be spent, but this information is difficult to find (part of Brunswick Town Council agenda). Why is information not part of the information given to the public about the Master Plan Update?

The Master Plan Chapters 1 and 2 were completed and posted on the MRRA website for review prior to the completion / publication of the Customs Feasibility study.

74. The date of the Customs Facility Feasibility Study is June, 2024. Wasn't the Customs facility effectively funded or planned to be funded by congress and DOT long before that? MRRA indicated they have been planning on doing it for years. Why was the feasibility study only done after the fact in order to justify it?

The first phase of due diligence of the potential Customs Facility was a feasibility study funded by a CDS grant. Please refer to question 11.

75. The Feasibility Study conducted surveys to determine the need for a Customs Facility (Section 3.1). The survey was open for 3 months. They broadcast it on social media and other means. They got a grand total of 15 responses. They had so few responses they had to call businesses and enterprises to get more to fill it out, and were only able to get 10 more entities to complete it. So, a total of 25 responses after beating the bushes? Only 15 of the total responses said they use or might be able to use customs services, and even those were extremely limited operations. How can this reasonably justify a need for a Customs Facility with such a small number of respondents who had to be heavily pursued to even complete the survey?

Many of the survey respondents operate fleets of 100s of aircraft. Please refer to question 11.

76. Citing privacy concerns, the actual survey raw results are not included in the report. Looking at the 17-question survey, it is very general about defining the need. How can broad questions like "Does your business or enterprise utilize or purchase goods or services from outside the US?" reasonably justify an actual demand for a Customs Facility in Brunswick? (any business or indeed any US consumer would answer yes).

Please refer to question 11.

77. The consultant estimated that there would be an estimated 145 "operations" per year (flights) needing customs services, for an estimated 419 passengers. So, less than 3 flights per week with an average of <3 people/flight?

The aircraft operations in the study are the minimum to operate not the limit of uses. Please refer to question 11.

78. Section 2 of the Feasibility Study states that the minimum criteria for US Customs & Border Patrol to designate an airport a "port of entry" for customs services requires a minimum of 15,000 international passengers per year or 2,000 international operations per year. Why is a Customs Facility even being considered for BXM when it doesn't even come close to meeting the minimum criteria?

As explained in the 4/16/25 public meeting BXM will not be a "port of entry", it will be a user fee based customs facility. Please reference the Customs Feasibility Study for an

explanation on a port of entry vs. a user fee based facility. Please also refer to question 11.

79. Why should our government spend \$7M+ to construct a Customs Facility (the study says \$9M) that has an estimated operating cost of \$300,000 per year? And, as MRRA emphasizes, "it will never be for freight." How can this make economic sense, even over a 20+ year payback timeline? Why, when people can easily go to Portland or Bangor to clear customs?

Please refer to question 11.

80. Was the Feasibility Study performed by a disinterested party with no financial interest in the conclusions reported? Who paid for the Study? Did MRRA guide the interpretation and/or assist with writing the Study?

The feasibility study was conducted with CDS funding and guided by FAA policy. MRRA did not guide the interpretation or assist with writing the study. It was written by consultants hired as part of the FAA/CDS grant. Please refer to question 11.

86. During the 4/16/25 meeting MRRA made a statement that they will not change their classification from a General Aviation Airport and are not looking to change or upgrade. Further MRRA stated they will never have cargo. If MRRA is never going to handle cargo and will never be a port of entry, please explain what is the need for a customs facility? Please also put into writing the above statements on the master plan documents.

As stated, the Aviation Forecast submitted to the FAA is a General Aviation forecast, not a commercial service (passenger) forecast, and not a cargo forecast. This forecast is a projection and it is the intent of MRRA for the next 20-years. Grant Assurance 5; Preserving Rights and Powers does not allow a sponsored airport to say they will never restrict the airport, however, the FAA has received a General Aviation forecast. It is the intent of MRRA to remain General Aviation for the 20-year planning period.

89. On page one of the Airport Master Plan 2024 it is indicated that "The Airport is operated by the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority, MRRA, under direct guidance and collaboration with the State of Maine". When MRRA turns the Landing property, including the airport, over to Brunswick, who will be in charge of day-to-day operations of the airport and what will their exact roles and responsibilities be? When MRRA leaves, the town of Brunswick could be saddled with all of the costs for running and maintenance of these airport facilities and upgrades. Please outline in detail the airport transfer plan, including all future costs Brunswick will be expected to absorb once the airport is transferred.

The Airport will not be turned over to the Town. MRRA will continue to operate the airport.

93. How will the strong objections raised by the public at the 4/16/2025 meeting be incorporated into the Plan? The consultant seemed to say MRRA is the sole decision maker and that even the Town has no say. However, it was also stated that the public is supposed to be involved. How specifically does MRRA plan to involve the public in the Airport Master plan

process? Will public comment influence airport decisions, or are public meetings just being held as a formality?

The Airport has invited the public to each of the Master Plan development meetings. MRRA encourages the public to take advantage of this opportunity and to attend the development meetings. The public is involved in the Master Plan process through public meetings and representation on the technical advisory committee by members of the public. To date, we have held two public meetings. MRRA plans to hold two more meetings. Public comment will be reviewed by MRRA, the consultant and the technical advisory committee. Whenever feasible, this public comment will be incorporated into the Master Plan.

94. What are MRRA's plans to meaningfully engage and involve the broader impacted communities (Topsham, Harpswell)?

The Airport has invited the public to each of the Master Plan development meetings. MRRA encourages the public to take advantage of this opportunity and to attend the development meetings. These Public Meetings are open to the public both in Brunswick and beyond.

95. When will there be an updated community survey, or other data-driven effort, to meaningfully collect public opinion about the airport in a statistically significant manner? For example, what fraction of Brunswick residents currently support an airport in their community? The public meeting referred to a survey conducted decades ago, which was completed by only a small number of residents. Obviously, a lot has changed since then with the AFFF spill last year and our evolving knowledge about the environmental contamination from the airport.

A public survey was not scoped as part of the Airport Master Plan Update.

96. Will the FAA and MaineDOT be informed about the public comments raised at the 4/16/2025 meeting? Will the FAA and MaineDOT receive a copy of all public comments emailed to bxmaairport@gmail.com?

Yes.

97. Will there be an ongoing record kept of citizen input, questions and responses, and a mechanism to make that information available to the public? How will the public's comments be memorialized?

The written comments will be answered and posted on the MRRA website. Comments specifically related to the Master Plan will be included in an appendix in the Airport Master Plan.

98. Will the community have a meaningful opportunity to participate in the rest of the Airport planning process?

Yes. The community is always welcome to attend the public meeting and provide written comments to the email address provided.

99. Will the airport master plan include a broad community survey of the noise associated with the facility? This would include community questionnaires distributed to Brunswick, Topsham, Harpswell and West Bath residents and decibel meter data collected from (and shared with) neighborhoods adjacent to the facility.

A public survey was not scoped as part of the Airport Master Plan Update.

101. There have been noise complaints voiced to the Brunswick Town and Town Council. What noise abatement procedures are planned? What information is currently distributed to pilots for how to minimize disturbance to nearby homes? Does MRRA keep track of noise complaints received?

BXM has a significantly reduced noise profile than when the Navy utilized it due to the type of aircraft that use the airport now and into the future. This reduction in noise profile does not require noise abatement review. The original Aviation Feasibility Study completed a noise contour study that demonstrated a significant decrease in the noise shed. This was also studied in the Navy's Environmental Impact Statement.

However, BXM does encourage appropriate mitigation mechanisms to reduce aircraft noise, including, but not limited to, recommended traffic patterns, right hand patterns on 01R and left-hand patterns on 19L, effectively keeping most traffic on the east side of the Airport.

103. What considerations have been made regarding airport operations when there is no fire or safety facility on site?

Airport firefighting services are provided by the Town of Brunswick. The FAA details in 14 CFR Part 139, Certification for Airports, when firefighting facilities are required to be located on the Airport. Brunswick, which is not a Part 139 commercial service airport, is not required to have airport firefighting services. However, additional assets and staffing are utilized and deployed for air shows to support the military flight team requirements. All necessary training and staff deployment of the Town is funded by the event.

104. What impact will airport operations have on the demands for the Town's municipal services, particularly fire and safety? Does the airport conduct particularized training to Town employees as to airport operations? How often is that training conducted?

Please refer to question 103 and consult with the Brunswick Fire Department.

105. Does the Airport maintain all necessary safety equipment on site for town emergency services to utilize when responding to an emergency?

Please refer to question 103.

108. As indicated on page 6 of the Airport Master Development Plan 2024, the airport is a “publicly owned, public-use facility”. What are the exact protocols and procedures for public involvement and decision-making step by step in the process of considering and approving individual projects related to the Airport Master Development Plan? What mechanisms are there for the public to exercise decision-making authority over a publicly owned airport?

A publicly owned, public-use airport is government-operated, open to all aircraft without prior permission, and eligible for federal funding, while a private airport is privately owned, may restrict access, and generally relies on private funding. Brunswick Executive Airport (BXM) is a public-use airport owned and managed by the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority (MRRA), which oversees operations, development, and compliance following the closure of Naval Air Station Brunswick. While the public does not control BXM directly, they can participate in MRRA's open meetings, influence planning through community input, and hold MRRA accountable through state oversight.

109. What are the exact mechanisms and procedures ongoingly for considering how to ensure that “Brunswick Landing is working to ensure that BXM is constantly evolving to meet the needs of the surrounding community”?

The Airport Master Plan Update is that mechanism. Currently, the Airport is undertaking a Master Plan Update effort in which public comment is gathered in a series of public meetings.

110. When exactly will the entire Airport Master Development Plan be released to the public, and what will be the protocols for including public input in the decision making process related to the development of the airport once this is released to the public? What is the timeframe for public input before each project is shown to the public and decisions are made on whether or not to proceed?

The Airport Master Plan Update, currently underway is expected to be completed by fall of 2025. The community may participate in the Master Plan process through public meeting engagement. Prior to future development each project must go through an environmental review in accordance with NEPA. If an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement is required for development, this process also includes

public engagement and time for public input.

111. Who decides and what are the mechanisms of decision for the Airport Master Plan review for public comments that “will be incorporated when appropriate into the narrative and plans?” Who exactly decides what is appropriate to include in the narrative and plans?

Though MRRA is the owner of the Master Plan and ultimately decides what is included in the plan, the technical advisory committee, MaineDOT and FAA review the plan and MRRA takes public comment. The FAA must approve both the forecast and the Airport Layout Plan in order for any projects in the Master Plan to be considered eligible for federal funding.

113. Airplane flight patterns have changed with smaller planes using the airfield (banking east and west at low altitudes shortly after takeoff or approaching from the east and west before banking in for landing). Will you mandate north-south flight patterns with steeper ascent/descent to reduce the ground-level noise impact?

Airport traffic patterns are developed by the Federal Aviation administration and are standard. During good weather conditions at BXM Runway 19L/1R has aircraft flying left hand turns completing a rectangle around the airport and 19R/1L has aircraft flying right hand turns completing a rectangle around the airport. Piston aircraft usually fly these patterns at 1,000 ft above the ground and turbine aircraft usually fly these patterns at 1,500 above the ground. This can change based on wind, weather, other traffic and safety in the traffic pattern. When the weather is poor, aircraft are required to fly published instrument approach procedures developed by the FAA which typically bring aircraft straight in to the runway from a north or south orientation.

114. Flight training often includes repetitive flight patterns and aerial stunts. Can these be limited to weekday time windows and kept to a shorter duration to be less of a disturbance to neighbors and the ecosystem?

An airport that has accepted federal funds under the FAA's Airport Improvement Program (AIP) is bound by Grant Assurances, particularly:

- ☒ *Grant Assurance 22 – Economic Nondiscrimination, which requires the airport to make its facilities available to all aeronautical users on reasonable terms without unjust discrimination, including flight schools and student pilots.*
- ☒ *Grant Assurance 19 – Operation and Maintenance, which obligates the airport to remain open and useable for public aeronautical use at all times.*

Because of these assurances, the airport cannot impose arbitrary limits on training flights based on number, days, or hours unless those restrictions are justified by safety or environmental concerns and are approved by the FAA. Doing otherwise could place the airport in noncompliance, risking the loss of federal funding.

115. Weekend usage has included automobile racing on the airport tarmac, with significant noise. Can these events be discontinued or relocated to a licensed and approved racetrack facility?

No; however, BXM is in compliance with all FAA, State and Local regulations when completing these events.

116. How will changes in the airport operations impact local air quality, and how will air quality be monitored and reported?

All future airport projects must comply with FAA Order 1050.1F – Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, provides FAA-specific procedures for complying with NEPA, including how to prepare CatExs, EAs, and EISs. There is currently no FAA requirement for MRRA to monitor air quality outside the development of new infrastructure.

117. Will Airport operators create a panel of citizens and residents to review future uses such as air show, car racing, stunt piloting, etc. to provide input on the desirability of such events.

No; however, BXM is in compliance with all FAA, State and Local regulations when completing these events.

118. At the meeting, the consultant presented a future for electric aircraft. What are the safety risks for such aircraft, how will electrical fires be handled, who will pay for special training and equipment?

Electric aircraft aerodynamically operate the same as other conventional aircraft, however their power plants operate with electricity in lieu of fossil fuels, and their operating range is less. Like electric vehicle charging stations, the fire department would respond in the same fashion in the event of a fire, Special training and equipment is not anticipated. If training is recommended, the airport would invite and host training at the airport.

119. Will public meetings and opportunities for questions and answers be provided for each of the additional sections of the airport master plan yet to be made available?

Yes. These sections have not yet been made available because they have not been completed.

120. How does the airport operator interface regarding airport operations and issues with the State of Maine government as well as with local town officials of the impacted communities of Brunswick and Harpswell?

MaineDOT Aeronautics works closely with Brunswick on an annual basis to fund 5%

of federally funded airport improvement projects.

121. What alternatives are there for the airport development OTHER than the expansion plan proposed by the Master Plan? What options have been and will be explored?

The Airport Master Plan Update, approved by FAA, will lay out a series of Alternatives developed by the Technical Advisory Committee and MRRA. The Master Plan is not an expansion plan.

122. What companies have actually requested the addition of a customs station? Please identify and give total number. Have each of these companies been approached about contributing to the cost of the construction and then ongoing staffing and maintenance expenses of the facility and its operations? For any companies (BIW, etc.) that have expressed a desire for the customs office at the landing as a “convenience” for them: are they willing to pay for some of this Customs structure? How much of the cost of the new Customs Facility will be paid by taxpayers vs. Users?

The cost of the construction of any future customs facilities may be paid with CDS funding through the FAA AIP program, or other sources. The salaries of the customs employees will be paid for by MRRA, through Airport Users fees.