

**Full Environmental Assessment Form**  
**Part 1 - Project and Setting**

**Instructions for Completing Part 1**

**Part 1 is to be completed by the applicant or project sponsor.** Responses become part of the application for approval or funding, are subject to public review, and may be subject to further verification.

Complete Part 1 based on information currently available. If additional research or investigation would be needed to fully respond to any item, please answer as thoroughly as possible based on current information; indicate whether missing information does not exist, or is not reasonably available to the sponsor; and, when possible, generally describe work or studies which would be necessary to update or fully develop that information.

Applicants/sponsors must complete all items in Sections A & B. In Sections C, D & E, most items contain an initial question that must be answered either “Yes” or “No”. If the answer to the initial question is “Yes”, complete the sub-questions that follow. If the answer to the initial question is “No”, proceed to the next question. Section F allows the project sponsor to identify and attach any additional information. Section G requires the name and signature of the project sponsor to verify that the information contained in Part 1 is accurate and complete.

**A. Project and Sponsor Information.**

Name of Action or Project: East Hampton Airport Noise Regulations		
Project Location (describe, and attach a general location map): East Hampton Town Airport, Daniel's Hole Road, Wainscott Hamlet, East Hampton Town		
Brief Description of Proposed Action (include purpose or need): Over the past three decades, the residents of the Town of East Hampton have experienced a significant increase in noisy aircraft traffic at the East Hampton Airport. Aircraft noise has substantially diminished the quiet enjoyment of homes and properties and compromised the pleasures of the woodlands, beaches, fields, and preserved lands that define our community and sense of place. The East Hampton Town Board proposes three local laws that restrict the times that noisy aircraft may take off and land at the airport to provide immediate, substantial noise relief for residents and visitors, maintain the intended and traditional use of the airport as a general aviation airport whose primary role is light aircraft and continue sufficient air traffic to maintain a financially self-sustaining airport. The Town proposes to professionally study and evaluate the effectiveness of these local laws following the 2015 summer season. These studies will include analysis of the diversion of traffic to other airports, the effect on noise and complaints, the effect on aircraft operators and the financial impact of the restrictions. A public meeting will be convened after the 2015 season to present the results of these studies and to hear from the public.		
Name of Applicant/Sponsor: East Hampton Town Board	Telephone: 631-324-4140	E-Mail: lcantwell@ehamptonny.gov
Address: 159 Pantigo Road		
City/PO: East Hampton	State: New York	Zip Code: 11937
Project Contact (if not same as sponsor; give name and title/role): Larry Cantwell, Town Supervisor	Telephone: same	E-Mail: same
Address: same		
City/PO: same	State: same	Zip Code: same
Property Owner (if not same as sponsor): East Hampton Town	Telephone: same	E-Mail: same
Address: same		
City/PO: same	State: same	Zip Code: same

**B. Government Approvals**

**B. Government Approvals, Funding, or Sponsorship.** (“Funding” includes grants, loans, tax relief, and any other forms of financial assistance.)

Government Entity	If Yes: Identify Agency and Approval(s) Required	Application Date (Actual or projected)
a. City Council, Town Board, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No or Village Board of Trustees	East Hampton Town Board	NA
b. City, Town or Village <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Planning Board or Commission		
c. City Council, Town or <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Village Zoning Board of Appeals		
d. Other local agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
e. County agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
f. Regional agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
g. State agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
h. Federal agencies <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		
i. Coastal Resources. i. Is the project site within a Coastal Area, or the waterfront area of a Designated Inland Waterway? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No  ii. Is the project site located in a community with an approved Local Waterfront Revitalization Program? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No iii. Is the project site within a Coastal Erosion Hazard Area? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No		

**C. Planning and Zoning**

**C.1. Planning and zoning actions.**

Will administrative or legislative adoption, or amendment of a plan, local law, ordinance, rule or regulation be the only approval(s) which must be granted to enable the proposed action to proceed? YesNo

- If Yes, complete sections C, F and G.
- If No, proceed to question C.2 and complete all remaining sections and questions in Part 1

**C.2. Adopted land use plans.**

a. Do any municipally- adopted (city, town, village or county) comprehensive land use plan(s) include the site where the proposed action would be located? YesNo

If Yes, does the comprehensive plan include specific recommendations for the site where the proposed action would be located? YesNo

b. Is the site of the proposed action within any local or regional special planning district (for example: Greenway Brownfield Opportunity Area (BOA); designated State or Federal heritage area; watershed management plan; or other?) YesNo

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

East Hampton Airport Master Plan, Remediation Sites:152156 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

c. Is the proposed action located wholly or partially within an area listed in an adopted municipal open space plan, or an adopted municipal farmland protection plan? YesNo

If Yes, identify the plan(s):

Community Preservation Fund Project Plan \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**C.3. Zoning**

a. Is the site of the proposed action located in a municipality with an adopted zoning law or ordinance.  Yes  No  
If Yes, what is the zoning classification(s) including any applicable overlay district?  
Commercial Industrial, Water Recharge Overlay District

b. Is the use permitted or allowed by a special or conditional use permit?  Yes  No

c. Is a zoning change requested as part of the proposed action?  Yes  No  
If Yes,  
i. What is the proposed new zoning for the site? \_\_\_\_\_

**C.4. Existing community services.**

a. In what school district is the project site located? Wainscott

b. What police or other public protection forces serve the project site?  
East Hampton Town Police Department

c. Which fire protection and emergency medical services serve the project site?  
Northwest Fire Protection District

d. What parks serve the project site?  
East Hampton Town contains Town, County and State Parkland.

**D. Project Details**

**D.1. Proposed and Potential Development**

a. What is the general nature of the proposed action (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial, recreational; if mixed, include all components)?  
\_\_\_\_\_

b. a. Total acreage of the site of the proposed action? \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
b. Total acreage to be physically disturbed? \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
c. Total acreage (project site and any contiguous properties) owned or controlled by the applicant or project sponsor? \_\_\_\_\_ acres

c. Is the proposed action an expansion of an existing project or use?  Yes  No  
i. If Yes, what is the approximate percentage of the proposed expansion and identify the units (e.g., acres, miles, housing units, square feet)? % \_\_\_\_\_ Units: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Is the proposed action a subdivision, or does it include a subdivision?  Yes  No  
If Yes,  
i. Purpose or type of subdivision? (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial; if mixed, specify types)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ii. Is a cluster/conservation layout proposed?  Yes  No  
iii. Number of lots proposed? \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. Minimum and maximum proposed lot sizes? Minimum \_\_\_\_\_ Maximum \_\_\_\_\_

e. Will proposed action be constructed in multiple phases?  Yes  No  
i. If No, anticipated period of construction: \_\_\_\_\_ months  
ii. If Yes:  
• Total number of phases anticipated \_\_\_\_\_  
• Anticipated commencement date of phase 1 (including demolition) \_\_\_\_\_ month \_\_\_\_\_ year  
• Anticipated completion date of final phase \_\_\_\_\_ month \_\_\_\_\_ year  
• Generally describe connections or relationships among phases, including any contingencies where progress of one phase may determine timing or duration of future phases: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

f. Does the project include new residential uses?  Yes  No  
 If Yes, show numbers of units proposed.

	<u>One Family</u>	<u>Two Family</u>	<u>Three Family</u>	<u>Multiple Family (four or more)</u>
Initial Phase	_____	_____	_____	_____
At completion	_____	_____	_____	_____
of all phases	_____	_____	_____	_____

g. Does the proposed action include new non-residential construction (including expansions)?  Yes  No  
 If Yes,

i. Total number of structures \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Dimensions (in feet) of largest proposed structure: \_\_\_\_\_ height; \_\_\_\_\_ width; and \_\_\_\_\_ length

iii. Approximate extent of building space to be heated or cooled: \_\_\_\_\_ square feet

h. Does the proposed action include construction or other activities that will result in the impoundment of any liquids, such as creation of a water supply, reservoir, pond, lake, waste lagoon or other storage?  Yes  No  
 If Yes,

i. Purpose of the impoundment: \_\_\_\_\_

ii. If a water impoundment, the principal source of the water:  Ground water  Surface water streams  Other specify: \_\_\_\_\_

iii. If other than water, identify the type of impounded/contained liquids and their source. \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Approximate size of the proposed impoundment. Volume: \_\_\_\_\_ million gallons; surface area: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

v. Dimensions of the proposed dam or impounding structure: \_\_\_\_\_ height; \_\_\_\_\_ length

vi. Construction method/materials for the proposed dam or impounding structure (e.g., earth fill, rock, wood, concrete): \_\_\_\_\_

**D.2. Project Operations**

a. Does the proposed action include any excavation, mining, or dredging, during construction, operations, or both?  Yes  No  
 (Not including general site preparation, grading or installation of utilities or foundations where all excavated materials will remain onsite)  
 If Yes:

i. What is the purpose of the excavation or dredging? \_\_\_\_\_

ii. How much material (including rock, earth, sediments, etc.) is proposed to be removed from the site?

- Volume (specify tons or cubic yards): \_\_\_\_\_
- Over what duration of time? \_\_\_\_\_

iii. Describe nature and characteristics of materials to be excavated or dredged, and plans to use, manage or dispose of them. \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Will there be onsite dewatering or processing of excavated materials?  Yes  No  
 If yes, describe. \_\_\_\_\_

v. What is the total area to be dredged or excavated? \_\_\_\_\_ acres

vi. What is the maximum area to be worked at any one time? \_\_\_\_\_ acres

vii. What would be the maximum depth of excavation or dredging? \_\_\_\_\_ feet

viii. Will the excavation require blasting?  Yes  No

ix. Summarize site reclamation goals and plan: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Would the proposed action cause or result in alteration of, increase or decrease in size of, or encroachment into any existing wetland, waterbody, shoreline, beach or adjacent area?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:

i. Identify the wetland or waterbody which would be affected (by name, water index number, wetland map number or geographic description): \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Describe how the proposed action would affect that waterbody or wetland, e.g. excavation, fill, placement of structures, or alteration of channels, banks and shorelines. Indicate extent of activities, alterations and additions in square feet or acres:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

iii. Will proposed action cause or result in disturbance to bottom sediments?  Yes  No  
If Yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Will proposed action cause or result in the destruction or removal of aquatic vegetation?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

- acres of aquatic vegetation proposed to be removed: \_\_\_\_\_
- expected acreage of aquatic vegetation remaining after project completion: \_\_\_\_\_
- purpose of proposed removal (e.g. beach clearing, invasive species control, boat access): \_\_\_\_\_
- proposed method of plant removal: \_\_\_\_\_
- if chemical/herbicide treatment will be used, specify product(s): \_\_\_\_\_

v. Describe any proposed reclamation/mitigation following disturbance: \_\_\_\_\_

c. Will the proposed action use, or create a new demand for water?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

i. Total anticipated water usage/demand per day: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons/day

ii. Will the proposed action obtain water from an existing public water supply?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

- Name of district or service area: \_\_\_\_\_
- Does the existing public water supply have capacity to serve the proposal?  Yes  No
- Is the project site in the existing district?  Yes  No
- Is expansion of the district needed?  Yes  No
- Do existing lines serve the project site?  Yes  No

iii. Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to supply the project?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

- Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: \_\_\_\_\_
- Source(s) of supply for the district: \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Is a new water supply district or service area proposed to be formed to serve the project site?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

- Applicant/sponsor for new district: \_\_\_\_\_
- Date application submitted or anticipated: \_\_\_\_\_
- Proposed source(s) of supply for new district: \_\_\_\_\_

v. If a public water supply will not be used, describe plans to provide water supply for the project: \_\_\_\_\_

vi. If water supply will be from wells (public or private), maximum pumping capacity: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons/minute.

d. Will the proposed action generate liquid wastes?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

i. Total anticipated liquid waste generation per day: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons/day

ii. Nature of liquid wastes to be generated (e.g., sanitary wastewater, industrial; if combination, describe all components and approximate volumes or proportions of each): \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

iii. Will the proposed action use any existing public wastewater treatment facilities?  Yes  No  
If Yes:

- Name of wastewater treatment plant to be used: \_\_\_\_\_
- Name of district: \_\_\_\_\_
- Does the existing wastewater treatment plant have capacity to serve the project?  Yes  No
- Is the project site in the existing district?  Yes  No
- Is expansion of the district needed?  Yes  No

• Do existing sewer lines serve the project site?  Yes  No  
 • Will line extension within an existing district be necessary to serve the project?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 • Describe extensions or capacity expansions proposed to serve this project: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

iv. Will a new wastewater (sewage) treatment district be formed to serve the project site?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 • Applicant/sponsor for new district: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Date application submitted or anticipated: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • What is the receiving water for the wastewater discharge? \_\_\_\_\_

v. If public facilities will not be used, describe plans to provide wastewater treatment for the project, including specifying proposed receiving water (name and classification if surface discharge, or describe subsurface disposal plans):  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

vi. Describe any plans or designs to capture, recycle or reuse liquid waste: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

e. Will the proposed action disturb more than one acre and create stormwater runoff, either from new point sources (i.e. ditches, pipes, swales, curbs, gutters or other concentrated flows of stormwater) or non-point source (i.e. sheet flow) during construction or post construction?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. How much impervious surface will the project create in relation to total size of project parcel?  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Square feet or \_\_\_\_\_ acres (impervious surface)  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Square feet or \_\_\_\_\_ acres (parcel size)  
 ii. Describe types of new point sources. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Where will the stormwater runoff be directed (i.e. on-site stormwater management facility/structures, adjacent properties, groundwater, on-site surface water or off-site surface waters)?  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 • If to surface waters, identify receiving water bodies or wetlands: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Will stormwater runoff flow to adjacent properties?  Yes  No

iv. Does proposed plan minimize impervious surfaces, use pervious materials or collect and re-use stormwater?  Yes  No

f. Does the proposed action include, or will it use on-site, one or more sources of air emissions, including fuel combustion, waste incineration, or other processes or operations?  Yes  No  
 If Yes, identify:  
 i. Mobile sources during project operations (e.g., heavy equipment, fleet or delivery vehicles)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Stationary sources during construction (e.g., power generation, structural heating, batch plant, crushers)  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Stationary sources during operations (e.g., process emissions, large boilers, electric generation)  
 \_\_\_\_\_

g. Will any air emission sources named in D.2.f (above), require a NY State Air Registration, Air Facility Permit, or Federal Clean Air Act Title IV or Title V Permit?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Is the project site located in an Air quality non-attainment area? (Area routinely or periodically fails to meet ambient air quality standards for all or some parts of the year)  Yes  No  
 ii. In addition to emissions as calculated in the application, the project will generate:  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>)  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Nitrous Oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O)  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Perfluorocarbons (PFCs)  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Sulfur Hexafluoride (SF<sub>6</sub>)  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Carbon Dioxide equivalent of Hydroflouorocarbons (HFCs)  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/year (short tons) of Hazardous Air Pollutants (HAPs)

h. Will the proposed action generate or emit methane (including, but not limited to, sewage treatment plants, landfills, composting facilities)?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Estimate methane generation in tons/year (metric): \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Describe any methane capture, control or elimination measures included in project design (e.g., combustion to generate heat or electricity, flaring): \_\_\_\_\_

---

i. Will the proposed action result in the release of air pollutants from open-air operations or processes, such as quarry or landfill operations?  Yes  No  
 If Yes: Describe operations and nature of emissions (e.g., diesel exhaust, rock particulates/dust): \_\_\_\_\_

---

j. Will the proposed action result in a substantial increase in traffic above present levels or generate substantial new demand for transportation facilities or services?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. When is the peak traffic expected (Check all that apply):  Morning  Evening  Weekend  
 Randomly between hours of \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_.  
 ii. For commercial activities only, projected number of semi-trailer truck trips/day: \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Parking spaces: Existing \_\_\_\_\_ Proposed \_\_\_\_\_ Net increase/decrease \_\_\_\_\_  
 iv. Does the proposed action include any shared use parking?  Yes  No  
 v. If the proposed action includes any modification of existing roads, creation of new roads or change in existing access, describe: \_\_\_\_\_

---

vi. Are public/private transportation service(s) or facilities available within 1/2 mile of the proposed site?  Yes  No  
 vii. Will the proposed action include access to public transportation or accommodations for use of hybrid, electric or other alternative fueled vehicles?  Yes  No  
 viii. Will the proposed action include plans for pedestrian or bicycle accommodations for connections to existing pedestrian or bicycle routes?  Yes  No

---

k. Will the proposed action (for commercial or industrial projects only) generate new or additional demand for energy?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Estimate annual electricity demand during operation of the proposed action: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Anticipated sources/suppliers of electricity for the project (e.g., on-site combustion, on-site renewable, via grid/local utility, or other): \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Will the proposed action require a new, or an upgrade to, an existing substation?  Yes  No

---

l. Hours of operation. Answer all items which apply.  
 i. During Construction:  
 • Monday - Friday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Saturday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Sunday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Holidays: \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. During Operations:  
 • Monday - Friday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Saturday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Sunday: \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Holidays: \_\_\_\_\_

m. Will the proposed action produce noise that will exceed existing ambient noise levels during construction, operation, or both?  Yes  No  
 If yes:  
 i. Provide details including sources, time of day and duration:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a noise barrier or screen?  Yes  No  
 Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

n.. Will the proposed action have outdoor lighting?  Yes  No  
 If yes:  
 i. Describe source(s), location(s), height of fixture(s), direction/aim, and proximity to nearest occupied structures:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Will proposed action remove existing natural barriers that could act as a light barrier or screen?  Yes  No  
 Describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

o. Does the proposed action have the potential to produce odors for more than one hour per day?  Yes  No  
 If Yes, describe possible sources, potential frequency and duration of odor emissions, and proximity to nearest occupied structures: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

p. Will the proposed action include any bulk storage of petroleum (combined capacity of over 1,100 gallons) or chemical products 185 gallons in above ground storage or any amount in underground storage?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Product(s) to be stored \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Volume(s) \_\_\_\_\_ per unit time \_\_\_\_\_ (e.g., month, year)  
 iii. Generally describe proposed storage facilities: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

q. Will the proposed action (commercial, industrial and recreational projects only) use pesticides (i.e., herbicides, insecticides) during construction or operation?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Describe proposed treatment(s):  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

ii. Will the proposed action use Integrated Pest Management Practices?  Yes  No

---

r. Will the proposed action (commercial or industrial projects only) involve or require the management or disposal of solid waste (excluding hazardous materials)?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Describe any solid waste(s) to be generated during construction or operation of the facility:  
 • Construction: \_\_\_\_\_ tons per \_\_\_\_\_ (unit of time)  
 • Operation : \_\_\_\_\_ tons per \_\_\_\_\_ (unit of time)  
 ii. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of materials to avoid disposal as solid waste:  
 • Construction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Operation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Proposed disposal methods/facilities for solid waste generated on-site:  
 • Construction: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 • Operation: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_



s. Does the proposed action include construction or modification of a solid waste management facility?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Type of management or handling of waste proposed for the site (e.g., recycling or transfer station, composting, landfill, or other disposal activities): \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Anticipated rate of disposal/processing:  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/month, if transfer or other non-combustion/thermal treatment, or  
 • \_\_\_\_\_ Tons/hour, if combustion or thermal treatment  
 iii. If landfill, anticipated site life: \_\_\_\_\_ years

t. Will proposed action at the site involve the commercial generation, treatment, storage, or disposal of hazardous waste?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Name(s) of all hazardous wastes or constituents to be generated, handled or managed at facility: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. Generally describe processes or activities involving hazardous wastes or constituents: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 iii. Specify amount to be handled or generated \_\_\_\_\_ tons/month  
 iv. Describe any proposals for on-site minimization, recycling or reuse of hazardous constituents: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 v. Will any hazardous wastes be disposed at an existing offsite hazardous waste facility?  Yes  No  
 If Yes: provide name and location of facility: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 If No: describe proposed management of any hazardous wastes which will not be sent to a hazardous waste facility:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**E. Site and Setting of Proposed Action**

**E.1. Land uses on and surrounding the project site**

a. Existing land uses.  
 i. Check all uses that occur on, adjoining and near the project site.  
 Urban  Industrial  Commercial  Residential (suburban)  Rural (non-farm)  
 Forest  Agriculture  Aquatic  Other (specify): \_\_\_\_\_  
 ii. If mix of uses, generally describe:  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

b. Land uses and covertypes on the project site.

Land use or Covertypes	Current Acreage	Acreage After Project Completion	Change (Acres +/-)
• Roads, buildings, and other paved or impervious surfaces			
• Forested			
• Meadows, grasslands or brushlands (non-agricultural, including abandoned agricultural)			
• Agricultural (includes active orchards, field, greenhouse etc.)			
• Surface water features (lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, etc.)			
• Wetlands (freshwater or tidal)			
• Non-vegetated (bare rock, earth or fill)			
• Other Describe: _____ _____			

c. Is the project site presently used by members of the community for public recreation?  Yes  No  
i. If Yes: explain: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Are there any facilities serving children, the elderly, people with disabilities (e.g., schools, hospitals, licensed day care centers, or group homes) within 1500 feet of the project site?  Yes  No  
If Yes,  
i. Identify Facilities: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

e. Does the project site contain an existing dam?  Yes  No  
If Yes:  
i. Dimensions of the dam and impoundment:  
• Dam height: \_\_\_\_\_ feet  
• Dam length: \_\_\_\_\_ feet  
• Surface area: \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
• Volume impounded: \_\_\_\_\_ gallons OR acre-feet  
ii. Dam's existing hazard classification: \_\_\_\_\_  
iii. Provide date and summarize results of last inspection: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

f. Has the project site ever been used as a municipal, commercial or industrial solid waste management facility, or does the project site adjoin property which is now, or was at one time, used as a solid waste management facility?  Yes  No  
If Yes:  
i. Has the facility been formally closed?  Yes  No  
• If yes, cite sources/documentation: \_\_\_\_\_  
ii. Describe the location of the project site relative to the boundaries of the solid waste management facility: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

iii. Describe any development constraints due to the prior solid waste activities: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

g. Have hazardous wastes been generated, treated and/or disposed of at the site, or does the project site adjoin property which is now or was at one time used to commercially treat, store and/or dispose of hazardous waste?  Yes  No  
If Yes:  
i. Describe waste(s) handled and waste management activities, including approximate time when activities occurred: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

h. Potential contamination history. Has there been a reported spill at the proposed project site, or have any remedial actions been conducted at or adjacent to the proposed site?  Yes  No  
If Yes:  
i. Is any portion of the site listed on the NYSDEC Spills Incidents database or Environmental Site Remediation database? Check all that apply:  Yes  No  
 Yes – Spills Incidents database Provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Yes – Environmental Site Remediation database Provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Neither database  
ii. If site has been subject of RCRA corrective activities, describe control measures: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

iii. Is the project within 2000 feet of any site in the NYSDEC Environmental Site Remediation database?  Yes  No  
If yes, provide DEC ID number(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
iv. If yes to (i), (ii) or (iii) above, describe current status of site(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

v. Is the project site subject to an institutional control limiting property uses?  Yes  No

- If yes, DEC site ID number: \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe the type of institutional control (e.g., deed restriction or easement): \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe any use limitations: \_\_\_\_\_
- Describe any engineering controls: \_\_\_\_\_
- Will the project affect the institutional or engineering controls in place?  Yes  No
- Explain: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

**E.2. Natural Resources On or Near Project Site**

a. What is the average depth to bedrock on the project site? \_\_\_\_\_ feet

b. Are there bedrock outcroppings on the project site?  Yes  No  
 If Yes, what proportion of the site is comprised of bedrock outcroppings? \_\_\_\_\_ %

c. Predominant soil type(s) present on project site: \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 \_\_\_\_\_ %  
 \_\_\_\_\_ %

d. What is the average depth to the water table on the project site? Average: \_\_\_\_\_ feet

e. Drainage status of project site soils:  Well Drained: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site  
 Moderately Well Drained: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site  
 Poorly Drained \_\_\_\_\_ % of site

f. Approximate proportion of proposed action site with slopes:  0-10%: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site  
 10-15%: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site  
 15% or greater: \_\_\_\_\_ % of site

g. Are there any unique geologic features on the project site?  Yes  No  
 If Yes, describe: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

h. Surface water features.

i. Does any portion of the project site contain wetlands or other waterbodies (including streams, rivers, ponds or lakes)?  Yes  No

ii. Do any wetlands or other waterbodies adjoin the project site?  Yes  No  
 If Yes to either *i* or *ii*, continue. If No, skip to E.2.i.

iii. Are any of the wetlands or waterbodies within or adjoining the project site regulated by any federal, state or local agency?  Yes  No

iv. For each identified regulated wetland and waterbody on the project site, provide the following information:

- Streams: Name \_\_\_\_\_ Classification \_\_\_\_\_
- Lakes or Ponds: Name \_\_\_\_\_ Classification \_\_\_\_\_
- Wetlands: Name \_\_\_\_\_ Approximate Size \_\_\_\_\_
- Wetland No. (if regulated by DEC) \_\_\_\_\_

v. Are any of the above water bodies listed in the most recent compilation of NYS water quality-impaired waterbodies?  Yes  No  
 If yes, name of impaired water body/bodies and basis for listing as impaired: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

---

i. Is the project site in a designated Floodway?  Yes  No

j. Is the project site in the 100 year Floodplain?  Yes  No

k. Is the project site in the 500 year Floodplain?  Yes  No

l. Is the project site located over, or immediately adjoining, a primary, principal or sole source aquifer?  Yes  No  
 If Yes:  
 i. Name of aquifer: \_\_\_\_\_

m. Identify the predominant wildlife species that occupy or use the project site: _____ _____ _____	
n. Does the project site contain a designated significant natural community? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> If Yes: <i>i.</i> Describe the habitat/community (composition, function, and basis for designation): _____ _____ <i>ii.</i> Source(s) of description or evaluation: _____ <i>iii.</i> Extent of community/habitat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently: _____ acres</li> <li>• Following completion of project as proposed: _____ acres</li> <li>• Gain or loss (indicate + or -): _____ acres</li> </ul>	
o. Does project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by the federal government or NYS as endangered or threatened, or does it contain any areas identified as habitat for an endangered or threatened species? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
p. Does the project site contain any species of plant or animal that is listed by NYS as rare, or as a species of special concern? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span>	
q. Is the project site or adjoining area currently used for hunting, trapping, fishing or shell fishing? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> If yes, give a brief description of how the proposed action may affect that use: _____ _____	
<b>E.3. Designated Public Resources On or Near Project Site</b>	
a. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in a designated agricultural district certified pursuant to Agriculture and Markets Law, Article 25-AA, Section 303 and 304? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> If Yes, provide county plus district name/number: _____	
b. Are agricultural lands consisting of highly productive soils present? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> <i>i.</i> If Yes: acreage(s) on project site? _____ <i>ii.</i> Source(s) of soil rating(s): _____	
c. Does the project site contain all or part of, or is it substantially contiguous to, a registered National Natural Landmark? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> If Yes: <i>i.</i> Nature of the natural landmark: <input type="checkbox"/> Biological Community <input type="checkbox"/> Geological Feature <i>ii.</i> Provide brief description of landmark, including values behind designation and approximate size/extent: _____ _____ _____	
d. Is the project site located in or does it adjoin a state listed Critical Environmental Area? <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</span> If Yes: <i>i.</i> CEA name: _____ <i>ii.</i> Basis for designation: _____ <i>iii.</i> Designating agency and date: _____	

e. Does the project site contain, or is it substantially contiguous to, a building, archaeological site, or district which is listed on, or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on, the State or National Register of Historic Places?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <i>i.</i> Nature of historic/archaeological resource: <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeological Site <input type="checkbox"/> Historic Building or District <i>ii.</i> Name: _____ <i>iii.</i> Brief description of attributes on which listing is based: _____	
f. Is the project site, or any portion of it, located in or adjacent to an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
g. Have additional archaeological or historic site(s) or resources been identified on the project site?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <i>i.</i> Describe possible resource(s): _____ <i>ii.</i> Basis for identification: _____	
h. Is the project site within five miles of any officially designated and publicly accessible federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <i>i.</i> Identify resource: _____ <i>ii.</i> Nature of, or basis for, designation (e.g., established highway overlook, state or local park, state historic trail or scenic byway, etc.): _____ <i>iii.</i> Distance between project and resource: _____ miles.	
i. Is the project site located within a designated river corridor under the Wild, Scenic and Recreational Rivers Program 6 NYCRR 666?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
If Yes: <i>i.</i> Identify the name of the river and its designation: _____ <i>ii.</i> Is the activity consistent with development restrictions contained in 6NYCRR Part 666?	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	

**F. Additional Information**

Attach any additional information which may be needed to clarify your project.

If you have identified any adverse impacts which could be associated with your proposal, please describe those impacts plus any measures which you propose to avoid or minimize them.

**G. Verification**

I certify that the information provided is true to the best of my knowledge.

Applicant/Sponsor Name Larry Cantwell Date \_\_\_\_\_

Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Title Town Supervisor

**Full Environmental Assessment Form**  
**Part 2 - Identification of Potential Project Impacts**

Agency Use Only [If applicable]  
 Project : East Hampton Airport Noise Regulations  
 Date : April 10, 2015

**Part 2 is to be completed by the lead agency.** Part 2 is designed to help the lead agency inventory all potential resources that could be affected by a proposed project or action. We recognize that the lead agency's reviewer(s) will not necessarily be environmental professionals. So, the questions are designed to walk a reviewer through the assessment process by providing a series of questions that can be answered using the information found in Part 1. To further assist the lead agency in completing Part 2, the form identifies the most relevant questions in Part 1 that will provide the information needed to answer the Part 2 question. When Part 2 is completed, the lead agency will have identified the relevant environmental areas that may be impacted by the proposed activity.

If the lead agency is a state agency **and** the action is in any Coastal Area, complete the Coastal Assessment Form before proceeding with this assessment.

**Tips for completing Part 2:**

- Review all of the information provided in Part 1.
- Review any application, maps, supporting materials and the Full EAF Workbook.
- Answer each of the 18 questions in Part 2.
- If you answer “**Yes**” to a numbered question, please complete all the questions that follow in that section.
- If you answer “**No**” to a numbered question, move on to the next numbered question.
- Check appropriate column to indicate the anticipated size of the impact.
- Proposed projects that would exceed a numeric threshold contained in a question should result in the reviewing agency checking the box “Moderate to large impact may occur.”
- The reviewer is not expected to be an expert in environmental analysis.
- If you are not sure or undecided about the size of an impact, it may help to review the sub-questions for the general question and consult the workbook.
- When answering a question consider all components of the proposed activity, that is, the “whole action”.
- Consider the possibility for long-term and cumulative impacts as well as direct impacts.
- Answer the question in a reasonable manner considering the scale and context of the project.

<b>1. Impact on Land</b> Proposed action may involve construction on, or physical alteration of, the land surface of the proposed site. (See Part 1. D.1) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - j. If “No”, move on to Section 2.</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>		
a. The proposed action may involve construction on land where depth to water table is less than 3 feet.	E2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may involve construction on slopes of 15% or greater.	E2f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may involve construction on land where bedrock is exposed, or generally within 5 feet of existing ground surface.	E2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The proposed action may involve the excavation and removal of more than 1,000 tons of natural material.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
e. The proposed action may involve construction that continues for more than one year or in multiple phases.	D1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
f. The proposed action may result in increased erosion, whether from physical disturbance or vegetation removal (including from treatment by herbicides).	D2e, D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
g. The proposed action is, or may be, located within a Coastal Erosion hazard area.	B1i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
h. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

**2. Impact on Geological Features**

The proposed action may result in the modification or destruction of, or inhibit access to, any unique or unusual land forms on the site (e.g., cliffs, dunes, minerals, fossils, caves). (See Part 1. E.2.g)

NO

YES

*If "Yes", answer questions a - c. If "No", move on to Section 3.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Identify the specific land form(s) attached: _____ _____	E2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may affect or is adjacent to a geological feature listed as a registered National Natural Landmark. Specific feature: _____	E3c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**3. Impacts on Surface Water**

The proposed action may affect one or more wetlands or other surface water bodies (e.g., streams, rivers, ponds or lakes). (See Part 1. D.2, E.2.h)

NO

YES

*If "Yes", answer questions a - l. If "No", move on to Section 4.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may create a new water body.	D2b, D1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in an increase or decrease of over 10% or more than a 10 acre increase or decrease in the surface area of any body of water.	D2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may involve dredging more than 100 cubic yards of material from a wetland or water body.	D2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve construction within or adjoining a freshwater or tidal wetland, or in the bed or banks of any other water body.	E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may create turbidity in a waterbody, either from upland erosion, runoff or by disturbing bottom sediments.	D2a, D2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may include construction of one or more intake(s) for withdrawal of water from surface water.	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may include construction of one or more outfall(s) for discharge of wastewater to surface water(s).	D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may cause soil erosion, or otherwise create a source of stormwater discharge that may lead to siltation or other degradation of receiving water bodies.	D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may affect the water quality of any water bodies within or downstream of the site of the proposed action.	E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may involve the application of pesticides or herbicides in or around any water body.	D2q, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may require the construction of new, or expansion of existing, wastewater treatment facilities.	D1a, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

I. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

**4. Impact on groundwater**  
 The proposed action may result in new or additional use of ground water, or may have the potential to introduce contaminants to ground water or an aquifer.  NO  YES  
 (See Part 1. D.2.a, D.2.c, D.2.d, D.2.p, D.2.q, D.2.t)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 5.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may require new water supply wells, or create additional demand on supplies from existing water supply wells.	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Water supply demand from the proposed action may exceed safe and sustainable withdrawal capacity rate of the local supply or aquifer. Cite Source: _____	D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may allow or result in residential uses in areas without water and sewer services.	D1a, D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may include or require wastewater discharged to groundwater.	D2d, E2l	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the construction of water supply wells in locations where groundwater is, or is suspected to be, contaminated.	D2c, E1f, E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may require the bulk storage of petroleum or chemical products over ground water or an aquifer.	D2p, E2l	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may involve the commercial application of pesticides within 100 feet of potable drinking water or irrigation sources.	E2h, D2q, E2l, D2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**5. Impact on Flooding**  
 The proposed action may result in development on lands subject to flooding.  NO  YES  
 (See Part 1. E.2)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", move on to Section 6.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may result in development in a designated floodway.	E2i	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in development within a 100 year floodplain.	E2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in development within a 500 year floodplain.	E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in, or require, modification of existing drainage patterns.	D2b, D2e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may change flood water flows that contribute to flooding.	D2b, E2i, E2j, E2k	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. If there is a dam located on the site of the proposed action, is the dam in need of repair, or upgrade?	E1e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
----------------------------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

6. Impacts on Air			
The proposed action may include a state regulated air emission source. (See Part 1. D.2.f., D.2.h, D.2.g) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", move on to Section 7.</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. If the proposed action requires federal or state air emission permits, the action may also emit one or more greenhouse gases at or above the following levels: i. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide (CO <sub>2</sub> ) ii. More than 3.5 tons/year of nitrous oxide (N <sub>2</sub> O) iii. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon equivalent of perfluorocarbons (PFCs) iv. More than .045 tons/year of sulfur hexafluoride (SF <sub>6</sub> ) v. More than 1000 tons/year of carbon dioxide equivalent of hydrochloroflourocarbons (HFCs) emissions vi. 43 tons/year or more of methane	D2g D2g D2g D2g D2g D2h	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may generate 10 tons/year or more of any one designated hazardous air pollutant, or 25 tons/year or more of any combination of such hazardous air pollutants.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may require a state air registration, or may produce an emissions rate of total contaminants that may exceed 5 lbs. per hour, or may include a heat source capable of producing more than 10 million BTU's per hour.	D2f, D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may reach 50% of any of the thresholds in "a" through "c", above.	D2g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in the combustion or thermal treatment of more than 1 ton of refuse per hour.	D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Impact on Plants and Animals			
The proposed action may result in a loss of flora or fauna. (See Part 1. E.2. m.-q.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - j. If "No", move on to Section 8.</i>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may cause reduction in population or loss of individuals of any threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any rare, threatened or endangered species, as listed by New York State or the federal government.	E2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may cause reduction in population, or loss of individuals, of any species of special concern or conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government, that use the site, or are found on, over, or near the site.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in a reduction or degradation of any habitat used by any species of special concern and conservation need, as listed by New York State or the Federal government.	E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e. The proposed action may diminish the capacity of a registered National Natural Landmark to support the biological community it was established to protect.	E3c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result in the removal of, or ground disturbance in, any portion of a designated significant natural community. Source: _____	E2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may substantially interfere with nesting/breeding, foraging, or over-wintering habitat for the predominant species that occupy or use the project site.	E2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action requires the conversion of more than 10 acres of forest, grassland or any other regionally or locally important habitat. Habitat type & information source: _____	E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Proposed action (commercial, industrial or recreational projects, only) involves use of herbicides or pesticides.	D2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>8. Impact on Agricultural Resources</b>			
The proposed action may impact agricultural resources. (See Part 1. E.3.a. and b.)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
<i>If "Yes", answer questions a - h. If "No", move on to Section 9.</i>			
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>
a. The proposed action may impact soil classified within soil group 1 through 4 of the NYS Land Classification System.	E2c, E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may sever, cross or otherwise limit access to agricultural land (includes cropland, hayfields, pasture, vineyard, orchard, etc).	E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in the excavation or compaction of the soil profile of active agricultural land.	E3b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may irreversibly convert agricultural land to non-agricultural uses, either more than 2.5 acres if located in an Agricultural District, or more than 10 acres if not within an Agricultural District.	E1b, E3a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may disrupt or prevent installation of an agricultural land management system.	E1 a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action may result, directly or indirectly, in increased development potential or pressure on farmland.	C2c, C3, D2c, D2d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed project is not consistent with the adopted municipal Farmland Protection Plan.	C2c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other impacts: _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>9. Impact on Aesthetic Resources</b> The land use of the proposed action are obviously different from, or are in sharp contrast to, current land use patterns between the proposed project and a scenic or aesthetic resource. (Part 1. E.1.a, E.1.b, E.3.h.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 10.</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>		
a. Proposed action may be visible from any officially designated federal, state, or local scenic or aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may result in the obstruction, elimination or significant screening of one or more officially designated scenic views.	E3h, C2b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may be visible from publicly accessible vantage points: i. Seasonally (e.g., screened by summer foliage, but visible during other seasons) ii. Year round	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
d. The situation or activity in which viewers are engaged while viewing the proposed action is: i. Routine travel by residents, including travel to and from work ii. Recreational or tourism based activities	E3h E2q, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		
e. The proposed action may cause a diminishment of the public enjoyment and appreciation of the designated aesthetic resource.	E3h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
f. There are similar projects visible within the following distance of the proposed project: 0-1/2 mile 1/2 -3 mile 3-5 mile 5+ mile	D1a, E1a, D1f, D1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

<b>10. Impact on Historic and Archeological Resources</b> The proposed action may occur in or adjacent to a historic or archaeological resource. (Part 1. E.3.e, f. and g.) <i>If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 11.</i>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>		
a. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, any buildings, archaeological site or district which is listed on or has been nominated by the NYS Board of Historic Preservation for inclusion on the State or National Register of Historic Places.	E3e	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
b. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an area designated as sensitive for archaeological sites on the NY State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) archaeological site inventory.	E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
c. The proposed action may occur wholly or partially within, or substantially contiguous to, an archaeological site not included on the NY SHPO inventory. Source: _____	E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

d. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. If any of the above (a-d) are answered “Yes”, continue with the following questions to help support conclusions in Part 3:			
i. The proposed action may result in the destruction or alteration of all or part of the site or property.	E3e, E3g, E3f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. The proposed action may result in the alteration of the property’s setting or integrity.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. The proposed action may result in the introduction of visual elements which are out of character with the site or property, or may alter its setting.	E3e, E3f, E3g, E3h, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>11. Impact on Open Space and Recreation</b> The proposed action may result in a loss of recreational opportunities or a reduction of an open space resource as designated in any adopted municipal open space plan. (See Part 1. C.2.c, E.1.c., E.2.q.) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - e. If “No”, go to Section 12.</i>			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>
a. The proposed action may result in an impairment of natural functions, or “ecosystem services”, provided by an undeveloped area, including but not limited to stormwater storage, nutrient cycling, wildlife habitat.	D2e, E1b E2h, E2m, E2o, E2n, E2p	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the loss of a current or future recreational resource.	C2a, E1c, C2c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may eliminate open space or recreational resource in an area with few such resources.	C2a, C2c E1c, E2q	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may result in loss of an area now used informally by the community as an open space resource.	C2c, E1c	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>12. Impact on Critical Environmental Areas</b> The proposed action may be located within or adjacent to a critical environmental area (CEA). (See Part 1. E.3.d) <i>If “Yes”, answer questions a - c. If “No”, go to Section 13.</i>			
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES
	<b>Relevant Part I Question(s)</b>	<b>No, or small impact may occur</b>	<b>Moderate to large impact may occur</b>
a. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quantity of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in a reduction in the quality of the resource or characteristic which was the basis for designation of the CEA.	E3d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**13. Impact on Transportation**  
 The proposed action may result in a change to existing transportation systems.  NO  YES  
 (See Part 1. D.2.j)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - g. If "No", go to Section 14.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. Projected traffic increase may exceed capacity of existing road network.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in the construction of paved parking area for 500 or more vehicles.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action will degrade existing transit access.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action will degrade existing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may alter the present pattern of movement of people or goods.	D2j	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**14. Impact on Energy**  
 The proposed action may cause an increase in the use of any form of energy.  NO  YES  
 (See Part 1. D.2.k)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - e. If "No", go to Section 15.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action will require a new, or an upgrade to an existing, substation.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will require the creation or extension of an energy transmission or supply system to serve more than 50 single or two-family residences or to serve a commercial or industrial use.	D1f, D1q, D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may utilize more than 2,500 MWhrs per year of electricity.	D2k	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may involve heating and/or cooling of more than 100,000 square feet of building area when completed.	D1g	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Other Impacts: <u>Diversion resulting from the proposed laws may increase the amount of aviation fuel used for some flights while decreasing the amount of fuel used for others.</u>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**15. Impact on Noise, Odor, and Light**  
 The proposed action may result in an increase in noise, odors, or outdoor lighting.  NO  YES  
 (See Part 1. D.2.m., n., and o.)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - f. If "No", go to Section 16.*

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may produce sound above noise levels established by local regulation.	D2m	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may result in blasting within 1,500 feet of any residence, hospital, school, licensed day care center, or nursing home.	D2m, E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may result in routine odors for more than one hour per day.	D2o	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

d. The proposed action may result in light shining onto adjoining properties.	D2n	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may result in lighting creating sky-glow brighter than existing area conditions.	D2n, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### 16. Impact on Human Health

The proposed action may have an impact on human health from exposure to new or existing sources of contaminants. (See Part 1.D.2.q., E.1. d. f. g. and h.)  
*If "Yes", answer questions a - m. If "No", go to Section 17.*

NO

YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action is located within 1500 feet of a school, hospital, licensed day care center, group home, nursing home or retirement community.	E1d	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The site of the proposed action is currently undergoing remediation.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. There is a completed emergency spill remediation, or a completed environmental site remediation on, or adjacent to, the site of the proposed action.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The site of the action is subject to an institutional control limiting the use of the property (e.g., easement or deed restriction).	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may affect institutional control measures that were put in place to ensure that the site remains protective of the environment and human health.	E1g, E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action has adequate control measures in place to ensure that future generation, treatment and/or disposal of hazardous wastes will be protective of the environment and human health.	D2t	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action involves construction or modification of a solid waste management facility.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. The proposed action may result in the unearthing of solid or hazardous waste.	D2q, E1f	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. The proposed action may result in an increase in the rate of disposal, or processing, of solid waste.	D2r, D2s	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
j. The proposed action may result in excavation or other disturbance within 2000 feet of a site used for the disposal of solid or hazardous waste.	E1f, E1g E1h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
k. The proposed action may result in the migration of explosive gases from a landfill site to adjacent off site structures.	E1f, E1g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
l. The proposed action may result in the release of contaminated leachate from the project site.	D2s, E1f, D2r	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
m. Other impacts: _____ _____			

**17. Consistency with Community Plans**

The proposed action is not consistent with adopted land use plans.

(See Part 1. C.1, C.2. and C.3.)

*If “Yes”, answer questions a - h. If “No”, go to Section 18.*

NO

YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action’s land use components may be different from, or in sharp contrast to, current surrounding land use pattern(s).	C2, C3, D1a E1a, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action will cause the permanent population of the city, town or village in which the project is located to grow by more than 5%.	C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action is inconsistent with local land use plans or zoning regulations.	C2, C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action is inconsistent with any County plans, or other regional land use plans.	C2, C2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action may cause a change in the density of development that is not supported by existing infrastructure or is distant from existing infrastructure.	C3, D1c, D1d, D1f, D1d, E1b	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. The proposed action is located in an area characterized by low density development that will require new or expanded public infrastructure.	C4, D2c, D2d D2j	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. The proposed action may induce secondary development impacts (e.g., residential or commercial development not included in the proposed action)	C2a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**18. Consistency with Community Character**

The proposed project is inconsistent with the existing community character.

(See Part 1. C.2, C.3, D.2, E.3)

*If “Yes”, answer questions a - g. If “No”, proceed to Part 3.*

NO

YES

	Relevant Part I Question(s)	No, or small impact may occur	Moderate to large impact may occur
a. The proposed action may replace or eliminate existing facilities, structures, or areas of historic importance to the community.	E3e, E3f, E3g	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. The proposed action may create a demand for additional community services (e.g. schools, police and fire)	C4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. The proposed action may displace affordable or low-income housing in an area where there is a shortage of such housing.	C2, C3, D1f D1g, E1a	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. The proposed action may interfere with the use or enjoyment of officially recognized or designated public resources.	C2, E3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. The proposed action is inconsistent with the predominant architectural scale and character.	C2, C3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Proposed action is inconsistent with the character of the existing natural landscape.	C2, C3 E1a, E1b E2g, E2h	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Other impacts: _____ _____		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project :

Date :

***Full Environmental Assessment Form***  
***Part 3 - Evaluation of the Magnitude and Importance of Project Impacts***  
***and***  
***Determination of Significance***

Part 3 provides the reasons in support of the determination of significance. The lead agency must complete Part 3 for every question in Part 2 where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.

Based on the analysis in Part 3, the lead agency must decide whether to require an environmental impact statement to further assess the proposed action or whether available information is sufficient for the lead agency to conclude that the proposed action will not have a significant adverse environmental impact. By completing the certification on the next page, the lead agency can complete its determination of significance.

**Reasons Supporting This Determination:**

To complete this section:

- Identify the impact based on the Part 2 responses and describe its magnitude. Magnitude considers factors such as severity, size or extent of an impact.
- Assess the importance of the impact. Importance relates to the geographic scope, duration, probability of the impact occurring, number of people affected by the impact and any additional environmental consequences if the impact were to occur.
- The assessment should take into consideration any design element or project changes.
- Repeat this process for each Part 2 question where the impact has been identified as potentially moderate to large or where there is a need to explain why a particular element of the proposed action will not, or may, result in a significant adverse environmental impact.
- Provide the reason(s) why the impact may, or will not, result in a significant adverse environmental impact
- For Conditional Negative Declarations identify the specific condition(s) imposed that will modify the proposed action so that no significant adverse environmental impacts will result.
- Attach additional sheets, as needed.

**Determination of Significance - Type 1 and Unlisted Actions**

SEQR Status:             Type 1                       Unlisted

Identify portions of EAF completed for this Project:    Part 1             Part 2             Part 3



Upon review of the information recorded on this EAF, as noted, plus this additional support information

and considering both the magnitude and importance of each identified potential impact, it is the conclusion of the \_\_\_\_\_ as lead agency that:

A. This project will result in no significant adverse impacts on the environment, and, therefore, an environmental impact statement need not be prepared. Accordingly, this negative declaration is issued.

B. Although this project could have a significant adverse impact on the environment, that impact will be avoided or substantially mitigated because of the following conditions which will be required by the lead agency:

There will, therefore, be no significant adverse impacts from the project as conditioned, and, therefore, this conditioned negative declaration is issued. A conditioned negative declaration may be used only for UNLISTED actions (see 6 NYCRR 617.d).

C. This Project may result in one or more significant adverse impacts on the environment, and an environmental impact statement must be prepared to further assess the impact(s) and possible mitigation and to explore alternatives to avoid or reduce those impacts. Accordingly, this positive declaration is issued.

Name of Action:

Name of Lead Agency:

Name of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Title of Responsible Officer:

Signature of Responsible Officer in Lead Agency:

Date:

Signature of Preparer (if different from Responsible Officer)

Date:

**For Further Information:**

Contact Person:

Address:

Telephone Number:

E-mail:

**For Type 1 Actions and Conditioned Negative Declarations, a copy of this Notice is sent to:**

Chief Executive Officer of the political subdivision in which the action will be principally located (e.g., Town / City / Village of)

Other involved agencies (if any)

Applicant (if any)

Environmental Notice Bulletin: <http://www.dec.ny.gov/enb/enb.html>

The purpose of the proposed local laws is reduction in annoyance and disturbance from aircraft noise. By its extensive complaints<sup>1</sup> to the Town Board and to other governmental entities, the public has made clear, and this Town Board has recognized through extensive analysis of the citizenry's complaints and of the air traffic itself by the Town's aviation consultants and noise engineers, that aircraft noise has substantially diminished the quiet enjoyment of homes and properties and compromised the pleasures of the woodlands, beaches, fields, and preserved lands that define our community and sense of place.

There are several factors that exacerbate the perception of noise in East Hampton. One is the dramatic increase in air traffic at East Hampton Airport during the summer months. Much of this seasonal demand is met through chartered helicopters originating in Manhattan. Helicopters frequently overfly surrounding areas at relatively low cruising altitudes causing a noise event distant from the airport. During the summer, the resident population triples due to summer vacationers who may have heightened expectations for quiet. Due to the absence of industrial noise sources, relatively low population densities, and a rural roadway network, areas in East Hampton and in the neighboring community of Southampton are atypically quiet which accentuates the perception of noise both in terms of peak levels and the duration of the events themselves.<sup>2</sup> The contrast in background noise levels between East Hampton Town and the urban areas of New York City is clearly depicted on the recently published maps of existing and natural sound conditions prepared by the National Park Service.<sup>3</sup> A comparison of the two maps also illustrates that the sound levels in East Hampton are much closer to how the area would sound naturally without human influence than the New York City area.

East Hampton Town is an established resort community whose entire economy is intrinsically tied to the use and enjoyment of its natural and scenic environment, including its world renowned ocean beaches, wetlands, shorelines, harbors, bays, woodlands, and historic hamlets. The Town and its residents have invested heavily in preserving the rural, quiet pace of life by preserving land and adopting land use policies that are designed to protect the unique quality of life in East Hampton. During the busy season of May through September, residents and visitors spend a significant portion of time outdoors engaged in recreational activities, gardening, entertaining, dining with family and friends, and otherwise enjoying the peaceful, restful atmosphere of the area. Visitors and residents alike enjoy East Hampton's unique scenic beauty and the Town has made significant efforts to preserve the natural environs of the Town, spending a total of \$229,431,502 of Community Preservation Funds to preserve approximately 1,924 acres since 1998. Approximately 41% of the Town's total land acreage is protected open space. Annoyance and disturbance from aircraft noise threatens the economic vitality of the Town and its "brand" as a place where people can escape the noise and stresses of urban life in

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.ehamptonny.gov/DocumentsPDF/Airport/AirportNoiseInterim/Phase2NoiseAnalysis12214.pdf>

The 24,000 complaints came from 633 households. One household filed approximately 2800 complaints and another household filed approximately 1800. The details are set out in the December 2, 2014 report. Many additional complaints from additional households have been made to the Town Board at hearings and public meetings.

<sup>2</sup> East Hampton Airport Final GEIS, August 2010

<http://www.htoplanning.com/docs/Town%20Documents/100801%20Airport%20Master%20Plan%20GEIS%20Aug%202010.PDF>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/soundmap.cfm>

favor of tranquility and rural quiet. This disturbance could result in lower rates of visitation, reduction in property values, and, more generally, a loss in the attractiveness of the Town. In addition to formal noise complaints, residents and visitors have expressed their anger and frustration about aircraft noise at numerous public meetings, Town Board meetings, in letters to local papers, and in communications with Town officials.

The FAA's traditional Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise metric has proved, after considerable study, not to be a useful tool for measuring the impact of noise from operations at East Hampton Airport because it is a calculated 24-hour sound level expressed as an average noise level on the basis of annual aircraft operations for a calendar year. It does not capture the demonstrated community annoyance and disruption from individual aircraft noise events. Therefore, beginning in 2014, the Town commissioned a series of comprehensive analyses of the noise and related complaints, including the following:

- Henry Young of Young Environmental Sciences and Les Blomberg of Noise Pollution Clearinghouse: (1) analyzed 2013 operational data collected by the AirScene system, (2) converted that data for use in the Integrated Noise Model (INM), (3) used the INM to develop Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) noise contours for 2013 operations (for total annual operations, annual helicopter operations, busiest day total operations, and busiest day helicopter operations), (4) used the INM to calculate the maximum sound level (Lmax) for each modeled flight in 2013 at each property parcel in a 10-mile radius from the airport, (5) applied the Town Code noise standards to determine the number of "exceedances" (i.e., the number of times each parcel experienced a noise impact above the Town's limits) by aircraft type and type of operation; and
- Peter Wadsworth analyzed January 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014 complaint data collected by the PlaneNoise system; and
- Ted Baldwin of Harris Miller Miller & Hanson Inc. (HMMH) led HMMH analyses of November 1, 2013 – October 31, 2014 data, including: (1) analysis of PlaneNoise complaint data to identify temporal and geographic complaint patterns for different aircraft types (e.g., jet, turboprop, piston prop, seaplane, and helicopter), (2) analysis of Vector operations data to identify patterns of activity by day of year, day of week, hour of day (for each day of the week and for the average annual day), and season; (3) correlated PlaneNoise complaint data and Vector operations data to identify patterns; (4) used the independent and correlated data analyses to develop a refined problem definition and alternatives for addressing that definition; (5) analyzed the effect that each of those alternatives would have had on the historical operations and associated noise complaints; and (6) identified and reviewed technical studies in the literature that have attempted to identify the most effective noise metric for understanding response to helicopter noise, whether the metric should include a special "adjustment" for helicopters, and otherwise provide useful information on the best means of assessing helicopter noise and predicting human response.
- The Town also commissioned several advisory groups to assist in identifying the noise problem with specificity and identifying meaningful, practical and carefully tailored measures that the Town could adopt to help reduce or eliminate the noise problem. These

advisory groups have held many public meetings, discussions and debates about how best to address the Town's noise problem. The Town Board also held meetings on October 30, 2014, December 2, 2014 and February 4, 2015 to review the findings of each phase of the noise analyses.<sup>4</sup>

The Town of East Hampton proposed and held a public hearing March 12, 2015 on four mandatory restrictions on aircraft operations at East Hampton Airport (HTO) to address the problems created by noisy aircraft. These included:

1. A mandatory year-round curfew on all aircraft operations between 11:00 PM and 7:00 AM replacing the existing voluntary curfew.
2. Extending this curfew to between 8:00 PM and 9:00 AM for aircraft defined by town ordinance as noisy.
3. Prohibiting all helicopter operations on weekends and holidays from May 1 through September 30, with weekend defined as Thursday noon to Monday noon and holidays including the day before and day after each holiday.
4. Prohibiting noisy aircraft from conducting more than one take-off and one landing in any calendar week from May 1 through September 30.

The March 12<sup>th</sup> hearing was attended by over 250 people, 72 of whom spoke at the hearing. Based on the public record and all evidence before it, the Town Board determined that it is in the best interest of the town to move forward only on proposed laws 1, 2 and 4 at this time. The proposed laws are functionally independent and the approval of laws 1, 2 & 4 does not commit the Town Board to any further action. However, any further restrictive legislation will be reviewed for cumulative impacts.

The proposed legislation expressly excludes from its application aircraft operated by any federal, state or local government purpose, any emergency services, public or private evacuation services, and any operation by an aircraft in an emergency. The airport will remain open to such operations at all times without restriction or charge.

The Town proposes to professionally study and evaluate the effectiveness of these local laws following the 2015 summer season. These studies will include analysis of the diversion of traffic to other airports, the effect on noise and complaints, the effect on aircraft operators and the financial impact of the restrictions. A public meeting will be convened after the 2015 season to present the results of these studies and to hear from the public.

### **Noise Abatement**

For over two decades, the Town has diligently identified and promoted voluntary measures, including maintaining helicopter altitude up to the airport boundary line and a nighttime curfew, in order to secure relief from the disturbance of aircraft noise. Town officials have met repeatedly with the New York Congressional delegation, to discuss this issue and finding a potential federal legislative solution to the problem of aircraft noise. Town officials have also met repeatedly with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) officials at the local, regional

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.htoplanning.com/>

and headquarters level and with the FAA's Air Traffic Organization, to discuss proposed measures and use restrictions, including the use of voluntary measures. The Town has worked with the New York Congressional delegation and all levels of the FAA in the implementation of a mandatory North Shore Helicopter Route, which was initially implemented in August 2012 and recently extended through August 2016.

The Town has repeatedly urged the FAA to adopt a mandatory helicopter route along the south shore of Long Island or to adopt mandatory transition routes for helicopters transitioning from the mandatory routes to the East Hampton Airport. The Town has spent the last several summer seasons studying various voluntary measures or measures in cooperation with the FAA to address the noise problem but the level of resident concern has actually increased over that time. Although the Town's past several years of efforts to address the problem of aircraft noise through voluntary measures promoted by the Town combined with mandatory flight tracks for helicopters imposed by FAA have provided some limited relief in certain neighborhoods, those measures alone have not reduced to an acceptable level the overall intensity of disturbance to Town residents, visitors and natural resources from noise associated with aircraft flying to and from East Hampton Airport.

Town officials and staff have also met repeatedly with airport stakeholders, including Eastern Region Helicopter Council, Friends of the East Hampton Airport, the National Business Aviation Association, the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, the National Air Transportation Association, and other informal local groups of users and service providers to discuss their respective concerns; and the Town held a special public meeting on August 27, 2014, to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the problem of aircraft noise and to share views on potential solutions. The meeting was attended by almost 400 people, including 22 elected officials, all of whom expressed support for finding a solution to the noise problem. A public hearing was held March 12, 2015 on the proposed laws which was attended by over 250 people.

Goal Two of the Town Comprehensive Plan states that we should "Take forceful measures to protect and restore the environment..." and reduce the impacts of human-produced noise.

The Airport Master Plan adopted in 2010 states: "Control of noise and adverse environmental impacts at the airport is consistent with current Town goals for improved quality of life and land and water conservation. These goals recognize that protecting the environment is essential for improving the Town's seasonal and year round economy. These controls are achieved through reasonable, non-arbitrary and non-discriminatory management practices. These may limit the maximum size of aircraft to be accommodated, regulate excessive peak demand during the summer season and otherwise adjust use patterns such as for helicopter access to minimize community disturbances."

Disturbance by all types of aircraft is most significant in the evening, nighttime, and early morning hours when people are sleeping or when there is a heightened expectation of quiet. The proposed legislation recognizes this and also recognizes that noisier aircraft need to be subject to greater restrictions because of their greater noise contribution to the community disturbance. By enacting this legislation, the Town Board seeks to achieve immediate, meaningful noise relief for residents and visitors during the times when quiet is most expected, provide an incentive for

airport users with noisy types of aircraft to transition to quieter types of aircraft, maintain the intended and traditional use of the East Hampton Airport as a general aviation aircraft for light aircraft, and continue sufficient air traffic to maintain a financially self-sustaining Airport.

### **Helicopters**

Of 24,000 airport noise complaints logged last year, the latest noise analysis discloses that they are overwhelmingly attributable to helicopters. Helicopter complaints at East Hampton Airport far exceed the level of complaints at major airports around the country<sup>5</sup>. Helicopters also have specific sound characteristics, beyond sheer decibel level, that exacerbate the annoyance they cause: (a) they have a unique percussive sound wave that is especially disturbing because it is felt and not just heard; (b) the duration of helicopter noise is longer than with other aircraft because of lower speed and relatively lower and more constant altitude on approach and departure; (c) their aural signature includes a higher proportion of low frequencies that, for reasons of physics, are heard at a much longer distance than other sounds and despite intervening obstacles, thereby aggravating the disturbance by causing significant periods during which those on the ground focus on and anticipate the loud noise to come and afterwards are reminded of the noise that has just affected them.; (d) approaching sounds that “ramp up” (termed “looming”) activate the “fear” region of the brain causing increases in anxiety.<sup>6</sup>

Helicopter noise adversely affects wildlife on land that has been preserved in part for the express purpose of protecting habitat.<sup>7</sup> The partial diversion of helicopters from residential areas has resulted in much of the helicopter noise being directed over preserved natural habitat that represents one of the core values of our environmentally sensitive community and geography. Two species of special concern, the least tern (*Sterna antillarum*) and the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), exist in shoreline areas of East Hampton and around the South Fork peninsula. Helicopters approaching or departing East Hampton Airport overfly the beach nesting habitat of both species.

### **Diversion**

The proposed legislation is expected to reduce the annoyance and disturbance from aircraft operating at the East Hampton Airport. Aircraft may also divert to other nearby airports (Montauk, Gabreski or Southampton Heliport) during the times when landing at East Hampton is restricted. However, aircraft operators and their passengers have a variety of potential responses to the proposed restrictions. They can change the timing of flights to comply with the restrictions, use another airport instead of East Hampton Airport, utilize quieter aircraft or use highway or rail instead of flying.

Changing flight timing appears to be a likely response for most flights affected by proposed

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.massport.com/environment/environmental-reporting/noise-abatement/complaints-by-towns/>

[http://www.oharenoise.org/PDFs/ANMS\\_Reports/2014/ORD\\_ANMS\\_Report\\_December\\_2014.pdf](http://www.oharenoise.org/PDFs/ANMS_Reports/2014/ORD_ANMS_Report_December_2014.pdf)

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/local/breaking/chi-noise-complaints-about-ohare-skyrocket-20140905-story.html>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.htoplanning.com/>

<sup>7</sup> F. Turina and Barber, J.; Impacts of Noise on Wildlife Annotated Bibliography; National Park Service [http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/Wildlife\\_AnnotatedBiblio\\_Aug2011.pdf](http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/Wildlife_AnnotatedBiblio_Aug2011.pdf)

law #1 and a number of the additional flights affected by proposed law #2. Aircraft operators can also switch to quieter helicopter or fixed wing aircraft to comply with law #2. Many types of fixed wing aircraft and seven types of helicopters that operated at East Hampton Airport from November 2013 to October 2014 meet the town noise limits. Restriction 4, limiting noisy aircraft to two operations per week at East Hampton Airport, would cause from 1,269 to 1,608 landings per year to shift to alternative airports. Estimates of the number of aircraft operations that could be affected by the proposed restrictions and possible responses are discussed in detail in the Town's Airport Study of Traffic Diversion prepared by Peter Stumpp<sup>8</sup>.

The local airports vary in size, ground facilities and amenities and the ability to accommodate all types of aircraft. The following is a comparison of East Hampton Airport, Gabreski Airport, Montauk Airport and the Southampton Heliport.

#### East Hampton Airport

- 610 acres in size
- 2 active runways
- on-site fuel
- Seasonal Control tower operational and staffed 8am-8pm/7 days May 22<sup>rd</sup>–September 13th
- 2 Fixed base operators
- Full fire and rescue
- Utilized by private aviation, corporate businesses and air taxi services
- 2 passenger terminals
- 2 rental car companies
- Inland location (approximately 2 miles from ocean)

#### Gabreski Airport

- 1,451 acres in size
- 3 active runways, including one 9,000 feet long – among Long Island's longest after JFK International
- on-site fuel
- Control tower operational and staffed and staffed 24 hours/7 days
- Fixed base operator
- Full fire and rescue
- Utilized by private aviation, corporate businesses and air taxi services
- Passenger terminal
- Multiple rental car companies
- Restaurant
- Inland location (approximately 2.5 miles from ocean) and full FAA certified weather system
- 24 hour security provided by Suffolk County Sheriff's Office.
- Suffolk County Police Department and the Air National Guard present on-site

#### Montauk Airport

---

<sup>8</sup> Peter Stumpp memorandum dated April 10, 2015

- 37 acres with one active runway and a crosswind runway used for storage
- No fuel
- No passenger terminal
- Open 24 hours but only staffed during daylight hours by one person (possibly 2 during peak season)
- No communication regarding airport conditions when staff is not present
- Weather conditions subject to quick changes, wind and fog
- Located approximately 275 ft from Block Island Sound
- Landing can be affected by winds conditions altered by an approximately 30 ft high dune

#### Southampton Heliport

- Helipad only
- Landing restrictions:
  - May 1 - September 15: 8am – 7 pm
  - Sep 15 – Oct 31: 8am – 6pm
  - Nov 1 – Dec 31: 7am – 4pm
  - Jan 1 – end of Feb: 7am – 5pm
  - Mar 1 – Apr 30: 7am – 6pm
- Helicopters with gross weight greater than 15,000 lbs are prohibited
- Landing approaches and departures must be over Shinnecock Bay
- No parking, services or on-site fuel
- No passenger terminal
- Helicopters shall not sit on the helipad while awaiting the arrival of passengers
- Located between bay and ocean, approximately 350 feet from the bay and approximately 1300 feet from the ocean
- Subject to foggy weather conditions




Google Maps lists the distance from the East Hampton Airport to the Montauk Airport as 22.6 miles while the distance from the East Hampton Airport to the Southampton Heliport is listed as 15.8 miles. It is reasonable to assume that some of the aircraft carrying passengers whose final destination is located between the East Hampton Airport and the Montauk Airport may choose to land in Montauk. However, those people with a destination that is west of the East Hampton Airport will need to add another 22.6 miles to their travel distance if they land at Montauk whereas a Southampton landing would only be located approximately 16 miles away at most, if their final destination is at the most eastern location between Southampton and East Hampton. This distance would be smaller the closer their destination is to the Southampton Heliport.

Gabreski Airport is located approximately 32 miles from the East Hampton Airport but only approximately 17 miles from Southampton Village, making a Southampton Village destination approximately an equal choice between East Hampton and Gabreski in terms of distance. Gabreski is much closer to Southampton Village than the Montauk Airport, located approximately 40 miles to the east. At approximately 22 miles from Bridgehampton, Gabreski is also closer to that destination than the approximately 28 miles required by a Montauk landing.



	Gabreski Airport	Montauk Airport	Southampton Heliport
<b>Driving Distance in Miles</b>			
Amagansett	31.5	16.0	20.9
Bridgehampton	22.2	25.1	12.3
East Hampton Village	28.9	18.4	18.3
Sagaponack	23.6	25.0	12.9
Shelter Island	30.6	31.5	22.8
Southampton Village	17.7	31.3	5.5
Water Mill	19.5	28.0	8.8

<b>Closest</b>	
<b>Middle</b>	
<b>Furthest</b>	

Gabreski offers fuel and instrument landings, is open 24 hours, seven days a week and can accommodate all of the sizes and types of aircraft that currently land in East Hampton. Montauk Airport is only manned during daylight hours, can only accommodate small aircraft, has no fuel and landings must be visual. Landings at Montauk are more often limited by ocean caused weather conditions due the airport’s location at the end of the South Fork approximately 275 feet from Block Island Sound. Since Montauk airport is only staffed during daylight hours, pilots flying to Montauk at other times have no communication from the ground regarding weather and must risk flying to an airport where conditions may preclude landing. It appears that these factors may already be limiting the number of aircraft using the Montauk airport since the fees for using that airport (\$17- \$50) are significantly cheaper than East Hampton’s fees (\$11 - \$660 with a 25% night landing fee). Furthermore, the paved areas that can accommodate aircraft and parked cars are very limited at Montauk.

A large number of factors will determine which alternative airport each flight will choose, including distance and driving time to the ultimate destination and availability of services. Of the three airports only Gabreski offers complete services including aircraft refueling.

Autos traveling to and from Montauk Airport on weekends have the advantage of traveling against the heaviest traffic arriving and leaving, but must funnel through the congested Montauk hamlet center to reach destinations to the west. Furthermore, summer traffic is not limited to people arriving and leaving. The increased summer population creates highway traffic in all directions at various times due to people driving from one place to another during their stay in East Hampton. All of the hamlet centers on Montauk Highway are congested during all hours of the summer and travel can be slow in both westerly and easterly directions at the same time.

Given the pros and cons of each potential diversion airport, it appears likely that all three will attract some of the diverted traffic, with no single airport receiving the majority share. All of the potential airports appear to have the capacity to handle diverted air traffic. FAA records indicate that during the early 1990s Gabreski had over 100,000 annual operations and Montauk Airport over 40,000, well over current traffic levels.<sup>9</sup> The FAA does not keep comparable records for Southampton Heliport, but given typical drop-off or pick-up and go helicopter operations, its airfield capacity does not appear to be an issue.

Two of the potential diversion airports – Montauk Airport and Southampton Heliport – are reached by narrow, two-lane roads, raising the issue that flights diverted from East Hampton Airport could possibly lead to highway congestion near these airports. This appears unlikely because of the limited number of flights diverted. Most flight diversions as a result of the curfew restrictions will occur at night when highway traffic tends to be light. The limits on noisy aircraft during the summer proposed by law 4 are expected to increase the number of diverted helicopter flights by 976 to 1,300 arrivals and diverted fixed wing flights by 113 to 128 arrivals for the season. With the summer season having 153 days, limiting noisy aircraft at East Hampton Airport to one flight (one landing and one take-off) per week would lead to an average of 6.4 to 8.5 helicopter arrivals diverted per day, and less than one fixed wing arrival per day.<sup>10</sup>

The peak day for helicopter activity at East Hampton Airport had a total of 65 arrivals, or 1.9% of total May to September helicopter arrivals. If the peak day for helicopter diversions follows the same pattern as arrivals at East Hampton Airport, between 18.5 and 24.7 helicopter flights could be diverted from East Hampton Airport. The first helicopter on the peak day at East Hampton Airport arrived at 7:41 AM and the last arrived at 9:11 PM, so diversions would most likely be spread over a similar period. Peak day helicopter arrivals averaged 4.3 per hour with a maximum of 10 per hour. Helicopters are expensive to own and use. Therefore, they are generally used by wealthy individuals or entities, whose homes are spread generally across the East End, from Southampton to Montauk. In light of that diversity of destination, the various pros and cons of the three potential diversion airports and with diverted flights spread over a period of time, it appears unlikely that proposed law 4 would add more than a handful of vehicles per hour to the current traffic on the Montauk Airport and Southampton Heliport access roads. The additional trips would not be sufficient to create a significant impact on traffic at or near any of the alternative airports. There is no potential for significant impacts elsewhere in light of the small number of trips and the fact that these automobile trips would not be additive to total traffic flow since they would replicate and replace the automobile trips diverted from East Hampton airport.

Given the congestion and delays on Long Island highways particularly on summer weekends, it seems unlikely that many travelers who currently choose air travel would switch to limousine or jitney service if proposed restrictions prohibit their flights to and from East Hampton Airport. Similarly, it may be difficult to convince travelers to switch from air to rail unless the Long

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://aspm.faa.gov/>, FAA Terminal Area Forecasts,

<sup>10</sup> Peter Stumpp memorandum dated April 10, 2015

Island Railroad introduces new service that offers higher levels of comfort and luxury to offset the longer travel time.

Given the attractiveness of the South Fork as a vacation destination, its proximity to New York City, and the number of options for traveling to the region, it appears unlikely that the proposed restrictions would substantially reduce the demand for travel to the region, particularly during the summer season. The growth of ride-sharing services like Uber has made it much simpler to travel within the South Fork region, making it easy to fly to alternative locations and obtain transport to one's final destination with very little advanced planning.

The potential for significant noise impacts at the alternative airports is less than that at East Hampton Airport. The approaches to Montauk and Southampton are principally over water, not residential neighborhoods and Gabreski Airport encompasses 1,451 acres of airport land. None of the three alternatives have experienced the level of noise complaints that East Hampton has.<sup>11</sup>

### **Effects on Wildlife and Natural Environment**

As noted above, aesthetic resources and the quality of the town's natural environment are a vital part of East Hampton's economy that is recognized in various town documents including the Town Comprehensive Plan and the Airport Master Plan.

We note that the proposed action is for legislation only and does not include any physical changes to the land that would impact groundwater, rare and endangered species or archaeological resources. However, the impacts of noisy aircraft have been demonstrated to adversely affect wildlife as well as the enjoyment of the town's aesthetic and natural resources by residents and visitors.<sup>12</sup> Aircraft travelling from New York City to the East Hampton Airport cross over protected open space areas including beaches, tidal wetlands, freshwater wetlands and forests as well as developed residential areas.

The proposed legislation is expected to reduce adverse impacts to wildlife in these areas as well as to the town residents and visitors that enjoy the quiet solitude of the natural landscape<sup>13</sup> by reducing the amount of overland travel by noisy aircraft in route to the East Hampton Airport during the hours of the proposed curfews. Although the legislation will reduce the volume of air traffic travelling to the East Hampton Airport, it is expected that some of the aircraft will shift their travel to other nearby airports such as Montauk, Gabreski or Southampton (Meadow Lane) Heliport. Some of the routes to these airports cross undeveloped natural landscapes.

---

<sup>11</sup> As per communication with airport managers.

<sup>12</sup> F. Turina and Barber, J.; *Impacts of Noise on Wildlife Annotated Bibliography*; National Park Service [http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/Wildlife\\_AnnotatedBiblio\\_Aug2011.pdf](http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/Wildlife_AnnotatedBiblio_Aug2011.pdf)  
National Park Service Natural Sounds and Night Skies Division <http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/night/index.cfm>  
National Sounds and Night Skies Division Handbook Team, *The Power of Sound*,  
<http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/InterpHandbook.pdf>  
E. Pilcher and F Turina, *Visitor Experience and Soundscapes: Annotated Bibliography*,  
[http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/VisitorExperience\\_Soundscapes\\_AnnotatedBiblio\\_17Aug10.pdf](http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/assets/docs/VisitorExperience_Soundscapes_AnnotatedBiblio_17Aug10.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.nature.nps.gov/sound/soundmap.cfm>

However, it is expected that the air traffic diverted from East Hampton will be distributed between the alternative locations and not concentrated at one other airport. Furthermore, two of the alternative locations, Montauk and Southampton, require a negligible amount of overland travel.

### **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the Town Board has extensively researched and considered the causes and effects of disturbance from aircraft noise. Potential solutions have been thoroughly examined, discussed and revised in accordance with that information and with input from numerous public meetings and written communications. The proposed laws are the result of those efforts. The laws are expected to reduce the disturbance to residents, visitors and wildlife caused by noisy aircraft and to help restore our acoustical environment in accordance with the goals of our Comprehensive Plan.