



**Town of East Hampton  
Long Island, NY**

**Resolution  
RES-2010-803**

**Adopt Findings Statement, Master Plan Update & ALP Update**

Information

<b>Department:</b>	Town Attorney	<b>Sponsors:</b>	Councilman Dominick J. Stanzione
<b>Category:</b>	Approvals	<b>Functions:</b>	Misc.

Body

WHEREAS, the Town of East Hampton undertook updates to the East Hampton Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan with the assistance of Savik & Murray, LLP, DY Associates, and Young Environmental Sciences, Inc., and with their assistance a Airport Master Plan Report dated April 24, 2007 was prepared, and a public hearing held thereon on July 19, 2007; and

WHEREAS, thereafter the Town Board conducted further review with the assistance of a decision making model, of the alternatives proposed in the Master Plan Report, and selected alternatives which the Board believed best represented the goals of the Town in maintaining the airport as a general aviation airport without further improvements unless desirable to increase safety or reduce noise; and

WHEREAS, thereafter, the Town Board prepared a DGEIS with regard to the proposed Master Plan alternatives to be evaluated by the Board and deemed such DGEIS complete on August 20, 2009 and held a public hearing thereon in September 17, 2009 and received written comments thereon from the public and interested agencies through September 28, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the Town carefully considered such oral and written comments on the DGEIS and said comments and responses thereto were set forth in an FGEIS together with additional information the Town Board deemed relevant in consideration of the comments received on the DGEIS, and the FGEIS was deemed complete and accepted on August 5, 2010 and the comment period on such FGEIS has expired; and

WHEREAS, the Town caused the annexed SEQRA Findings and Determination to be prepared which the Town Board has carefully considered in weighing and balancing its consideration of environmental social and economic effects of the adoption of the updated Master Plan; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby adopts the annexed Findings and Determination with regard to the proposed Airport Master Plan Update and Airport layout Plan update and finds that neither the proposed Master Plan Update nor the proposed Airport Layout Plan Update will have a significant adverse environmental impact, and, therefore, the Town Board hereby makes a Negative Declaration pursuant to SEQRA and Chapter 128 of the East Hampton Town Code, as set forth in the annexed Findings Statement, and notice of such determination shall be posted in the Environmental News Bulletin as required by SEQRA; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby adopts the Airport Master Plan Update, together with an Errata Page clarifying the Town Board's adoption of Alternative #2 including a no-growth

policy with regard to the construction of further improvements at the airport unless the Planning Board determines in the first instance that such improvements increase safety or reduce noise and the Town Board thereafter approves an amendment to the ALP; and be it further

RESOLVED, that the Town Board hereby adopts the Airport Layout Plan Update and directs the Airport Manager to forward a copy of the Airport Layout Plan to the Federal Aviation Administration for their review and approval;

#### LEAD AGENCY FINDINGS STATEMENT STATE ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY REVIEW ACT

This Findings Statement has been prepared in accordance with Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law, the State Environmental Quality Review Act (SEQRA), and its implementing regulations set forth at 6 NYCRR Part 617.

Lead Agency: Town of East Hampton

Address: Town Hall  
159 Pantigo Road  
East Hampton, NY 11937

Name of Action: Adoption of the East Hampton Airport Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update

Description of Action: The Town of East Hampton proposes to adopt the East Hampton Airport Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update which serves as an update to the last officially recognized versions of which were adopted in 1989. These plans are updated in order to better meet the requirements of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) with regard to the ongoing operation of the airport, as well as to provide a guide for future development and improvement of the airport in a manner which best meets the needs of the users of the airport and the community as a whole. The Town's focus in developing the updated Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan is to provide for the airport's continued functionality while maintaining operations as a local general aviation airport.

The East Hampton Airport, owned and operated by the Town of East Hampton is located on approximately 610 acres in northern Wainscott, in a water recharge area of the Town. The Airport was originally constructed in 1936. Since the time of its construction it has had three runways: Runway 10-28, the primary runway oriented in an east-west direction at 100 degrees and 280 degrees; Runway 4-22, oriented at 040 and 220 degrees, and Runway 16-34, oriented at 160 degrees and 340 degrees. Runway 10-28, due in part due to its length at 4,255 feet, its increased navigational aids and being the only runway with an FAA approved instrument approach, serves as the primary runway at the airport. The other two runways, Runway 4-22 at 2,223 feet and Runway 16-34 at 2,501 feet are considerably shorter than Runway 10-28, and are used primarily by smaller aircraft. All design standard aircraft are in the general aviation category.

Location: The East Hampton Town Municipal Airport is located at 200 Daniel's Hole Road, Wainscott, Town of East Hampton. The airport is located in an environmentally sensitive special groundwater protection overlay district area in that it overlays the largest high quality drinking water resource in the entire town, and several of the largest capacity public water well fields are adjacent to the airport. As a result, it is the Town Board's policy that restraints on the extent of airport development and the intensity of airport use are necessary to help preserve and protect this resource. Such controls are sought to be achieved through reasonable, non-arbitrary and non-discriminatory management practices.

Date Final GEIS filed: August 5, 2010

## Introduction.

This Findings Statement is issued by the Town of East Hampton, which has served as the lead agency pursuant to SEQRA, Article 8 of the New York State Environmental Conservation Law, and the regulations promulgated there under (6 NYCRR Part 617), in connection with the proposed implementation of the Airport Master Plan Update and the Airport Layout Plan Update.

The "findings" stated below provide a summary of the Town's rationale for its decision to adopt the Airport Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update.

## Name of action.

Adoption of the Airport Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan update.

## Project description.

The projects proposed in the Master Plan Update and reviewed in the Generic Environmental Impact Statement comprise a consensus plan for airport improvements to support the provision and management of essential activities at the airport. The projects reflect a modest plan, concentrating on improved safety, efficiency and compliance with design standards applicable to the existing airport facilities with no expansion. Preliminary examination of these projects found no potential for any significant adverse impacts on the environment, based on State and Federal requirements, and an Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) could have been utilized to satisfy the requirements of SEQRA and Town Code Chapter 128. However, in order to maximize public input and involvement in the review of the Master Plan Update, the Town Board chose to circulate the Town Board's initial environmental analysis and prepare and circulate a Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) in satisfaction of the requirements of Town Code Section 128-2-40 and as a more thorough and extensive means of analysis and more meaningful public review of the update plans and the potential environmental impacts of the improvement projects under consideration.

The following proposed improvements are considered:

[Note: references are not exclusive but intended to facilitate the reader's access to further information]:

Rehabilitation and reactivation of Runway 4/22 (currently closed) - by shortening Runway 4/22 at the Runway 22 end by 126 feet and instituting a displaced landing threshold of 60 feet to comply with FAA standards; Trimming of any trees that penetrate the approach surface at the Runway 22 end, per FAR Part 77 [See DGEIS at 4.2.2; 5.5 and Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Conversion of Runway 16/34 to a taxiway; removal of pavement at both ends [see DGEIS at 4.2; 5.5 and Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Relocation of Daniel's Hole Road at Runway 28 to comply with FAA safety standards and to comply with FAA standards without relocating the threshold of the runway [See DGEIS at 4.10; 5.5 and Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need; Master Plan Decision Making Model - DGEIS Appendix E ]

Improving taxiway system -

a. Addition of a bypass taxiway at the Runway 28 end of 10/28, [See DGEIS at 4.4 and 5.5, Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need]

b. Extension of Taxiway G to Runway 28 end of 10/28; [See DGEIS at 4.5; 5.5 and Figure 1-1;

FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need]

c. Completion of parallel taxiway north of Runway 10/28 through midfield; [See DGEIS at 4.3;5.5 and Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need]

Construction of an additional Fuel Farm (12,000 gallon above ground storage tank for Jet A fuel) [See DGEIS at 4.8; 5.5 and Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Modification of Vehicle Parking near Terminal Building; addition of paved parking spots for rental cars and employees [See DGEIS at 4.9;5.5 and Figure 1-; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need 1];

Construct Maintenance Building south of Terminal Building [See DGEIS at 4.9; 5.5; Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Addition of new tie down or hanger space where found to increase safety and reduce noise [See DGEIS at Appendix E, II Facilities, 2 "Aircraft Aprons" Master Plan Report at Page 181 C. Landside considerations, 1 Aprons and facilities];

Installation of Automated Weather Observation Station (AWOS) in midfield [See DGEIS at 4.8; 5.5; Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Install Seasonal Control Tower in north or south corner of Runways 4/22 and 10/28 intersection (a trailer with full surround windows); construct Access Road from Daniel's Hole Road [See DGEIS at 4.6; 5.5 Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Acquisition of land or control of land use through an easement in the Runway Protection Zones (4 ends, total of 0.71 acres) [See DGEIS at 4.11; 5.5; Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Release sites along Industrial Road in southern portion of site for non-aeronautical development [See DGEIS at 4.10; 5.5; Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need];

Reserve site off of Daniel's Hole Road in northern portion of Airport as future Industrial Site [See DGEIS at 4.10; 5.5; Figure 1-1; FGEIS 1.1 Purpose and Need].

Purpose and need.

The proposed actions are intended to improve the overall safety, efficiency, and economic viability of the East Hampton Airport. The proposed projects minimize alterations to the existing airfield while still achieving compliance with required FAA design standards. The Town maintains as its goal the continued operation of the East Town Airport (HTO) as a General Aviation facility.

Procedural background- Airport Master Plan and Layout Plan Updates.

The Town of East Hampton's efforts to undertake the preparation of updated Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plans began as early as 2004 when the Town Board authorized the retention of Savik & Murray, LLP, consulting engineers, for the preparation of an updated Airport Master Plan. Thereafter, the services of DY Consultants, Young Environmental Sciences, Inc. and Lisa Liquori of FINE Arts and Sciences, as well as those of the East Hampton Town Planning Department, were retained to help facilitate the development of the updates and to assist in the environmental review of the updated plans. A planning study conducted between 2004 and 2007 pointed to several alternative plans. A Master Plan Report dated April 24, 2007 evaluating the various alternatives for a master plan update was prepared by Savik & Murray, LLP, in association with DY Consultants and Young Environmental Sciences, Inc., and a public hearing was scheduled to obtain and consider the comments of the public with regard to the alternatives set forth in the report. The public hearing held on July 19, 2007 at the East Hampton High

School auditorium. One of the proposed alternatives for consideration was a no-action alternative which would maintain the status quo at the airport. Under the no action alternative, the Twin Otter is considered the critical design aircraft and ARC A-II Airport design standards would apply. (The runways in existence exceed those standards and the Twin Otter is virtually non-existent currently at the airport). Alternative 1 selected the Beech Baron as the design aircraft, which requires conformance with ARC B-I design standards (the existing runways meet or exceed those standards). Alternative 2 utilizes the a Cessna Citation V as the design aircraft for Runway 10/28 (B-II design standards), and the Beech Baron as the design aircraft for Runway 4/22 (ARC B-1 design standards). Alternative 3 utilizes a Challenger 600 as the design aircraft, requiring ARC C-II design standards, which would require expansion of the existing runways.

A decision making model was utilized by the Town Board in determining the choices to be made by the Board in selecting among the alternatives for the Master Plan update. A copy of that model, dated 7/8/08 is annexed to the FGEIS as Appendix H. As a result of the Board's use of the decision making model, together with its consideration of the comments of the public in response to the Master Plan Report, Alternative 2, which was then subject to further refinement during a twelve month review period, was selected as the most appropriate Alternative to meet the goals of the Board in planning for the Airport's future development. As a result of the selection of Alternative 2, the Cessna Citation V was chosen as the design aircraft for runway 10/28, and the Beech Baron for Runway 4/22. Runway 10/28 and Runway 4/22 would be neither extended nor reduced in length, and Runway 16/34 would be closed as a runway.

The provision of a full parallel taxiway for Runway 10/28, which currently has two sections of parallel taxiway but not a full taxiway, will shorten taxiing distances, thereby reducing fuel consumption and emissions, and increase safety as the need to taxi on a portion of the runway will be eliminated. The construction of a bypass taxiway in the runway 28 threshold area will reduce congestion and delays which presently arise when a departing aircraft is awaiting takeoff, thereby increasing safety and reducing fuel consumption and emissions. Construction of a new taxiway connecting Runway 28 to the southern FBO facilities will eliminate the current need for aircraft to taxi over portions of Runway 10/28 to access those facilities.

Proposals for new hangars were evaluated, Consistent with the Board's goal not to encourage nor facilitate expansion at the airport, the Board took a "safety first" approach and decided that the no new apron tie down space or hangars which could lead to expansion of the airport should be permitted, but that such proposals should instead be evaluated to determine their potential to increase safety and reduce noise and not expand activity at the airport (see FGEIS Exhibit H item ?2. Aircraft Aprons? and Errata Sheet). The Board concluded that in order to be consistent with the goals of the Master Plan, unless the Planning Board determines that the purpose and result of such improvement meets that goals of increasing safety or reducing noise, they may not issue approvals. The Town Board, in approving an amendment to the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) would have final review of any such proposals.

The Board also reached consensus with regard to various other items, including agreeing to make improvements to and install additional taxiways to bring the airport into compliance with FAA standards, provide a maintenance building to shelter airport equipment and materials, install an AWOS, contract with a private company to provide a seasonal control tower and classify airport airspace as controlled Class D airspace when the tower is operational, provide improvements to the parking area to provide parking for employees and rental cars, and seek the release of a portion of the Town Industrial Park and an undeveloped area in the northern part of the airport premises along Daniels Hole Road for future commercial industrial development consistent with zoning.

#### Procedural Background - SEQRA:

Although the Town Board's preliminary review found no potential for significant adverse

environmental impacts from the contemplated improvements (see Resolution # 2009-923), a decision was made to proceed with a more extensive and thorough review of the proposed plan updates by way of the preparation of a generic environmental impact statement (GEIS). The use of the GEIS served as a means of meeting the requirements of Town Code 128-2-40 while affording the public the fullest opportunity to review and comment upon the Town's preliminary analysis and to provide the fullest input to the Town Board in making its decisions regarding the updates and the potential for environmental impacts of the proposed improvements. A Draft Generic Environmental Impact Statement (DGEIS) was prepared and reviewed by the Town Board, and adopted by the Town Board on August 20, 2009. A public hearing was noticed and held with regard to the DGEIS on September 17, 2009. The hearing was kept open for an additional 10 day period, to September 28, 2009 for the submission of written comments. Extensive public comments were received on the DGEIS and the comments were evaluated, and responses issued as a part of the FGEIS. The time for completion of the FGEIS was extended by the Town Board on several occasions, each authorized by Town Board Resolution, the most recent extending the Town Board's time for completion of the FGEIS to August 19, 2010. The Town Board completed the FGEIS and accepted the same on August 5, 2010 and a Notice of Completion was adopted by the Board at that time and duly noticed in the Environmental News Bulletin published by the NYS DEC. Notice of the acceptance of the FGEIS was provided to those persons who commented on the DGEIS and whose contact information was provided or found available elsewhere, by email or in writing. A copy of the FGEIS was also made available on the Town's official website.

The Town Board's adoption of the FGEIS was followed by an additional comment period ending August 20, 2010. Many of the comments submitted in response to the FGEIS were similar to those submitted in response to the DGEIS, and those comments were thoroughly addressed by the Town in its response to comments to the DGEIS. Among the comments submitted in response to the FGEIS were concerns over noise generated by aircraft, primarily from helicopters. The FGEIS was intended to address the impacts of adoption of the Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan updates that would permit the proposed improvement projects specified therein, none of which were determined to have any significant impact upon, contribute to or otherwise impact upon noise (though the operation of a control tower may have some ancillary noise reduction benefits due to the ability to regulate incoming and departing aircraft). As the review with regard to the Airport Master Plan update and Airport Layout Plan update has been by way of a Generic EIS. Potential improvement projects set forth in the updates will require a subsequent individual environmental review when and if a decision is made to proceed with the same (See 6 NYCRR Sec.617.10(c)).

The Town Board took advantage of the use of the Generic EIS process, rather than proceeding by way of the use of an Environmental Assessment Form, as the EIS provided a means by which the Town was able to disseminate data related to what the Town Board was aware to be one of the public's major concerns related to the airport, that of noise resulting from aircraft operations. Although none of the improvements contemplated in the Airport Master Plan and ALP updates were found to have any potential for significant impact upon noise, nevertheless the Town Board felt it in the best interests of the Town as a whole to acknowledge noise as a significant concern of the public, and to provide the public with information on what actions the Town Board has taken to date and continues to take to address noise both within the confines of applicable Federal law, proposed legislation and FAA Agency rulemaking. The Town Board will continue to address aircraft noise and continue its dialogue with the FAA on this issue. The Town Board did not consider the closure of the airport (and its reversion back to the County) or the decision to accept or not accept future Federal funding as an appropriate subject for review in the EIS as such decisions are not related to the goals of the action under consideration or performance of the projects set forth in the EIS.

Alternatives Analysis: The East Hampton Airport Master Plan Report considered various alternatives for each of the proposed projects, including a no action alternative.

Three potential runway configuration alternatives were considered:

- 1) retain Runway 16/34,
- 2) close Runway 16/34 and rehabilitate Runway 4/22, or
- 3) retain both runways.

Currently, the Airport has three runways, 10/28, 16/34 and 4/22, though 4/22 is currently closed due to its poor condition. The question of whether three runways were necessary was examined in the airport Master Plan Report. The determination was made that retaining either runway 16/34 or runway 4/22, together with the longer runway 10/28 would provide adequate runway facilities in accordance with appropriate wind coverage criteria. Considering the closure of either Runway 16/34 or Runway 4/22, examination of the existing runway configuration and adjoining land uses led to a preliminary decision to retain Runway 16/34 and continue to keep Runway 4/22 in a closed condition. Runway 16/34 in its existing condition, without a taxiway, violates existing FAA design standards and promotes unsafe conditions, allowing aircraft to park too close to an active runway. Provision of a parallel taxiway on the east side of runway 16/34 was found to interfere with existing ramp and aircraft parking areas, requiring the installation of additional paved areas which would still not fully offset the loss of ramp space resulting from the taxiway. Installing a taxiway to the west side of 16/34 would not allow practical access to the terminal area. Relocation of Runway 16/34 to avoid placing a parallel taxiway in the terminal area was not deemed to be a practical alternative due to a variety of complications more fully set forth in the FGEIS [See FGEIS 4.2.1 Terminal Area Alternatives]. A submission was made to the Town to maintain runway 16/34 in recognition of the currently better land use compatibility to the southeast of the airport, but a review of that plan found that changes to the existing airport premises were needed to implement the same, including reconfiguration of the terminal area, segregation of small light aircraft from larger turbine aircraft in order to permit the construction of the parallel taxiway, demolition of an existing hangar building, the creation of additional tie down areas and the cooperation of an existing FBO to relocation and rearrangement of portions of its leasehold. After considering this question in depth, including discussion of the same at public hearings and with input from the airport user community, it was therefore determined that rehabilitating Runway 4/22 and converting existing Runway 16/34 to a taxiway was less disruptive, more consistent with the layout and function of the airport and more cost effective. It is recognized that reactivation of Runway 4/22 will increase noise impact in areas to the southwest of the Airport in Wainscott from small piston engine aircraft. A detailed analysis of noise abatement techniques were analyzed, including lengthening the runway. Lengthening the runway was deemed insufficient, in view of its costs and its impact upon proposed forest preserve when compared to the possible noise reduction such a lengthening could provide. The most appropriate means of noise abatement management was determined to be to utilize runway 28 as much as possible for departure traffic and to utilize Runway 22 only when wind conditions require it. A noise abatement turn for Runway 22 takeoffs, which turn aircraft to the 280 degree heading before crossing out of airport property is recommended as a voluntary noise abatement procedure for smaller and lighter aircraft.

As there are currently two vendors of aviation fuel at the airport, the inclusion of a second fuel farm is contemplated. Also, maintaining the Town's existing fuel farm as is, with its operation continued by the Town, is not consistent with recommendations given the Town by the State Comptroller's office, since the Town purchases fuel and then makes it available, as needed to the FBOs to sell to their customers, thus inadvertently financing the purchase of fuel for re-sale by the FBOs. Therefore, maintaining the existing fuel farm as a Town operation may not be consistent with the Comptroller's recommendations. Therefore, the update proposes the existence of two fueling facilities at the airport, each operated by one of the fuel vendors. Improved fueling equipment as well as containment structures which would be required to prevent spillage in the event of a fuel leak would substantially reduce the risk of installing an additional fueling facility on airport property, and upgrades to the existing facility or its replacement would improve the safety of the existing facility. A no action alternative is not practical since the Town cannot continue to operate a fueling facility and comply with the

recommendations of the State Comptroller. The inclusion of a second fueling facility should help to meet current fueling demands at the airport and reduce delivery trips by fueling suppliers, as well as reduce transiting of airport property by fueling trucks to the southerly FBO.

Currently, aircraft may face the need to taxi on portions of the runway and cross runway thresholds due to a lack of taxiways. The installation of parallel and bypass taxiways will serve to increase safety while reducing congestion and taxiing times, thereby providing the additional benefit of reducing fuel consumption and emissions. A no action alternative would continue existing conditions which include increased safety risks and increased taxiing times and aircraft fuel consumption.

Existing parking conditions at the airport are largely unregulated, resulting in often crowded conditions which impact the operations of arriving and departing passengers as well as rental car and employee parking. Minimal improvements are proposed consisting of the pavement of additional parking areas with the installation of appropriate drainage as needed to improve parking by providing specified spaces at the airport for both employees and rental cars. A no action alternative would result in no improvements to the existing parking situation.

The proposed maintenance building will allow the Town to store essential equipment for airport maintenance (mowers, plows and similar items) in an enclosed space out of the elements, thus containing fuels, oils and similar potentially hazardous materials while extending the equipments useful life and reducing costs. The area is already cleared and the foundation already in place. The no action alternative would result in no enclosed storage area for required maintenance equipment and insufficient enclosed space for materials storage.

The automated weather observation system (AWOS) will serve to improve safety by providing arriving and departing pilots with necessary local weather information which they can utilize to determine whether they should proceed with departures or arrivals. Arriving aircraft can make decisions on whether to land or divert to another airport when unfavorable weather conditions are present locally. The no action alternative would be to have no AWOS installation, increasing the potential for aircraft approaches to the airport in low visibility conditions when landings are not feasible, resulting in additional noise and decreased safety.

Installation of a control tower will improve safety by providing controlled airspace around the airport during periods of heavy seasonal usage, with directives given to departing and arriving pilots by Federal Aviation Administration approved controllers who will be able to supervise traffic within a five mile radius of the airport providing a more orderly and safe entry into and departure from the airport. A secondary benefit of this installation may be increased compliance with noise abatement procedures. The proposed control tower is a self-contained structure which will require the provision of electric, and cable, and the provision of a concrete pad upon which the structure can be placed. A no action alternative would result in no seasonal control tower and no classification of airspace, with no increase in control over aircraft utilizing the Town airport.

In order to conform with FAR Part 77, the threshold of Runway 28 must be displaced by 150 feet or Daniel's Hole Road will need to be relocated. An evaluation of the costs associated with each reveals that relocation of Daniel's Hole Road would be more cost effective. Displacing the threshold would require replacement of all the runway lights to maintain proper spacing, the runway end identifier lights, the Precision Path Indicator Path Lights (PAPIs) and restriping of the runway. Displacing the threshold was not likely to reduce the number of the larger or noisier aircraft currently or prospectively using the airport, and maintaining the current length maximizes safety. Maintaining current conditions would continue non-compliance with regulations.

Certain clear zones are necessary under FAA standards to assure the safety of both persons on the ground and those arriving and departing the airport. Acquisition of such areas as are

necessary to complete the clear zones around the runways will further the airport's compliance with FAA requirements and increase safety. A no action alternative would continue non-compliance with required aviation safety regulations.

Release of those areas south of the airport currently used for non-aviation related activities, as well as a portion of the property at the northern side of the airport along Daniel's Hole Road, for industrial use would allow the Town to provide economic opportunities for such uses within the Town rather than losing such uses to neighboring Towns while also permitting the property to be used in a manner consistent with the neighboring airport use. Furthermore, the remaining "Industrial Park" lots together with remaining property will provide sufficient property "on-site" for all anticipated future aviation uses. A no action alternative would maintain the existing properties sought to be removed from the airport as surplus as a part of the airport. This would limit the future use of such properties and the ability of the Town to determine the manner and terms upon which such properties are leased or sold.

#### Findings.

The Town Board's use of its decision making model and its consideration of the comments with regard to the proposed Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan Update, together with its review of potential impacts as set forth in the DGEIS and FGEIS have resulted in the Board's determination that the following projects are appropriate for inclusion in the Airport Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update:

Rehabilitation and reactivation of Runway 4/22 (currently closed) - by shortening Runway 4/22 at the Runway 22 end by 126 feet and instituting a displaced landing threshold of 60 feet to comply with FAA standards; Trimming of any trees that penetrate the approach surface at the Runway 22 end, per FAR Part 77;

Conversion of Runway 16/34 to a taxiway; removal of pavement at both ends;

Relocation of Daniel's Hole Road at Runway 28 to comply with FAA safety standards and to comply with FAA standards without relocating the threshold of the runway;

#### Improving taxiway system -

- a. Addition of a bypass taxiway at the Runway 28 end of 10/28,
- b. Extension of Taxiway G to Runway 28 end of 10/28;
- c. Completion of parallel taxiway north of Runway 10/28 through midfield;

Construction of an additional Fuel Farm (12,000 gallon above ground storage tank for Jet A fuel);

Modification of Vehicle Parking near Terminal Building; addition of paved parking spots for rental cars and employees;

Construct Maintenance Building south of Terminal Building;

Addition of new tie down or hanger space where found to increase safety and reduce noise;

Installation of Automated Weather Observation Station (AWOS) in midfield;

Install Seasonal Control Tower in north or south corner of Runways 4/22 and 10/28 intersection (a trailer with full surround windows); construct Access Road from Daniel's Hole Road;

Acquisition of land or control of land use through an easement in the Runway Protection Zones (4 ends, total of 0.71 acres);

Release sites along Industrial Road in southern portion of site for non-aeronautical development;

Reserve site off of Daniel's Hole Road in northern portion of Airport as future Industrial Site.

In designing and developing the Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update, the Board has sought and promoted alternatives which minimize and limit improvements to the airport property to those necessary to increase operational safety and the continued operation and maintenance of the airport as a functional general aviation facility, while at the same time limiting further expansion. By adhering to such standards, the Town has eliminated any proposals which may result in any significant adverse environmental impacts.

The Town Board has considered the relevant environmental impacts, facts and conclusions set forth in the Final GEIS, as well as the public comments on the DGEIS and FGEIS, weighed and balanced the relevant environmental impacts with social, economic and other essential considerations and certifies that all of the procedural requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617 (NY SEQRA regulations) and Chapter 128 of the East Hampton Town Code have been met with regard to the considered updates to the Airport Master Plan and Airport Layout Plan and that such plans are consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations from among the reasonable alternatives available, and that the proposed action avoids adverse environmental impacts.

The Town Board finds that the adoption of the proposed Master Plan Update and Airport Layout Plan Update will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact, and a Negative Declaration is hereby made pursuant to SEQRA and Chapter 128 of the East Hampton Town Code.

Certification of findings.

Having considered the Draft and Final GEIS, and having considered the preceding written facts and conclusions and specific findings relied upon to meet the requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617, this Statement of Findings certifies that:

1. The requirements of 6 NYCRR Part 617 have been met;
2. Consistent with the social, economic and other essential considerations, from among the reasonable alternatives thereto, the action approved is one which minimizes or avoids adverse environmental effects to the maximum extent practicable; including the effects disclosed in the generic environmental impact statement; and
3. Consistent with social, economic and other essential considerations, to the maximum extent practicable, adverse environmental effects revealed in the environmental impact statement process will be minimized or avoided by incorporating as conditions to the decision those mitigative measures which were identified as practicable.

Dated: September 2, 2010 BY ORDER OF THE TOWN BOARD  
East Hampton, New York TOWN OF EAST HAMPTON  
FRED OVERTON, OWN CLERK

Public Discussion

---

 Add Comment

Powered by **Accela** - Legislative Management