



**FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION**

**EASTERN REGION**  
AIRPORTS DIVISION

**Short Environmental  
Assessment Form  
for  
AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT  
PROJECTS**



**Airport Name: Randall Airport**

**Identifier: 06N**

**Project Title: Off-Airport Obstruction Removal (Runway 26)**

This Environmental Assessment becomes a Federal document when evaluated, signed, and dated by the Responsible FAA official.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Responsible FAA Official

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## INSTRUCTIONS

**THIS FORM IS FOR LIMITED USE ON SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROJECTS. AIRPORT SPONSORS MUST CONTACT YOUR LOCAL AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE (ADO) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST (EPS) BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM.**

**This form was prepared by FAA Eastern Region Airports Division and can only be used for proposed projects in this region.**

**Introduction:** This Short Environmental Assessment (EA), is based upon the guidance in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Orders 1050.1F – *Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures*, and the *Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions* and 5050.4B – *NEPA Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions*. These orders incorporate the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as US Department of Transportation environmental regulations, and other applicable federal statutes and regulations designed to protect the Nation's natural, historic, cultural, and archeological resources. The information provided by sponsors, with potential assistance from consultants, through the use of this form enables the FAA ADO offices to evaluate compliance with NEPA and the applicable special purpose laws.

**Use:** For situations in which this form may be considered, refer to the APPLICABILITY Section below. The local ADO has the final determination in the applicability of this form to a proposed Federal Action. Proper completion of the Form will allow the FAA to determine whether the proposed airport development project can be processed with a short EA, or whether a more detailed EA or EIS must be prepared. **If you have any questions on whether use of this form is appropriate for your project, or what information to provide, we recommend that you contact the environmental specialist in your local ADO.**

This Form is to be used in conjunction with applicable Orders, laws, and guidance documents, and in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies. Sponsors and their consultants should review the requirements of special purpose laws (See 5050.4B, Table 1-1 for a summary of applicable laws). Sufficient documentation is necessary to enable the FAA to assure compliance with all applicable environmental requirements. Accordingly, any required consultations, findings or determinations by federal and state agencies, or tribal governments, are to be coordinated, and completed if necessary, prior to submitting this form to FAA for review. Coordination with Tribal governments must be conducted through the FAA. We encourage sponsors to begin coordination with these entities as early as possible to provide for sufficient review time. Complete information will help FAA expedite its review. This Form meets the intent of a short EA while satisfying the regulatory requirements of NEPA for an EA. Use of this form acknowledges that all procedural requirements of NEPA or relevant special purpose laws still apply and that this form does not provide a means for circumvention of these requirements.

**Submittal: When using this form for an airport project requesting *discretionary funding*, the documentation must be submitted to the local ADO by April 30<sup>th</sup> of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which funding will be requested. When using this form for an airport project**

requesting *entitlement funding*, the documentation must be submitted to the local ADO by November 30<sup>th</sup> of the fiscal year in which the funding will be requested.

**Availability:** An electronic version of this Short Form EA is available on-line at <http://www.faa.gov/airports/eastern/environmental/media/short-form-ea-final.docx>. Other sources of environmental information including guidance and regulatory documents are available on-line at [http://www.faa.gov/airports\\_airtraffic/airports/environmental](http://www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic/airports/environmental).

## APPLICABILITY

**Local ADO EPSs make the final determinations for the applicability of this form. If you have questions as to whether the use of this form is appropriate for your project, contact your local EPS BEFORE using this form.** Airport sponsors can consider the use of this form if the proposed project meets either Criteria 1 or Criteria 2, 3, and 4 collectively as follows:

- 1) It is normally categorically excluded (see paragraphs 5-6.1 through 5-6.6 in FAA Order 1050.1F) but, in this instance, involves at least one, but no more than two, extraordinary circumstance(s) that may significantly impact the human environment (see paragraph 5-2 in 1050.1F and the applicable resource chapter in the 1050.1F Desk reference).
- 2) The action is one that is not specifically listed as categorically excluded or normally requires an EA at a minimum (see paragraph 506 in FAA Order 5050.4B).
- 3) The proposed project and all connected actions must be comprised of Federal Airports Program actions, including:
  - (a) Approval of a project on an Airport Layout Plan (ALP),
  - (b) Approval of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for airport development,
  - (c) Requests for conveyance of government land,
  - (d) Approval of release of airport land, or
  - (e) Approval of the use of Passenger Facility Charges (PFC).
- 4) The proposed project is not expected to have impacts to more than two of the resource categories defined in the 1050.1F Desk Reference.

**This form cannot be used when any of the following circumstances apply:**

- 1) The proposed action, including all connected actions, requires coordination with or approval by an FAA Line of Business or Staff Office other than the Airports Division. Examples include, but are not limited to, changes to runway thresholds, changes to flight procedures, changes to NAVAIDs, review by Regional Counsel, etc.
- 2) The proposed action, including all connected actions, requires coordination with another Federal

Agency outside of the FAA. The proposed action will likely result in the need to issue a Record of Decision.

- 3) The proposed action requires a construction period exceeding 3 years.
- 4) The proposed action involves substantial public controversy on environmental grounds.
- 5) The proposed project would have impacts to, or require mitigation to offset the impacts to more than two resources<sup>1</sup> as defined in the 1050.1F Desk Reference.
- 6) The proposed project would involve any of the following analyses or documentation:
  - a. The development of a Section 4(f) Report for coordination with the Department of the Interior,
  - b. The use of any Native American lands or areas of religious or cultural significance,
  - c. The project emissions exceed any applicable *de minimis* thresholds for criteria pollutants under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or
  - d. The project would require noise modeling with AEDT 2b (or current version).

If a project is initiated using this form and any of the preceding circumstances are found to apply, the development of this form must be terminated and a standard Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement (if applicable) must be prepared.

---

<sup>1</sup> A resource is any one of the following: Air Quality; Biological Resources (including Threatened and Endangered Species); Climate; Coastal Resources; Section 4(f); Farmlands; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomics; Environmental Justice; Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Visual Effects; Wetlands; Floodplains; Surface Waters; Groundwater; Wild and Scenic Rivers; and Cumulative Impacts.

**Complete the following information:**

**Project Location**

Airport Name: Randall Airport Identifier: 06N  
Airport Address: 100 Airport Road  
City: Middletown State: NY Zip: 10940  
County: Orange

**Airport Sponsor Information**

Point of Contact: Charles Brodie  
Address: 100 Airport Road State: NY Zip: 10940  
City: Middletown  
Telephone: 845.343.5965 Fax: N/A  
Email: [aerodrome@frontiernet.net](mailto:aerodrome@frontiernet.net)

**Evaluation Form Preparer Information**

Point of Contact: Shavawn M. Lockhart, P.E.  
Company (if not the sponsor): TriState Planning Engineering & Land Surveying, P.C.  
Address: 740 Veterans Memorial Highway, Suite 303  
City: Hauppauge State: NY Zip: 11788  
Telephone: 516.282.3572 Fax: N/A  
Email: [slockhart@tspe.com](mailto:slockhart@tspe.com)

**This form was prepared in association with:**

Point of Contact: Kim Gennaro-Oancea, AICP CEP  
Company: P.W. Grosser Consulting, Inc.  
Address: 630 Johnson Avenue, Suite 7  
City: Bohemia State: NY Zip: 11716  
Telephone: 631.589.6353 Fax: N/A  
Email: [kgennaro@pwgrosser.com](mailto:kgennaro@pwgrosser.com)

---

---

## 1. Introduction/Background:

The Randall Airport is a designated Reliever airport located at 100 Airport Road in the Town of Wallkill, County of Orange, NY. The Airport is currently owned by Mr. Charles Brodie and managed through his organization, the Airport Development Corporation (ADC). As of 2017, there are 15 single engine, 19 gliders and 4 ultra-light aircraft (total 38) based at Randall Airport.

The airfield at Randall Airport is comprised of a single paved runway, Runway 8-26, which is 2,810 feet long x 60 feet wide with a full length 25-foot-wide parallel taxiway. The runway was constructed in 1997 and the parallel taxiway was constructed in 1999. A 6,600-square yard apron north of the parallel taxiway provides 14 tie downs with an additional six paved tie-downs located midfield to the south of the runway.

As part of the Master Plan Update (MPU) / Airport Layout Plan (ALP) Update dated October 2017 and performed under AIP grant 3-36-0224-28-12 (see Attachment G), an obstruction study was performed. The purpose of the obstruction study was to determine whether penetrations to the threshold siting / departure surfaces existed. The Threshold Siting Surface, as defined by AC 150/5300-13A is a Runway Type 4. This runway expects to support instrument night operations, serving approach Category A and B aircraft only. The surface begins 200 from the runway end with a width of 400 feet, extending 10,000 feet to a width of 3,800 feet at a slope of 20:1. The Approach Surface as defined for a non-precision runway is 500 feet wide beginning at the end of the primary surface extending to a width of 2,000 feet, 5,000 feet from the beginning point. The approach slope is 20:1. The Transitional Surface extends outward and upward, starting from the runway threshold from the edge of the Approach Surface at a slope of 7:1.

The obstructions to these surfaces were identified through aerial photography and were mapped (see Inner Approach Runway Surface [Paved] in Attachment A) as well as categorized by type and location (see Obstruction Data Tables, Runway 26, [Drawing 10 of 14] included in Attachment A). In total, 156 objects were identified as obstructions to one or more of the surfaces: nine (9) of which were ground penetrations and the remaining 147 were trees or other forms of vegetation. Regarding the ground penetrations, these are not vegetation, NAVAIDS, or other man-made objects, but rather ground area that is located on the northwest end of Runway 26, immediately outside the Primary Surface, and within an area of approximately 160 feet in length and 80± feet in width. The area has been re-graded several times under other improvement projects, but the presence of an underground stream and its topography continues to result in the ponding of water, and in an area that cannot be regularly mowed and maintained. However, this area is located 300 west of the runway centerline and is 300 feet from the runway end, and thus, outside the regulated surfaces of the Runway Safety Area, the Runway Object Free Area and the Runway Protection Zone. The ground penetrations do not present a safety concern to the approach as an aircraft that inadvertently finds itself in this area has already breached approach procedures. Regarding the vegetative obstructions, so as not to count the obstructions more than once, an object is counted as an obstruction to a surface in the following order of demand: Threshold Siting Surface, the Approach Surface and the Transitional Surface. The 147 vegetative obstructions penetrated the following surfaces as such:

Threshold Siting Surface:	95 Penetrations
Approach Surface:	43 Penetrations
Transitional Surface:	9 Penetrations

As the maintenance of approaches clear of obstructions is a priority of the airport sponsor to enhance aircraft and airport safety as well as requirement of the FAA, as reiterated in the Memorandum entitled “Reminder of Responsibilities for FAA Personnel and Airport Sponsors for Protecting Approach and Departure Surfaces” dated August 18, 2015 (hereinafter, the “2015 FAA Memorandum”), the proposed project includes removal of the 147 vegetative obstructions.

Excerpts from the 2015 FAA Memorandum are included below provided solely for the benefit of understanding the purpose and intent of the proposed project:

***Roles and Responsibilities of the Airport Sponsor***

*The Airport Sponsor is responsible to maintain clear airport approach and/or departure surfaces. This responsibility is derived from the following FAA Grant Assurances:*

- *Grant Assurance 19 (Operations and Maintenance) states that the airport shall be operated in a safe and serviceable condition and in accordance with appropriate minimum standards required by applicable agencies.*
- *Grant Assurance 20 (Hazard Removal) states that an airport sponsor must also take appropriate action to ensure that terminal airspace will be adequately cleared and protected by removing, lowering, lighting or otherwise mitigating existing airport hazards and by preventing the establishment of future hazards.*
- *Grant Assurance 21 (Compatible Land Use) says that an airport sponsor must take appropriate action, to the extent practicable, including the adoption of zoning laws, to restrict the use of land adjacent to the airport to uses compatible with normal airport operations.*
- *Grant Assurance 29 (ALP) says the sponsor must keep the ALP up to date (obstacles are generally shown on the ALP plan and profile sheets).*

***20:1 Penetrations – On-Airport Property and Off-Airport Property Under Sponsor Control***

- *In the case of the 20:1 surface on airport property, or off airport property but which property remains under the land-use planning and/or zoning control of the airport sponsor, the sponsor is required to remove or mitigate penetrations to the 20:1 surface to be in compliance with Grant Assurance 20, Hazard Removal and Mitigation. The FAA will require the sponsor to remove, lower, light, or otherwise mitigate the penetration in accordance with the sponsor’s OAP.*

- *Grant Assurance 21, Compatible Land Use, obligates the airport sponsor to take appropriate actions to control existing and planned land uses in the vicinity of the airport to make them compatible with aircraft operations at the airport. Where the sponsor does have authority to zone or control land use adjacent to the airport, the FAA expects the sponsor to implement zoning ordinances or take other measures to restrict the use of land in the vicinity of the airport to activities and purposes compatible with normal aircraft operations, including appropriate action to avoid or mitigate penetrations to the approach/departure surfaces.*

### **20:1 Penetrations – Off-Airport Property Not Under Sponsor Control**

- *The FAA recognizes that not all airport sponsors have direct jurisdictional control over uses of property near the airport. However, for the purpose of evaluating airport sponsor compliance with Grant Assurance 21, the FAA does not consider a sponsor’s lack of direct authority as a reason for the sponsor to decline to take any action at all to achieve land use compatibility outside the airport boundaries.*
- *The FAA expects airport sponsors to ensure that neighboring municipalities and other entities that own or control land within the 20:1 surface fully understand the purpose of approach/departure obstacle clearance surfaces, including the risks associated with penetrations of those surfaces. Airport sponsors are expected to have a voice in the affairs of the community where a potential risk to the clearance surfaces is located or proposed. The sponsor should make an effort to ensure proper zoning or other land use controls are in place to protect airport approach/departure surfaces.*
- *The FAA recommends sponsor to seek out opportunities for land acquisition, land exchanges, right-of-first refusal to purchase, agreements with property owners regarding land uses, or other means of establishing land-use controls.*
- *In all cases, the FAA expects airport sponsors to actively seek feasible and prudent opportunities to eliminate, reduce or mitigate risks associated with penetrations to the 20:1 surface anytime there is an ALP update or master plan update.*

As discussed in Section 2 below and illustrated on Drawing 1A in Attachment A, the 147 vegetative obstructions to be removed as part of the proposed project have been delineated as Areas 1, 2 and 3 (collectively, the “project area”). Upon removal of the trees, the airport sponsor intends to replant the project area with native grasses. The proposed removal and replanting with native grasses will maintain the approaches for the future, while also maintaining these areas as vegetated land rather property devoid of vegetation.

This Short EAF will evaluate the environmental consequence, if any, of the proposed tree removal and replanting, and any alternatives that may exist to the proposed project.



**2. Project Description** (List and clearly describe ALL components of project proposal including all connected actions). **Attach a map or drawing of the area with the location(s) of the proposed action(s) identified:**

The proposed project includes the removal of approximately 147 trees in the approach to Runway 26 in order to maintain safe approaches. As explained in Section 1 (Introduction/Background), Randall Airport undertook a Master Plan Update / ALP Update, wherein the obstructions to the threshold siting / departure surfaces were identified and mapped. As shown on the Inner Approach Runway Surface (Paved) drawing in Attachment A, the Runway 26 threshold siting surface has numerous off-airport vegetative obstructions and it is the intent of the airport sponsor to remove such obstructions. The obstructions are listed on the drawing titled Obstruction Data Tables, Runway 26, [Drawing 10 of 14] included in Attachment A.

As illustrated on Drawing 1A in Attachment A, the vegetative obstructions are generally located in three separate areas encompassing 14± acres, as described below:

- Area 1 – Area 1 is an area located to the south of the Randall Airport and north of Interstate 84 (I-84), and it is comprised entirely of lands owned by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT) as part of the I-84 Right-of-Way (ROW). There are approximately 84 vegetative obstructions (trees) in this area.
- Area 2 – Area 2 is an area located within the median of I-84, which separates the eastbound and westbound traffic, and is owned by the NYSDOT as part of the I-84 ROW. There are approximately 39 vegetative obstructions (trees) in this area.
- Area 3 – Area 3 is an area located on the south side of I-84 and is comprised of lands owned by three (3) separate entities, including NYSDOT I-84 ROW property (Area 3a), and two private landowner parcels including property owned by Joseph Distelburger (Area 3b) (Tax Map No. 73-1-32 – see Figure 1 in Attachment B) and the Fairways residential subdivision (on land under common ownership of the Homeowners Association (HOA) (Area 3c) (Tax Map No. 105-2-2.1). In total, there are approximately 24 vegetative obstructions (trees) in this area. The Area 3 subareas are depicted on the drawing entitled “Enlarged View of Area 3” in Attachment A and Figure 1 in Attachment B depicts the overall project area and parcels with tax map boundaries.

It is noted that the tree count on the respective areas (i.e., approximately 123 trees in Areas 1 and 2, and approximately 24 trees in Area 3) is based upon tax parcel boundary map overlain on aerial photographs, and therefore, ground surveying prior to construction would be required in order to definitively define the exact number of trees for removal.

As part of the proposed project, upon removal of the trees, the three identified areas would be replanted with native grasses in order to maintain the approaches for the future. The replanting with native grasses would also establish a natural groundcover to bind the soil and protect the affected lands from erosion, while also providing a grassland community similar to surrounding vegetation.

## Project Coordination

The proposed project involves three separate landowners, including the NYSDOT. Areas 1, 2 and 3a are located on NYSDOT property. As such, consultations were undertaken with the NYSDOT through written and electronic mail. In email correspondence dated April 23, 2020, the NYSDOT has advised that the agency has no objection to the vegetation removal subject to the filing of a Highway Work Permit and the time period when such removal would occur (see Attachment E). As further discussed in the Biological Resources section of this Short EAF (see Section 6.B) and evaluated by Ecological Solutions, LLC (see Attachment C), all tree removal activities would be undertaken during the time period between October 1 and March 31 to avoid tree clearing during roosting periods of potential species within the area.

Area 3b includes private property and the project contact has initiated communications with the landowner for authorization of the proposed tree removal (see Attachment F). To date, a response has not been received. Should the landowner not grant authorization to access and/or remove the select trees identified, the project sponsor has determined alternate methods for the obstructions. Specifically, and explained further in the Alternatives section of this Short EAF, there are seven (7) obstructions identified within the approximated tax line boundary for the private landowner. However, prior to construction, the property lines will be staked by a professional surveyor which may remove (or add additional) obstructions within the private property. Based on the information currently available, the seven (7) noted obstructions penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface (1ea), the Part 77 Approach Surface (5ea) and the Part 77 Transitional Surface (1ea). If the airport sponsor is unable to obtain permission to remove the Part 77 Obstructions, the Sponsor will file a 7460 with the FAA. The FAA will then either issue a Determination of No Hazard or establish requirements for marking the obstructions. The single obstruction that penetrates the Threshold Siting Surface (#569) would require an approximate 260-foot displacement to Runway 26 if no other agreement could be made with the landowner. The final determination may not be known until the precise location of this obstruction is determined relative to the actual property line verses the approximated tax boundary.

Area 3c includes land area owned by The Fairways at Wallkill subdivision. It is noted that the consultants to the project contact has coordinated with members of the HOA. Specifically, on February 21, 2020, the project consultants met with three members of the HOA, including the President, to visually inspect the trees proposed for removal. During this meeting, it was determined that the removal would not result in any impacts, visual or otherwise, to the residences in the community as a significant portion of the current vegetative buffer to I-84 will remain. As such, the HOA members in attendance did not object to the removal of the trees conditioned upon further coordination during the construction planning phase. See Attachment F for a summary memorandum of the on-site meeting.

### **3. Project Purpose and Need:**

The original runway to Randall Airport was designed and constructed in 1997. Since the construction of runway in 1997, vegetative obstructions (i.e., trees) have grown and now jeopardize the approach. The purpose of the proposed project is to remove vegetative obstructions in the approach to Runway 26, which are required to be removed pursuant to FAA Part 77 regulations, for the safety and unobstructed

navigation to Runway 26. As stated in the Introduction/Background, the need to maintain clear approach and/or departure surfaces is a high priority safety project for the airport sponsor and is also reiterated by the FAA in its August 2015 Memorandum.

The Airport is looking to keep maximum runway operation throughout this project. As such, this project simply clears the obstructions that have grown over time so that the runway can safely operate under the parameters it originally did when designed. Essentially, the proposed obstruction clearing is a maintenance project returning the Runway 26 approach to a “clear” condition as it was in 1997.

**4. Describe the affected environment (existing conditions) and land use in the vicinity of project:**

The Randall Airport property is located within the hamlet of Middletown, in the Town of Wallkill, Orange County. Within a one-quarter mile radius of the Randall Airport property boundary, the land uses are primarily residential and vacant land to the north; residential, with conservation lands to the west; agricultural land to the south; and residential and agricultural lands to the east (see the Land Use Map [Figure 2] in Attachment B).

The proposed project areas include NYSDOT ROWs associated with the I-84 corridor (transportation land use) and open areas associated with a residential subdivision and private landowner. However, the prominent land use is the NYSDOT ROW along I-84 in Middletown, New York. The existing conditions are best described in Attachment C, Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat Suitability Assessment Report.

**5. Alternatives to the Project: Describe any other reasonable actions that may feasibly substitute for the proposed project and include a description of the “No Action” alternative. If there are no feasible or reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, explain why (attach alternatives drawings as applicable):**

Alternatives:

Alternative 1: Trim or cut the trees to a specified height below the approach surface (recommended 10 feet). This alternative is not a long-term solution as the trees will continue to grow, thus requiring periodic monitoring and trimming in the future. There is also the likelihood that some trees may not survive the extent of trimming recommended.

Alternative 2: Remove all vegetation within the approach surface without any replanting. Although this alternative meets the purpose and need of the project, this alternative was not deemed feasible as it would alter lands that are not owned by the airport sponsor and the removal of trees without replanting of ground cover would result in an increased potential for erosion and sedimentation. Also, this alternative would result in visual conditions that would be less aesthetically appealing when compared to the replanting with native grasses.

Alternative 3: Allow the obstructions to remain in place, and displace the threshold, thus reducing the

usable runway length. However, the existing runway is already minimal at a total length of 2,810 feet. As such, this alternative does not meet the purpose and need to remove obstructions. Moreover, this alternative would impact airport operations by the current aircraft that utilize Randall Airport.

#### No Action Alternative:

The No-Action alternative includes allowing the obstructions to remain in place, without removal. The No-Action alternative does not meet the purpose and need to maintain safe approaches. If the existing trees are permitted to stay in place, the approach will not meet FAA safety requirements/standards.

#### Proposed Project (Preferred Alternative):

The proposed project is the preferred alternative as it would remove vegetative obstructions (primarily trees) in the approach to Runway 26 and replant these areas with native grasses. This will maintain the approaches for the future, while also maintaining these areas as vegetated land rather property devoid of vegetation. As indicated earlier (see Project Description), the vegetative obstructions are located within three specific areas - area north of I-84, area within the median of I-84, and area south of I-84. The current height of the vegetative obstructions creates a safety issue for users of the Airport and in conflict with the relevant FAA Grant Assurances and objectives, as described in Section 1 above.

In the area north of I-84 and in the median of I-84, these are exclusively NYSDOT-owned as ROW land. In the area to the south of I-84, there are three landowners affected by the proposed action: the NYSDOT, a private residential subdivision (Fairways at Wallkill) and a private landowner. It is important to note that each landowner has been contacted through written and verbal communications, and the airport owner has received authorization for tree removal from two of the three landowners (NYSDOT and Fairways at Wallkill). The airport owner is still awaiting a response from the third private landowner. However, it is possible that the private landowner may not allow access and the removal of the obstructions. Seven (7) obstructions were identified within the approximated tax line boundary for the private landowner. However, prior to construction, the property lines will be staked by a professional surveyor which may remove (or add additional) obstructions within the private property. Based on the information currently available, the seven (7) noted obstructions penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface (1ea), the Part 77 Approach Surface (5ea) and the Part 77 Transitional Surface (1ea).

Table 1 below summarizes the obstructions controlled by the private landowner, based on aerial photographs and tax parcel boundary maps. If the airport sponsor is unable to obtain permission to remove the Part 77 Obstructions, the Sponsor will file a 7460 with the FAA. The FAA will then either issue a Determination of No Hazard or establish requirements for marking the obstructions. The obstruction that penetrates the Threshold Siting Surface (#569) would require an approximately 260-foot displacement to Runway 26 if no other agreement could be made with the landowner. The final determination may not be known until the precise location of this obstruction is determined relative to the actual property line verses the approximated tax boundary through ground survey.

**Table 1 – Obstruction Data Table for Trees on Property Owned by Private Landowner**

**Obstruction Data Table - Runway 26 Paved**

Number	Description	Distance To Rwy 26 End	Offset from Extended RWY C/L		Obst. Height (ft)	Surface Elev.	Penetration (ft)	Surface Elev.	Penetration (ft)	Surface(s) Pentrated	Proposed Action
						TSS, Part 77	TSS, Part 77	PAPI OSC	PAPI OSC		
558	Tree	803.30	352.50	R	552.60	552.50	0.10	N/A	N/A	Part 77-T	Remove (Distelburger Property)
566	Tree	857.70	344.80	R	561.60	553.55	8.06	N/A	N/A	Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)
569	Tree	870.60	345.30	R	567.20	554.19	13.01	N/A	N/A	Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)
572	Tree	881.40	296.30	R	558.40	554.73	3.67	N/A	N/A	TSS, Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)
578	Tree	902.60	341.20	R	564.00	555.79	8.21	N/A	N/A	Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)
581	Tree	915.50	353.90	R	562.60	556.44	6.17	N/A	N/A	Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)
582	Tree	918.00	346.20	R	564.00	556.56	7.44	N/A	N/A	Part 77-A	Remove (Distelburger Property)

N/A: Object is outside the OSC; Part 77-A(Approach); Part 77-T(Transitional)

**6. Environmental Consequences – Special Impact Categories (refer to the Instructions page and corresponding sections in 1050.1F, the 1050.1F Desk Reference, and the Desk Reference for Airports Actions for more information and direction. Note that when the 1050.1F Desk Reference and Desk Reference for Airports Actions provide conflicting guidance, the 1050.1F Desk Reference takes precedence. The analysis under each section must comply with the requirements and significance thresholds as described in the Desk Reference).**

**(A) AIR QUALITY**

**(1)** Will the proposed project(s) cause or create a reasonably foreseeable emission increase? Prepare an air quality assessment and disclose the results. Discuss the applicable regulatory criterion and/or thresholds that will be applied to the results, the specific methodologies, data sources and assumptions used; including the supporting documentation and consultation with federal, state, tribal, or local air quality agencies.

The tree clearing activity, including truck transportation associated with material removal and machinery used on-site for the clearing, stumping and chipping, will create an increase in emissions; however, the increase is temporary as the construction duration is limited to approximately 30 days. It is also noted that tree clearing would be performed with the use of hand tools (e.g., chain saws) in select areas, and tree stumpers in other areas. As such, emissions are expected to be minimal (*de minimus*).

**(2)** Are there any project components containing unusual circumstances, such as emissions sources in close proximity to areas where the public has access or other considerations that may warrant further analysis? If no, proceed to (c); if yes, an analysis of ambient pollutant concentrations may be necessary. Contact your local ADO regarding how to proceed with the analysis.

No. The proposed tree clearing poses no unusual circumstances, as the areas to be cleared are close to the Randall Airport and the interstate highway system (I-84).

**(3)** Is the proposed project(s) located in a nonattainment or maintenance area for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established under the Clean Air Act?

The project is in Orange County. Orange County has been designated “maintenance” for PM<sub>2.5</sub> since April 18, 2014.

4) Are all components of the proposed project, including all connected actions, listed as exempt or presumed to conform (See FRN, vol.72 no. 145, pg. 41565)? If yes, cite exemption and go to (B) Biological Resources. If no, go to (e).

No. The project is not considered General Landscaping taking place on airport.

(5) Would the net emissions from the project result in exceedances of the applicable *de minimis* threshold (reference 1050.1F Desk Reference and the *Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook* for guidance) of the criteria pollutant for which the county is in non-attainment or maintenance? If no, go to (B) Biological Resources. If yes, stop development of this form and prepare a standard Environmental Assessment.

No. The emissions related to the proposed action are associated with the limited period of construction activity (i.e., approximately 30 days) associated with the proposed tree clearing and replanting activities. There are no post-development changes in air quality expected as a result of the proposed action as the purpose of the activity is to maintain safe approaches to Runway 26.

The *de minimus* threshold relates to the net change in emissions when comparing the proposed action emission levels versus the no-action emission levels. For projects that are projected to result in net emissions in exceedance of *de minimus* thresholds, a General Conformity analysis is required. Alternatively, for projects that are projected to result in net emissions less than the *de minimus* levels, the proposed action is considered to be too small to adversely affect air quality. Based on prior experience with similar projects, and the limited scope and timeframe under which activities will occur (i.e., approximately 30 days), the emissions resulting from the construction phase of this limited scope will meet the *de minimus* threshold and a General Conformity analysis is not required.

## **(B) BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

Describe the potential of the proposed project to directly or indirectly impact fish, wildlife, and plant communities and/or the displacement of wildlife. Be sure to identify any state or federal species of concern (Candidate, Threatened or Endangered).

(1) Are there any candidate, threatened, or endangered species listed in or near the project area?

As indicated in the report prepared by Ecological Solutions LLC (included in Attachment C), the project area contains potential habitat for the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), which is listed as endangered (Federal and State), and the Northern Long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), which is listed as threatened (Federal and State). The report also evaluated the dwarf wedge mussel (*Alasmidonta heterodon*), small whorled pogonia (*Isotria medeoloides*), and Bog Turtle (*Clemmys muhlenbergii*), which were also listed as potentially being located in the project area. Regarding the dwarf wedge mussel, this species relies on watercourses (i.e., rivers and streams) and no such habitat exists within or adjacent to the project area. The small whorled pogonia is a member of the orchid family and grows in older hardwood stands of beech, birch, maple, oak, and hickory that have an open understory. Sometimes it grows in stands of softwoods such as hemlock. It prefers acidic soils with a thick layer of dead leaves, often on slopes near

small streams. As the habitat in the project area is younger aged densely canopied forest, it has been determined that there is no potential habitat for this species in the project area. Regarding the Bog turtle, their habitat is recognized by suitable hydrology, suitable soils and suitable vegetation. As evaluated by Ecological Solutions, LLC, there is no habitat for the Bog turtle on or proximate to the project areas. As such, there would be no adverse effects to this species would occur as a result of the proposed tree clearing.

**(2) Will the action have any long-term or permanent loss of unlisted plants or wildlife species?**

No. As indicated in the report prepared by Ecological Solutions, LLC, there are no known occurrences of threatened or endangered plant species in the project area.

Regarding the potential impacts to wildlife species, as indicated in Item (1) above, there is potential habitat for the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared Bat. Specifically, the trees located between the existing fence along the Airport service road and I-84 (Area 1) as well as the trees located southeast of I-84 (Area 3) provide potential foraging and roosting habitat for this species. The trees located in the median of I-84 (Area 2) are smaller trees and do not contain the characteristics associated with suitable habitat for roosting or foraging. It is noted that the Indian bat typically hibernates in caves/mines (hibernacula) in the winter and roosts under bark or in tree crevices in the spring, summer, and fall. No hibernacula were found in the project area.

As a result of the proposed action, trees within Areas 1 and 3 would be removed; however, the project sponsor would avoid any and all direct impacts to Indiana bats by scheduling tree removal activities to occur during the time period from October 1 to March 31 (i.e., the hibernation period). Also, as recommended by the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), the project sponsor would install orange construction fencing between the areas to be cleared and the areas that would be left undisturbed. Further, for areas where only select tree removal is required, such trees would be tagged to avoid removal of trees that pose no current or potential future obstruction.

Regarding the Northern Long-eared bat, as indicated by Ecological Solutions, LLC, the species requires/occupies practically the same habitat niche as the Indiana bat, and maintains the same roosting/foraging, and hibernation periods. As such, the proposed mitigation to avoid tree clearing during roosting periods and flagged demarcation of tree removal areas would avoid any and all direct impact to the Northern Long-eared bat.

As part of this environmental review, Ecological Solutions, LLC filed the proposed action with the US FWS under the “Programmatic Biological Opinion on Final 4(d) Rule for the Northern Long-eared Bat and Activities Excepted from Take Prohibitions.” In correspondence dated December 20, 2019 (see Attachment C), it was indicated that the “*Action may affect the northern long-eared bat; however, any take that may occur as a result of the Action is not prohibited under the ESA Section 4(d) rule adopted for this species at 50 CFR §17.40(o). Unless the Service advises you within 30 days of the date of this letter that your IPaC-assisted determination was incorrect, this letter verifies that the PBO satisfies and concludes your responsibilities for this Action under ESA Section 7(a)(2) with respect to the northern long-eared bat.*”

It is further noted that there are large contiguous areas of woodland adjacent and/or proximate to the project areas that provide suitable habitat for both Bat species.

Overall, based on the above, the proposed action would not be expected to have any long-term or permanent loss of the species.

**(3) Will the action adversely impact any species of concern or their habitat?**

No. As indicated above, there is potential habitat for the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared bat. These species typically hibernate in caves/mines (hibernacula) in the winter and roosts under bark or in tree crevices in the spring, summer, and fall. No hibernacula were found in the area; however, Areas 1 and 3 contain potential habitat for roosting and foraging. Accordingly, so as to not disturb the potential habitat of these bat species, tree clearing would be restricted to occur only between October 1 and March 31. Also, the project sponsor would install orange construction fencing between the areas to be cleared and the areas that would be left undisturbed. It is also to be noted that the proposed replanting with native grasses would be expected to increase the habitat available for grassland birds. Accordingly, the proposed action would not be expected to adversely impact the two Bat species.

**(4) Will the action result in substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species habitats or populations?**

No. There are large contiguous areas of woodland adjacent and/or proximate to the project areas that provide suitable habitat for both Bat species. The proposed native grasses are also expected to provide beneficial habitat for grassland birds.

**(5) Will the action have adverse impacts on a species' reproduction rates or mortality rate or ability to sustain population levels?**

No. The proposed tree removal activity would occur during the hibernation period of the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared bat, and habitat for hibernation is not present within the project area. It is also noted that there are large contiguous areas of woodland adjacent and/or proximate to the project areas that provide suitable habitat for both Bat species.

**(6) Are there any habitats, classified as critical by the federal or state agency with jurisdiction, impacted by the proposed project?**

Within and around the project area, there is potential roosting and foraging habitat of Indiana Bats and Northern Long Eared Bats. However, no adverse impacts to such potential habitats would result from the proposed project. See response to Item (B) (1) above.

**(7) Would the proposed project affect species protected under the Migratory Bird Act? (If Yes, contact the local ADO).**



As explained in the report prepared by Ecological Solutions, LLC, the USFWS identified several species of migratory birds as being potentially within the project area. It is noted that the migratory birds listed do not winter in the project area. These species migrate to other climates by the end of July/August and return to the area in mid-March. In late April/early May, at the earliest, is when they typically fledge their young. As the proposed tree clearing would occur between October 1 and March 31, there would be no adverse impacts to the migratory birds that may utilize the area.

If the answer to any of the above is “Yes”, consult with the USFWS and appropriate state agencies and provide all correspondence and documentation.

Michael Nowicki of Ecological Solutions, LLC, was retained to assess the threatened/endangered species within the project area and the report in its entirety is attached as Attachment C. As indicated in said report, the proposed project would not harm or adversely impact the habitat for potential Bat species. Furthermore, as indicated in Item (B)(2) above, Ecological Solutions, LLC filed the proposed action with the US FWS under the “Programmatic Biological Opinion on Final 4(d) Rule for the Northern Long-eared Bat and Activities Excepted from Take Prohibitions.” In correspondence dated December 20, 2019 (see Attachment C), the US FWS indicated that the “Action may affect the northern long-eared bat; however, any take that may occur as a result of the Action is not prohibited under the ESA Section 4(d) rule adopted for this species at 50 CFR §17.40(o).”

## **(C) CLIMATE**

**(1)** Would the proposed project or alternative(s) result in the increase or decrease of emissions of Greenhouse gases (GHG)? If neither, this should be briefly explained and no further analysis is required and proceed to (D) Coastal Resources.

No, the proposed project is not expected to have any measurable increase or decrease in Greenhouse Gases. Greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane and nitrous oxide) are typically released during the combustion of fossil fuels, such as coal, oil, and natural gas, to produce electricity. These activities have no relevance to the proposed project. Furthermore, emissions GHG associated with construction vehicles and equipment will be temporary, of short duration and minimal, with no overall impact.

**(2)** Will the proposed project or alternative(s) result in a net decrease in GHG emissions (as indicated by quantitative data or proxy measures such as reduction in fuel burn, delay, or flight operations)? A brief statement describing the factual basis for this conclusion is sufficient.

No, the proposed project would not result in any changes to airport operations that would result in a net decrease in GHG emissions. As indicated throughout this document, the proposed project includes tree removal and replanting with native grasses to correct a safety issue caused by such vegetative obstructions. Accordingly, the proposed project would not impact GHG emissions.

**(3)** Will the proposed project or alternative(s) result in an increase in GHG emissions? Emissions should be assessed either qualitatively or quantitatively as described in 1050.1F Desk Reference or Aviation Emissions

and Air Quality Handbook.

The proposed project would have a negligible impact on GHG emissions with the replacement of approximately 147 trees for native grasses, due to the vehicles and machinery that would be required as part of the removal and replanting process. As excerpted from the Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook, Version 3, Update 1 (dated January 2015) (“Air Quality Handbook”), “Greenhouse gases (GHGs) [are pollutants for which there are no NAAQS and] are emitted principally from the combustion of fossil fuels, decomposition of waste materials, and deforestation... GHG emissions associated with aviation are principally in the form of CO2 and are generated by aircraft, APUs, GSE, motor vehicles and an assortment of stationary sources.” (Section 3.2.3, Greenhouse Gases).

The construction-related sources for the proposed project are temporary with a projected construction period of 30 days maximum. The construction equipment would be limited to the use of hand tools (e.g., chain saws) in select areas and tree stumpers in other areas. Accordingly, GHG emissions associated with motor vehicles would be minimal, as well as temporary.

#### **(D) COASTAL RESOURCES**

**(1)** Would the proposed project occur in a coastal zone, or affect the use of a coastal resource, as defined by your state's Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMP)? Explain.

The inland New York coastal zone boundary is variable but generally is 1,000 feet from the shoreline in non-urbanized areas. In urbanized areas and other developed locations along the coastline, the inland boundary is usually 500 feet or less from the shoreline, with the boundary possibly extending inland up to 10,000 feet to encompass significant coastal resources.

Randall Airport is not located within a coastal zone management area and, therefore, no impacts to coastal resources would be expected.

**(2)** If Yes, is the project consistent with the State's CZMP? (If applicable, attach the sponsor's consistency certification and the state's concurrence of that certification).

Not Applicable

**(3)** Is the location of the proposed project within the Coastal Barrier Resources System? (If Yes, and the project would receive federal funding, coordinate with the FWS and attach record of consultation).

Pursuant to the U.S Fish & Wildlife Services Coastal Barrier Resources Mapper (April 2019), there are no coastal barrier systems in Orange County and, therefore, no coastal barrier impacts would occur.

#### **(E) SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES**

**(1)** Does the proposed project have an impact on any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or an historic site of national, state, or local significance? Specify if the use will be physical (an actual taking of the property) or constructive (i.e. activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4 (f) property are substantially impaired.) If the answer is “No,”

proceed to (F) Farmlands.

Section 4(f) Resources were evaluated by Carol S. Weed, MA, RPA (#989090). As presented in Attachment D of this Short EAF, there are no Section 4(f) public parks, recreation areas, wildlife or waterfowl refuges of national, state, or local significance in or immediately adjacent to the project areas. There are also no recorded historic sites of national, state, or local significance in or immediately adjacent to the five project areas and subareas. There is one eligible historic site in the one-mile study area, which includes an archaeological site holding the Unique Site Number 07119.000155 (Golf Links Road Historic Cemetery). The significance of the archaeological site is linked to its role in early Euro American settlement in the area and it would not suffer degradation of setting by the removal of trees. Furthermore, as explained in Section H below, the New York State Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation (OPRHP) has reviewed the proposed project and has issued a determination of no impact. Overall, no Section 4(f) properties would be affected by physical or constructive uses.

**(2)** Is a *De Minimis* impact determination recommended? If “yes”, please provide; supporting documentation that this impact will not substantially impair or adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4 (f) property; a Section 106 finding of “no adverse effect” if historic properties are involved; any mitigation measures; a letter from the official with jurisdiction concurring with the recommended *de minimis* finding; and proof of public involvement. (See Section 5.3.3 of 1050.1F Desk Reference). If “No,” stop development of this form and prepare a standard Environmental Assessment.

A De Minimis impact determination is not needed as no Section 4(f) properties will be affected.

#### **(F) FARMLANDS**

Does the project involve acquisition of farmland, or use of farmland, that would be converted to non-agricultural use and is protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)? (If Yes, attach record of coordination with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), including form AD- 1006.)

No. The proposed project does not involve the acquisition or use of farmland. The proposed project includes tree removal on areas that function as NYSDOT-owned highway ROW or private residential landowner property adjacent to the NYSDOT ROWs. As such, no farmlands will be affected.

#### **(G) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION**

**(1)** Would the proposed project involve the use of land that may contain hazardous materials or cause potential contamination from hazardous materials? (If Yes, attach record of consultation with appropriate agencies). Explain.

No, the area is not developed and will only include the removal of trees and the replanting of these areas with native grasses.

**(2)** Would the operation and/or construction of the project generate significant amounts of solid waste? If Yes, are local disposal facilities capable of handling the additional volumes of waste resulting from the project? Explain.

The proposed action would result in the generation of vegetative debris in the form of stumps, wood chips, and leaf debris from the tree removal. A licensed tree removal company that has been preapproved for work on NYSDOT properties will be contracted by the airport owner to perform the work. It is expected that the vegetative debris would be carted to a facility for processing and reuse as mulch or compost, or if requested by the private landowners, stumped and cut (and left on-site) for personal reuse. The decision for removal or material to remain on-site will be made prior to undertaking any activities, in coordination with the landowners. It is noted that no material is proposed by the project sponsor to be left on-site for biodegradation. It is also not expected that the vegetative debris would be landfilled as such material is useful for reuse, as noted above.

**(3)** Will the project produce an appreciable different quantity or type of hazardous waste? Will there be any potential impacts that could adversely affect human health or the environment?

No, solid waste or hazardous waste will be generated.

## **(H) HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHEOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**(1)** Describe any impact the proposed project might have on any properties listed in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. (Include a record of your consultation and response with the State or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (S/THPO)).

The proposed project was submitted to the NYS OPRHP via the agency's Cultural Resource Information System. By letter dated April 8, 2020, OPRHP commented that "...no historic properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, will be affected by this undertaking." See Attachment D for a copy of this correspondence along with a supporting memorandum as prepared by Carol S. Weed, MA, RPA.

**(2)** Describe any impacts to archeological resources as a result of the proposed project. (Include a record of consultation with persons or organizations with relevant expertise, including the S/THPO, if applicable).

There are no previously reported archaeological sites occurring in the direct impact areas for the proposed project. As indicated in Item (1) above, OPRHP has reviewed the proposed project and indicated that no archaeological resources will be affected.

## **(I) LAND USE**

**(1)** Would the proposed project result in other (besides noise) impacts that have land use ramifications, such as disruption of communities, relocation of residences or businesses, or impact natural resource areas? Explain.

No. The proposed action would not result in an increase in the intensity of the use nor would the proposed tree removal be expected to impact surrounding land uses. The trees within the NYSDOT ROW for I-84 (Areas 1, 2 and 3a) are proposed to be replaced with native grasses. It is noted that the NYSDOT has reviewed the proposed project and has indicated that there are no objections with the proposed removal and reseeded, with the condition that the work take place within the time period of October 1 to March 31 (see email correspondence in Attachment E). The NYSDOT requires the filing of a Highway Work Permit prior to the commencement of any work, which would be performed by

the consultants to the airport owner at the appropriate time. It is also important to note that the airport owner would seek to contract a licensed tree removal company that has been prequalified for such work on NYSDOT lands.

Trees within Areas 3b and 3c are also proposed to be removed and replanted with native grasses. As noted earlier, consultations were undertaken with members of the HOA for the Fairways at Wallkill subdivision as the proposed tree removal within Area 3c is located on common ownership land between the residential development and the I-84 corridor. As summarized in the Memorandum dated February 24, 2020 in Attachment F, on February 21, 2020, the project consultants met with three members of the HOA, including the President, to visually inspect the trees proposed for removal. During the meeting, it was determined that the removal would not result in any impacts, visual or otherwise, to the residences in the community as a significant portion of the current vegetative buffer to I-84 will remain. As such, the HOA members in attendance verbally agreed to the proposed removal of the trees, conditioned upon further coordination during the construction planning phase.

Consultations were also undertaken with the second private landowner (see Attachment F) whom would be affected by tree removal in Area 3b. It is possible that the private landowner may not allow access and the removal of the obstructions. As indicated in the Alternatives section, seven (7) obstructions have been identified within the approximated tax line boundary for the private landowner and these obstructions penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface, the Part 77 Approach Surface and the Part 77 Transitional Surface (see Table 1 in this document). Should the owner not grant access or allow removal, the Sponsor will file a 7460 with the FAA. The FAA will then either issue a Determination of No Hazard or establish requirements for marking the obstructions. The obstructions that penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface would require an approximate 260-foot displacement to Runway 26 if no other agreement could be made with the landowner. The final determination may not be known until the precise location of this obstruction is determined relative to the actual property line verses the approximated tax boundary.

**(2)** Would the proposed project be located near or create a wildlife hazard as defined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33, "Wildlife Hazards On and Near Airports"? Explain.

No, the resulting condition would be unchanged.

**(3)** Include documentation to support sponsor's assurance under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 (a) (10), of the 1982 Airport Act, that appropriate actions will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict land use to purposes compatible with normal airport operations.

Not Applicable.

#### **(J) NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY SUPPLY**

What effect would the project have on natural resource and energy consumption? (Attach record of consultations with local public utilities or suppliers if appropriate)

Not Applicable. The project will use a negligible amount of natural resources to fuel construction vehicles and power tools for tree removal.

**(K) NOISE AND NOISE-COMPATIBLE LAND USE**

Will the project increase noise by DNL 1.5 dB or more for a noise sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL 65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe? (Use AEM as a screening tool and AEDT 2b as appropriate. See FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference, Chapter 11, or FAA Order 1050.1F, Appendix B, for further guidance). Please provide all information used to reach your conclusion. If yes, contact your local ADO.

No. The project will have no effect on the Noise generated by the airport. During tree removal and replanting, there would be noise generation associated with machinery used for removal; however, the noise would be temporary (e.g., approximately 30 days) and would occur during non-sensitive time periods (8:30 am to 5:00 pm). Further, it is not expected that there would be any adverse noise impacts post-construction with the proposed tree removal. Randall Airport lies adjacent to the I-84 transportation corridor. All land areas are adjacent to this corridor. For the Fairways at Wallkill landowners on the south side of I-84, there will continue to be vegetative buffer between the residential development and I-84 corridor. There is no residential development on the Area 3b and there are limited trees to be removed. Accordingly, the proposed project is not expected to result in any adverse noise impacts.

**(L) SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, and CHILDREN’S HEALTH and SAFETY RISKS**

**(1)** Would the project cause an alteration in surface traffic patterns, or cause a noticeable increase in surface traffic congestion or decrease in Level of Service?

No. The proposed action includes a tree removal and reseeded project. Minimal temporary disruptions are anticipated to surface traffic congestion as it is reasonable to assume that surface traffic congestion may minimally, and temporarily, be disrupted as drivers slow to observe the clearing process which would be visible on the I-84 corridor. However, there would be no expected impact to surface traffic patterns as the proposed clearing can be accomplished via access from the state right-of ways to the north and south of I-84. The project would be awarded to a pre-approved NYSDOT contractor that has experience working within the State ROW. Furthermore, it is noted that surface traffic controls would be addressed during the NYSDOT Highway Work Permit process, which would include the preparation of Work Zone Traffic Controls Plans, in accordance with the NYSDOT Work Zone Traffic Control Manual.

**(2)** Would the project cause induced, or secondary, socioeconomic impacts to surrounding communities, such as changes to business and economic activity in a community; impact public service demands; induce shifts in population movement and growth, etc.?

As established in the NYSDEC Commissioner Policy 29 on Environmental Justice and Permitting (CP-29), the potential environmental justice areas are defined as “U.S. Census block groups of 250 to 500

households each that, in the Census, had populations that met or exceeded at least one of the following statistical thresholds:

1. At least 51.1% of the population in an urban area reported themselves to be members of minority groups; or
2. At least 33.8% of the population in a rural area reported themselves to be members of minority groups; or
3. At least 23.59% of the population in an urban or rural area had household incomes below the federal poverty level.” (NYSDEC, <https://www.dec.ny.gov/public/911.html>)

Pursuant to the maps for Orange County, NY, as published by the NYSDEC, and specific to the project area (see Figure 7 in Attachment B), the project would not occur within a potential EJ area. Furthermore, the proposed action is limited to the removal of vegetative obstructions and replacement with vegetation that is more compatible to the existing Airport use.

**(3)** Would the project have a disproportionate impact on minority and/or low-income communities? Consider human health, social, economic, and environmental issues in your evaluation. Refer to DOT Order 5610.2(a) which provides the definition for the types of adverse impacts that should be considered when assessing impacts to environmental justice populations.

No. See Response to Item (L)(2) above.

**(4)** Would the project have the potential to lead to a disproportionate health or safety risk to children?

No. See Response to Item (L)(2) above.

If the answer is “YES” to any of the above, please explain the nature and degree of the impact. Also provide a description of mitigation measures which would be considered to reduce any adverse impacts.

#### **(M) VISUAL EFFECTS INCLUDING LIGHT EMISSIONS**

**(1)** Would the project have the potential to create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions for nearby residents?

No, the proposed tree removal project would not result in increased light emissions.

**(2)** Would the project have the potential to affect the visual character of nearby areas due to light emissions?

No, the proposed tree removal project would not result in increased light emissions. As such, there would be no change to the visual character of the area.

**(3)** Would the project have the potential to block or obstruct views of visual resources?

No, the proposed tree removal project would not block or obstruct views of visual resources. While the proposed tree removal would increase visibility into the Airport property within the extent of the project areas only, such visibility changes would occur only for those in vehicles traveling at high speeds along

the I-84 corridor. The potential viewshed changes were also evaluated on-site with the HOA members and it was determined that suitable woodland exists to protect the viewshed (and screening) for residences within the Fairways subdivision.

If the answer is “YES” to any of the above, please explain the nature and degree of the impact using graphic materials. Also provide a description of mitigation measures which would be considered to reduce any adverse impacts.

**(N) WATER RESOURCES (INCLUDING WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS, SURFACE WATERS, GROUNDWATER, AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS)**

**(1) WETLANDS**

**(a)** Does the proposed project involve federal or state regulated wetlands or non-jurisdictional wetlands? (Contact USFWS or appropriate state natural resource agencies if protected resources are affected) (Wetlands must be delineated using methods in the US Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual. Delineations must be performed by a person certified in wetlands delineation Document coordination with the resource agencies).

No. The proposed action would not occur within a wetland or a regulated adjacent area. There is one man-made feature to the south of the project area on Area 3b. As indicated on the National Wetland Inventory map (Figure 4 in Attachment B), this feature is designated as “PUBHh,” which consists of a wetland that has been created or modified by a man-made barrier or dam that obstructs the inflow or outflow of water. See Figures 3 and 4 in Attachment B. As part of the proposed action, and prior to construction, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for sediment and erosion control protection would be prepared, as required by the NYSDEC, for the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity - GP-0-20-001. The proposed erosion and sedimentation controls that would be in place would include, at minimum: (1) the diversion of stormwater runoff from exposed soils; (2) the installation of silt fencing and/or hay bales, or similar methods, at the limits of disturbance; and (3) the protection of stockpiles. All erosion and sediment control measures would be routinely inspected and maintained during construction activities, and would be designed and implemented in accordance with the relevant provisions of the *New York State Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control* (NYSDEC, 2016) and the *New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual* (NYSDEC, 2015).

It is noted that there is NYSDEC-regulated freshwater wetland located off-Airport to the west (see Figure 3 in Attachment B), one freshwater pond (not regulated) on the Airport property (see Figures 4 and 6 in Attachment B), and several surface waterbodies within the general area (see Figure 6 in Attachment B). None of these features are proximate to the project area and, therefore, would not be affected by the proposed tree removal or replanting activities.

**(b)** If yes, does the project qualify for an Army Corps of Engineers General permit? (Document coordination with the Corps).



Not Applicable

(c) If there are wetlands impacts, are there feasible mitigation alternatives? Explain.

Not Applicable

(d) If there are wetlands impacts, describe the measures to be taken to comply with Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands.

Not Applicable

**(2) FLOODPLAINS**

(a) Would the proposed project be located in, or would it encroach upon, any 100-year floodplains, as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)?

No. See the FEMA Flood Map included as Figure 5 in Attachment B.

(b) If Yes, would the project cause notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values as defined in Paragraph 4.k of DOT Order 5620.2, *Floodplain Management and Protection*?

Not Applicable

(c) If Yes, attach the corresponding FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and describe the measures to be taken to comply with Executive Order 11988, including the public notice requirements.

Not Applicable

**(3) SURFACE WATERS**

(a) Would the project impact surface waters such that water quality standards set by Federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory agencies would be exceeded or would the project have the potential to contaminate a public drinking water supply such that public health may be adversely affected?

No. There are no surface water bodies that would be impacted by the proposed project. See Figure 6 in Attachment B.

(b) Would the water quality impacts associated with the project cause concerns for applicable permitting agencies or require mitigation in order to obtain a permit?

No. See Response to Item 3(a) above.

If the answer to any of the above questions is “Yes”, consult with the USEPA or other appropriate Federal and/or state regulatory and permitting agencies and provide all agency correspondence.

**(4) GROUNDWATER**

**(a)** Would the project impact groundwater such that water quality standards set by Federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory agencies would be exceeded or would the project have the potential to contaminate an aquifer used for public water supply such that public health may be adversely affected?

No. The proposed project is limited to the removal of trees and replanting with native grasses, which would not result in any adverse impacts on groundwater.

**(b)** Would the groundwater impacts associated with the project cause concerns for applicable permitting agencies or require mitigation in order to obtain a permit?

No. See Response to 4(a) above.

**(c)** Is the project to be located over an EPA-designated Sole Source Aquifer?

No. The project is not located over an EPA-designated Sole Source Aquifer.

If the answer to any of the above questions is “Yes”, consult with the USEPA or other appropriate Federal and/or state regulatory and permitting agencies and provide all agency correspondence as an attachment to this form.

**(5) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS**

Would the proposed project affect a river segment that is listed in the Wild and Scenic River System or Nationwide River Inventory (NRI)? (If Yes, coordinate with the jurisdictional agency and attach record of consultation).

No. The proposed project is not within a Wild and Scenic River System or NRI.

**(O) CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Discuss impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects both on and off the airport. Would the proposed project produce a cumulative effect on any of the environmental impact categories above? Consider projects that are connected and may have common timing and/or location. For purposes of this Form, generally use 3 years for past projects and 5 years for future foreseeable projects.

As indicated in the Randall Airport (06N) Master Plan Update – 2017 (Master Plan Update) (see Attachment G), the airside development program to date has focused primarily on the runways and taxiways. The runway was originally reconstructed in 1997. This involved a widening from 24 feet to 60 feet and the length increased from to 2,610 feet to 2,810 feet. A full-length parallel taxiway was constructed and widened from the original 14-foot width to 25 feet in 1999. Additionally, Phase I of the itinerant apron (55,000 sf) was completed in 2002.

Under current FAA criteria, the airport has been deemed “unclassified.” This designation greatly reduces the amount of funding that FAA can provide unless there is a substantial increase in aircraft activity.

Therefore, the majority of future airside improvements, such as the full build-out of the itinerant apron (71,000 sf), additional taxiway stubs, hangars, etc., will have to be completed with private funds.

Other projects included in the Master Plan Update, Phase I (2018-2021) involved a new terminal building, landside roadways, hangar construction and an underground fuel vault. However, no work has been performed to date and there is no timeline for these activities as these rely solely on funding by the Airport owner and such finances are not available.

The airport is currently eligible to receive federal funding for safety and maintenance projects only, as outlined by Congress in AIP legislation. It is anticipated that the FAA will fund these projects in 2022. The airport is also slated to receive monies to replace the aging edge lighting system in 2020 and a runway rehabilitation (mill and overlay) project in 2021. Without a change from the “unclassified” status, the airport does not anticipate additional projects for many years to come.

Any future projects that are not safety or maintenance related (e.g., new terminal building, landside roadways, hangar construction) are fully dependent upon financing by the Airport owner. As such, although construction projects are included in the Master Plan Update, the timing for actual development cannot be determined until funding is available, which cannot be determined at this time. Finally, no future projects will be undertaken at the Airport the projects are designed and a full environmental review has been completed.

It is further noted that the implementation of the proposed project is not related to any of the aforementioned improvements, and thus, no cumulative impacts would result. The only anticipated impacts are temporary land disturbances associated with tree removal activities, which have been addressed in earlier sections of this Short EAF.

## 7. PERMITS

List all required permits for the proposed project. Has coordination with the appropriate agency commenced? What feedback has the appropriate agency offered in reference to the proposed project? What is the expected time frame for permit review and decision?

In addition to the approvals from the FAA, the proposed action is subject to the following permits and approvals:

Agency or Entity	Permit/Approval	Status
NYS Department of Transportation	Highway Work Permit for Non-Utility Work (PERM-33) (Areas 1, 2 and 3a)	To Be Filed* *Consultations Initiated. See Below.
Town of Wallkill	Tree Removal Permit (Area 3b and Area 3c)	To Be Filed
NYS Department of Environmental Conservation	SPDES General Permit for Construction Activity (GP-0-20-001)	To Be Filed (prior to construction)
Fairways Subdivision HOA	Tree Removal (Area 3c)	Consultations Initiated/Project Authorization Received. See Below.
Mr. Joseph Distelburger	Tree Removal (Area 3b)	Consultations Initiated. See Below.

### Status of Permits and Approvals

*NYSDOT* - Consultations were undertaken with the NYSDOT (Region 8) via written and electronic correspondence (see Attachment E). As advised by the NYSDOT, there are no objections to the proposed tree removal based on the proposed condition that all tree removal would occur between October 1 and March 31. Prior to the commencement of any work, the project sponsor is also required to apply for and obtain a Highway Work Permit for Non-Utility Work (PERM-33). The application for permit would be filed when the FAA awards an Off-Airport Obstruction Removal Design and Bidding project, and after professional surveying is completed. At this time, it is not anticipated this will happen prior to 2022.

*NYSDEC* – Prior to construction, a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) for sediment and erosion control protection would be prepared, as required by the NYSDEC, for the General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity - GP-0-20-001. A Notice of Intent (NOI) would also be filed prior to construction.

*Town of Wallkill* - Pursuant to Section 203-7-A and Section 249-58-R-1 of the Town of Wallkill Town Code, the Building Department has permitting authority for the removal of trees on private lands of more than half an acre and less than one acre. Clearing of trees over one acre will require approval from the Town of Wallkill Planning Board. As the proposed action involves the removal of trees on private lands, permit approvals will be required. However, until final tree surveys are performed, the permit type (i.e., Building Department approval or Planning Board approval) cannot be determined. The application for permit would be filed when the FAA awards an Off-Airport Obstruction Removal Design and Bidding project, and after professional surveying is completed. At this time, it is not anticipated this will happen prior to 2022.

*Private Landowners* - Consultations were undertaken with the HOA for the Fairways subdivision for the proposed tree removal within Area 3c, which is a common ownership land. As summarized in the Memorandum dated February 24, 2020 in Attachment F, during the on-site meeting with the HOA members, it was determined that the removal would not result in any impacts, visual or otherwise, to the residences in the community as a significant portion of the current vegetative buffer to I-84 will remain. As such, the HOA members in attendance did not object to the removal of the trees, conditioned upon further coordination during the construction planning phase.

Consultations were also undertaken with the second private landowner, Mr. Joseph Distelburger (see Attachment F); however, a response is still pending. If the airport sponsor is unable to obtain permission to remove the Part 77 Obstructions, the Sponsor will file a 7460 with the FAA. The FAA will then either issue a Determination of No Hazard or establish requirements for marking the obstructions. The obstructions that penetrate the Threshold Siting Surface (#569) would require an approximately 260-foot displacement to Runway 26. The final determination may not be known until the precise location of this obstruction is determined relative to the actual property line verses the approximated tax boundary.

## **8. MITIGATION**

Describe those mitigation measures to be taken to avoid creation of significant impacts to a particular resource as a result of the proposed project and include a discussion of any impacts that cannot be mitigated.

The proposed project includes the following mitigation measures:

1. Tree removal and replanting to occur between October 1 – March 31 to avoid disturbance to the potential roosting and foraging habitat of the Indiana bat and Northern Long-eared bat.
2. The proposed replanting with native grasses mitigates the potential impacts associated with land clearing as well as comply with the approved ALP/Master Plan, which includes the removal of obstructions to Runway 26.
3. Installing orange construction fencing in the areas to be cleared to distinguish from areas not to be cleared as well as tag select individual trees to avoid accidental removal of trees not determined to be vegetative obstructions.
4. All vegetative debris would be carted to a facility for processing and reuse for mulch or compost or, if requested by the private landowners, stumped and cut (and left on-site) for personal reuse.
5. Following industry recognized best management practices for erosion and sedimentation controls. Specifically, the proposed project will include erosion and sedimentation controls, and such controls will be installed prior to the commencement of work. All controls will be inspected during construction. Such controls would include, at minimum, (1) the diversion of stormwater runoff from exposed soils, (2) the installation of silt fencing or similar methods at the limits of disturbance, and (3) the protection of stockpiles. The erosion and sedimentation controls and methods by which stormwater would be

accommodated during construction would be designed to be consistent with the 2016 New York Standards and Specifications for Erosion and Sediment Control (NYSDEC) and the 2015 New York State Stormwater Management Design Manual (NYSDEC). As the proposed action would result in the disturbance of greater than one-acre of land, the project sponsor, through the project contact, will obtain coverage under the SPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activity GP-0-20-001 prior to the commencement of any construction activities.

## **9. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

Describe the public review process and any comments received. Include copies of Public Notices and proof of publication.

The proposed project requires a Public Notice of Availability and Request for Comment in the official local newspaper - The Wallkill Valley Times (<http://www.timeshudsonvalley.com/wallkill-valley-times/>). This document will also be available for review at the office of the Randall Airport. The public comment period will be 30 days.

## LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Project Drawings, including:

- Drawing 1A - Inner Approach Runway Surface (Paved)
- Drawing 1B - Obstruction Data Tables, Runway 26
- Drawing 1C – Enlarged View of Area 3 (South Side of I-84)

Attachment B: Figures

- Figure 1 – Airport Location Map with Project Areas
- Figure 2 – Land Use Map
- Figure 3 – NYSDEC Freshwater Wetlands Map
- Figure 4 – National Wetlands Inventory
- Figure 5 – FEMA Floodplain Map
- Figure 6 – Surface Waters Map
- Figure 7 – Potential Environmental Justice Areas Map

Attachment C: US Fish and Wildlife Service Determination and Threatened and Endangered Species Habitat Suitability Assessment Report (prepared by Michael Nowicki, Ecological Solutions, LLC, dated February 19, 2018)

Attachment D: NYS Office of Parks, Recreation and Historic Preservation Project Review Documents and Correspondence, and Section 4(f) Documentation (prepared by Carol Weed, M.A. RPA)

Attachment E: Correspondence with NYS Department of Transportation

Attachment F: Correspondence with Private Landowners

Attachment G: Randall Airport Master Plan/ALP, approved July 2018

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



**11. PREPARER CERTIFICATION**

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, correct.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature 07/20/2020  
Date

Name: Shavawn M. Lockhart  
Title: President  
Affiliation: TriState Planning Engineering & Land Surveying, P.C.  
Phone: 516.282.3572

**12. AIRPORT SPONSOR CERTIFICATION**

I certify that the information I have provided above is, to the best of my knowledge, correct. I also recognize and agree that no construction activity, including but not limited to site preparation, demolition, or land disturbance, shall proceed for the above proposed project(s) until FAA issues a final environmental decision for the proposed project(s), and until compliance with all other applicable FAA approval actions (e.g., ALP approval, airspace approval, grant approval) and special purpose laws has occurred.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Name: Charles Brodie  
Title: President  
Affiliation: Aerodrome Development Corp.  
Phone: 845.343.5965