

PROPOSED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN PROJECTS

ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM



Prepared For:

Martha's Vineyard Airport
71 Airport Road
West Tisbury, MA 02575

December 2018



Prepared By

McFarland Johnson
53 Regional Drive
Concord, NH 03301



Martha's Vineyard Airport
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Environmental Notification Form

Table of Contents

Cover Letter

Environmental Notification Form

Attachments

1. List of Attachments
2. U.S.G.S. Location Map
3. Airport Layout Plan (Existing Conditions)
4. Priority and Estimated Habitat
5. Proposed Conditions Plans
6. ENF Distribution List
7. List of Municipal and Federal Permits

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office

Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only

EEA#: _____

MEPA Analyst: _____

The information requested on this form must be completed in order to submit a document electronically for review under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Martha's Vineyard Airport Capital Improvement Plan Projects		
Street Address: 71 Airport Rd, West Tisbury		
Municipality: West Tisbury/Edgartown	Watershed: Islands (coastal)	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 41° 23' 35" N Longitude: 70° 36' 45" W	
Estimated commencement date:	Estimated completion date:	
Project Type: Airport Capital Improvements	Status of project design: 10 %complete	
Proponent: Martha's Vineyard Airport Commission		
Street Address: 71 Airport Road		
Municipality: West Tisbury	State: MA	Zip Code: 02575
Name of Contact Person: Ann Richart, Airport Manager		
Firm/Agency: Martha's Vineyard Airport Commission	Street Address: 71 Airport Road	
Municipality: West Tisbury	State: MA	Zip Code: 02575
Phone: (508)693-7022	Fax: (508)696-4631	E-mail: arichart@mvyairport.com

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If this is an Expanded Environmental Notification Form (ENF) (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) or a Notice of Project Change (NPC), are you requesting:

a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8))

☐ Yes ☐ No

a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR 11.09)

☐ Yes ☐ No

a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11)

☐ Yes ☐ No

a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)

☐ Yes ☐ No

(Note: Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis must be included in the Expanded ENF.)

Which MEPA review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03)?

11.03(1)(a)1. Direct alteration of 50 or more acres of land

11.03(1)(a)2. Creation of ten or more acres of impervious area

11.03(2)(b)2. Greater than two acres of disturbance to Priority Habitat

11.03(6)(b)15. Construction of 300 or more new parking spaces

Which State Agency Permits will the project require?

MESA Conservation and Management Permit

Possible MassDOT Indirect Access Permit

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an Agency of the Commonwealth, including the Agency name and the amount of funding or land area in acres:

MassDOT funding of environmental study: \$27,138.00

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage	688		
New acres of land altered		118.1	
Acres of impervious area	77.4	+17.4	94.8
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	ND*	+57,350	ND*
Number of housing units	0	0	0
Maximum height (feet)	ND*	ND*	ND*
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day			
Parking spaces	369	549	918
WASTEWATER			
Water Use (Gallons per day)	13,369	1,750	15,119
Water withdrawal (GPD)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Wastewater generation/treatment (GPD)	10,695	1,400	12,095
Length of water mains (miles)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Length of sewer mains (miles)	n/a	n/a	n/a
Has this project been filed with MEPA before? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes (EEA # _____) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No			
Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (EEA # <u>1131, 2650, 2729, 5116, 5117, 5526, 6437, 6503, 13024</u>) <input type="checkbox"/> No			

* ND = Not Determined
n/a – Not Applicable

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION – all proponents must fill out this section

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Describe the existing conditions and land uses on the project site

Martha's Vineyard Airport is a public airport located at 71 Airport Road, West Tisbury, Massachusetts with both general aviation and passenger airline activity. Passenger airlines providing arrivals and departures to the Airport include Cape Air, Delta, JetBlue, and American Airlines. The airport is located on 688 acres with a variety of facilities. According to the 2016 Master Plan Update, between 2000 and 2013, there was an average of 51,151 annual flights, with average peak season (June-August) flights accounting for 47.7 percent. Martha's Vineyard Airport is directly impacted by the seasonal nature of the island's economy.

Martha's Vineyard Airport is located in West Tisbury and Edgartown, Dukes County, Massachusetts. According to the US Census Bureau, West Tisbury had a population of 2,740 in 2010, with estimates of 2,306 between 2012 and 2016. Edgartown had a population of 4,067 in 2010 with an estimated population of 4,247 between 2012 and 2016. The Airport is located in the LI (light industrial) zone in West Tisbury and the B-III (light manufacturing and light industrial) and B-IV (aviation facilities, storage of heavy equipment) zones in Edgartown. The land surrounding the airport in West Tisbury is zoned as rural residential and zoned as single family residential in Edgartown. Much of the surrounding land to the North, East, and West of the Airport is undeveloped, with residential development south of the Airport.

There are no mapped regulatory floodplains at or in the vicinity of the Airport. There are no mapped wetlands located within the Airport, although there is one detention basin. The Airport is located within the designated Coastal Zone, but with its centralized location on the island, is not likely to result in any coastal resource impacts. The Airport is located over an EPA Sole Source Aquifer. (A Sole Source Aquifer is an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water to its service area, and for which there is no reasonably available alternative source.)

The Airport includes mapped Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program Priority Habitat of Rare Species and Estimated Habitat of Rare Wildlife. Within the Airport, the mapped Priority Habitat covers much of Airport property and includes grassland, scrub oak, forested, and disturbed land. Estimated Habitat is mapped within the northwestern corner of airport property and includes forest, grass, and runway pavement areas. Other areas that are not designated as Priority or Estimated Habitat include forested and disturbed areas. The Airport operates under a habitat management plan, developed as part of the Conservation Management Permit (004-039 DFW), that was developed in 2004, and outlines general habitat maintenance and monitoring.

Existing Facilities

Runway 15-33 is 3,328 feet long and 75 feet wide with a design code of B-II (based on the approach speed and shape of aircraft using the runway), and northwest-southeast orientation. Runway 15/33 was last reconstructed in 1992. Representative aircraft for the B-II classification include BE-200, CE-560, CE-650, FA-50, FA-2000, and PC-12. According to the 2016 Master Plan Update, a survey of aircraft operations (flights) performed in 2012 showed that B-II aircraft accounted for 17.5% of operations. Runway 6-24 is 5,504 feet long and 150 feet wide with a design code of C-III, meaning it can accommodate larger aircraft than a B-II runway. Runway 6-24 is the primary runway because of its length, precision instrument landing system (ILS), and

alignment with prevailing winds.

The airfield is served by multiple taxiways. Taxiway A runs parallel to Runway 6/24, with four short “stub connector” taxiways (A1, B, C, and D) providing access from the ramps to the runway. All taxiways at Martha’s Vineyard Airport are 50 feet wide, except for Taxiway E, which is 35 feet wide. Taxiway E provides skewed, or non-perpendicular, access to both Runways 6/24 and 15/33.

There are currently four paved aprons, or ramps, used for parking aircraft. There are two main ramps, the Southeast and Southwest. The Southwest Ramp encompasses the “North”, “Restaurant”, and “Transient” Ramps. There are a combined total of 72 marked tie down locations. There is also a turf tie down area that has 28 spots for transient aircraft and is currently utilized during peak season demand.

There are currently seven T-hangar buildings and four conventional hangars at the airport.

The existing airport fuel farm, located by the Southwest ramp, contains two 20,000-gallon Jet A fuel tanks and one 20,000-gallon 100LL AVGAS tank. The existing concrete pad is approximately 3,900 square feet.

The terminal building was constructed in 1998 and is utilized for ticketing, baggage, screening, rental car counters, airline offices, a restaurant and restrooms. The terminal building is connected to the general aviation building utilized for airport administration and operations offices.

Describe the proposed project and its programmatic and physical elements:

Martha’s Vineyard Airport is proposing several airport improvements, addressed in the 2016 Capital Improvement Plan. The project consists of the following ten components:

1. Runway 6/24 Side Safety Areas and Primary Surface Obstruction

During the design review for the Reconstruct Runway 6/24 Project, the side safety areas and primary surface were analyzed for compliance. (Safety areas and primary surfaces are surfaces surrounding a runway that must meet certain criteria for purposes of aircraft safety.) That exercise resulted in a finding that the side safety area slopes do not meet Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) grading criteria outlined in Advisory Circular (AC) 150/5300-13A. It was also determined that the existing ground elevation exceeds the runway elevation within the limits of the Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 primary surface. Existing ground elevations should be at or lower than the primary surface elevation per AC 150/5300-13A. The rehabilitation of the runway would occur in the existing footprint. Within Priority Habitat, the side safety areas and primary surface obstruction would result in approximately 82.3 acres of re-graded grass, 13.5 acres of grass to be converted to impervious surface, and 0.2 acres of impervious surface returned to grass. There will be approximately 0.4 acres of grass to be converted to impervious surface within non-Priority Habitat.

2. Rehabilitate Runway 15/33 and Regrade Side Safety Areas

There are deformations such as weathering and cracking which result in debris on the runway (“foreign object debris”) that can damage aircraft. The 2016 Master Plan notes that crack repair was conducted in 2010 under the Massachusetts Department of

Transportation statewide runway maintenance project but noted that it should be rehabilitated in 2020. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation – Aeronautics Division inspected the pavement condition inspection for Runway 15/33 in 2016. The inspection determined a “Pavement Condition Index” rating of 67 for 2016 and projected a rating of 62 for 2020. Pavements within a rating of 50 to 70 typically require more extensive rehabilitation than pavements in better condition. Rehabilitation will involve removing the surface pavement, possible subbase work, and adding new pavement at approximately the same elevation and configuration as existing.

The runway also has existing 37.5-foot paved shoulders on a runway that does not require them. The shoulders are in poor condition with high-severity cracking. By definition these are severely cracked and broken, and pieces are loose or missing, causing the potential for foreign object debris on the runway. The rehabilitation will remove this pavement and replace it with turf meeting FAA design guidelines. However, the Runway 15/33 side safety areas currently do not meet transverse grade criteria, and following FAA grading guidelines for turf would make the transverse grades worse. Alternatives to address these non-conformities are being studied.

The proposed rehabilitation and regrading of the runway safety areas will result in approximately 15.1 acres of grass to be regraded in Priority Habitat, 2.3 acres of which is also Estimated Habitat. Approximately 4.9 acres of impervious surface would be converted to grass in Priority Habitat, 0.7 acres of which is also Estimated Habitat.

3. Construct Concrete Fuel Pad at Fuel Farm

The existing fuel farm is surrounded by crushed asphalt pavement referred to as “millings.” These millings become lodged in the tread of the fuel truck tires and are tracked onto the aircraft apron. This creates a foreign object debris risk as it can cause damage to aircraft and equipment. The existing surface material does not provide containment in the event of a fuel spillage, and is more burdensome on operations to maintain, particularly during snow clearing operations. The fuel farm pad therefore needs to be paved to reduce the risk of damage from foreign object debris, improve fuel containment, and improve regular maintenance. The proposed work would involve paving the existing footprint of the fuel pad and adding an access road that would result in the conversion of approximately 0.2 acres of grass to impervious surface within Priority Habitat, and 0.4 acres of grass to impervious surface within non-Priority Habitat.

4. Expand and Renovate Existing Terminal Building

The current terminal building capacity is insufficient to meet current demand. The existing building provides a total of 9,800 square feet. The 2016 Master Plan identified an existing (2014) need of approximately 18,100 square feet, and an anticipated (2020) need of 21,850 square feet, more than double the existing capacity, using the Airport Cooperative Research Program Terminal Planning Spreadsheet Model. Constructed in 1998, the pre-9/11 terminal building does not provide the necessary space to meet existing TSA security requirements. Current conditions lead to long security lines and holding areas in open courtyards with no restrooms or other facilities. The project proposes to expand the existing terminal building to meet the demands of the airport. The expansion also includes creating an additional 549 new parking spaces, and a right turn lane exiting Airport Road. In total, the proposed expansion would result in approximately 284,400 square feet (6.5 acres) of permanent impacts to non-Priority

Habitat.

5. Remove Existing Taxiway E and Construct New Taxiway E

Taxiway E is a remnant of the former Navy configuration. Converted from a former runway, Taxiway E provides skewed, or non-perpendicular, access to both Runways 6/24 and 15/33. This configuration restricts visibility of the runway approach area for aircraft crossing or entering a runway. The current configuration of Taxiway E does not provide access to the end of Runway 15. To use the full runway length for departures or landings, an aircraft is required to taxi on the runway, which increases the risk of conflicts between aircraft using the runway. Taxiway E was last paved in 1980 and exceeds FAA design life criteria.

The existing Taxiway E will be removed and approximately 6.3 acres of impervious surface will be returned to grassland within Priority Habitat. A new Runway 15-33 parallel taxiway will be constructed, resulting in approximately 6.8 acres of regraded grass and 2.9 acres of grass to be converted to impervious surface within Priority Habitat. The northern end of the relocated taxiway is also within Estimated Habitat.

6. Pave Transient Turf Tie Down Area

Paving the transient turf tie down area will provide a safe, viable option for peak demand. The proposed project would result in approximately 4.1 acres of permanent impacts to Priority Habitat, by converting existing grass to impervious surface.

7. Southeast Ramp Expansion

FAA AC 150/5300-13A specifically states, "Do not design taxiways to lead directly from an apron to a runway without requiring a turn." This is referred to as direct access. The stub Taxiway B provides direct access from the southeast ramp and terminal apron area to Runway 6/24. To comply with FAA AC 150/5300-13A, a No-Taxi Apron Island will be constructed, resulting in a reduced capacity of the existing apron. The proposed expansion would result in approximately 0.3 acres of permanent impacts to Priority Habitat by converting existing grass to impervious surface.

8. Southwest Ramp Expansion

The airport has seen a reduction in usable apron area for General Aviation over the last few years and an increase in the number of flights. To compensate for reduced useable apron space, the airport proposes to expand the Southwest Ramp by paving turf and removing four existing hangars. It is expected that the hangar space will eventually be replaced by three new hangars and new additional vehicle parking. The proposed expansion would result in approximately 4.4 acres of additional apron space in non-Priority Habitat, and 0.04 acres of re-graded grass in non-Priority Habitat.

9. Construct New Aircraft Hangars

The airport does not have facilities to store large corporate aircraft. The Airport has current demand from a new tenant interested in leasing an 80' x 80' hangar and basing their aircraft at the airport. Hangars are necessary because they protect aircraft from harsh weather elements and ensure aircraft readiness. The proposed hangar would be

approximately 15,900 square feet, and would be constructed at the Southeast ramp location, resulting in approximately 0.04 acres of regraded grass and 0.4 acres of grass converted to impervious surface in Priority Habitat. Additionally, four hangars on the Southwest Ramp would be removed and up to three new hangars would be constructed in their place. This would occur in existing and proposed pavement areas. There would be a net increase of approximately 26,450 square feet of hangar space at the Southwest Ramp.

Describe the on-site project alternatives (and alternative off-site locations, if applicable), considered by the proponent, including at least one feasible alternative that is allowed under current zoning, and the reasons(s) that they were not selected as the preferred alternative:

NOTE: The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to consider what effect changing the parameters and/or siting of a project, or components thereof, will have on the environment, keeping in mind that the objective of the MEPA review process is to avoid or minimize damage to the environment to the greatest extent feasible. Examples of alternative projects include alternative site locations, alternative site uses, and alternative site configurations.

1. Runway 6/24 Side Safety Areas and Primary Surface Obstruction
 - a. No Build: This alternative would not affect Priority Habitat. However, the safety areas and primary surface would not meet FAA criteria, resulting in a safety concern for aircraft that stray from runway pavement.
 - b. Build: The proposed build alternative is the minimum needed to meet FAA safety guidelines. No other build alternatives were considered.
2. Rehabilitate Runway 15/33 and Regrade Side Runway Safety Areas
 - a. No Build: Under this alternative, the 37.5-foot paved shoulders would remain in place. Since the shoulders are severely damaged, with potential for foreign object debris to enter the runway, this alternative was rejected for safety reasons. The existing runway safety areas do not meet transverse grade standards listed in the AC 150/5300-13A. Additionally, MassDOT recommended that Runway 15-33 be rehabilitated in 2020. In order to meet FAA standards and airport needs, this alternative was not selected.
 - b. Build: Under this alternative, the 37.5-foot paved shoulders would be removed and replaced with turf to FAA design standards. This alternative reduces risks of foreign object debris entering the runway and damaging aircraft, and eliminates unnecessary pavement, and therefore is the preferred alternative. The existing runway would be milled and repaved to extend the runway's useful life and to postpone full reconstruction. The runway safety areas would be regraded in order to meet FAA standards. This alternative meets the purpose and need of the project and is the preferred alternative.
3. Construct Concrete Fuel Pad at Fuel Farm
 - a. No Build: This alternative would allow the foreign object debris risk to continue, would not provide spill containment, and would be more burdensome to maintain than the Build Alternative.
 - b. Build: This alternative would reduce the potential for foreign object debris, improve spill containment, and be easier to maintain than current conditions.
4. Expand and Renovate Existing Terminal Building
 - a. No Build: This alternative would not provide the capacity to meet current or projected demand. There would continue to be long security lines and holding

- areas in open courtyards with no restrooms or other facilities. Vehicular traffic would continue to be congested.
- b. Build: This alternative would accommodate sufficient capacity in the terminal to process passengers efficiently and safely. No alternatives were studied as a smaller expansion would not meet projected need and a larger expansion would not be needed. The proposed parking and roadway improvements may be phased based on demand and need.
- 5. Remove Existing Taxiway E and Construct New Taxiway E
 - a. No Build: This alternative would maintain existing conditions, which would minimize Priority and Estimated Habitat impacts but would maintain the safety concerns, primarily the limited visibility of the runway approach and the lack of direct access to the Runway 15 end.
 - b. Alternative 5a: Existing Taxiway E would be removed and a new taxiway constructed along the west side of Runway 15-33. This would bring the taxiway and runway closer together, improve visibility with a perpendicular approach to the runway, and allow access to the end of Runway 15.
 - c. Alternative 5b: This alternative would move the taxiway to the opposite side of the runway. The alternative would be functionally similar to Alternative 1 and would have similar Priority Habitat impacts but somewhat more Estimated Habitat impacts.
 - 6. Pave Transient Turf Tie Down Area
 - a. No Build: Under this alternative, the tie down area for transient aircraft would remain turf. The turf is uneven, rough, and inaccessible by aircraft under their own power. This area is currently utilized during peak demand when the large ramp areas are blocked or filled. The no build alternative would not meet the project purpose and need and therefore was not selected.
 - b. Alternative 6a: This alternative would provide paved tie-down areas adjacent to the existing taxiway.
 - c. Alternative 6b: This alternative would provide a comparable number of paved tie-down areas but with somewhat less pavement than Alternative 1.
 - 7. Southeast Ramp Expansion
 - a. No Build: The No Build would maintain the existing safety concerns associated with direct access from a ramp to a runway.
 - b. Alternative 7a: Alternative 1 would eliminate direct access by constructing a grass island and reconfiguring the existing paved ramp, and no new pavement would be added.
 - c. Alternative 7b: This alternative would eliminate direct access by constructing a grass island, reconfiguring the existing paved ramp, and adding a stub taxiway from the ramp to Taxiway A.
 - 8. Southwest Ramp Expansion
 - a. No Build: This alternative would not resolve the reduction in usable apron area and resulting capacity problems the airport has been experiencing.
 - b. Build: There is only one feasible location for this alternative. This project would impact mostly existing pavement, buildings and disturbed ground, although Priority Habitat would be affected. For these reasons, no other alternatives have been developed.
 - 9. Construct New Aircraft Hangars
 - a. No build: Under the No Build, the airport would continue to have insufficient

facilities for storing large corporate aircraft and would not meet current demand for hangar space.

- b. Build: Under this alternative an approximately 15,900 square foot hangar would be constructed at the Southeast ramp location, and up to three hangars totaling 47,600 square feet would be constructed within the reconstructed Southwest Ramp.

Summarize the mitigation measures proposed to offset the impacts of the preferred alternative:

New impervious surfaces will be balanced by removal of existing impervious surfaces where feasible.

Permanent stormwater management measures such as catch basins and infiltration practices will be implemented to provide treatment of runoff from new impervious surfaces.

Erosion and sediment control will be implemented during construction.

Mitigation measures for rare species have yet to be determined, but will be developed in consultation with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program and other agencies. Mitigation may consist of habitat management measures in existing rare species habitat on airport property, habitat restoration on airport property, payments in lieu of formal mitigation, or other measures. In addition, there may be "surplus" mitigation from past airport projects which could be applied to this project.

If the project is proposed to be constructed in phases, please describe each phase:

The current projected schedule for the Capital Improvement Plan projects are as follows:

2020

- Project 1: Regrade Runway 6/24 side safety areas and address primary surface obstructions
- Project 2: Rehabilitate Runway 15/33, remove shoulder pavement, and regrade side safety areas
- Project 3: Construct concrete fuel pad at fuel farm

2022

- Project 4: Expand and renovate existing terminal building

2023

- Project 5: Remove old Taxiway E and construct new Taxiway E

2024

- Project 6: Pave transient turf tiedown area
- Project 7: Expand Southeast Ramp
- Project 8: Expand Southwest Ramp
- Project 9: Construct new aircraft hangars

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN:

Is the project within or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

☐ Yes (Specify _____)

☒ No

if yes, does the ACEC have an approved Resource Management Plan? ____ Yes ____ No;
If yes, describe how the project complies with this plan.

Will there be stormwater runoff or discharge to the designated ACEC? ____ Yes ____ No;
If yes, describe and assess the potential impacts of such stormwater runoff/discharge to the designated ACEC.

RARE SPECIES:

Does the project site include Estimated and/or Priority Habitat of State-Listed Rare Species? (see http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhosp/regulatory_review/priority_habitat/priority_habitat_home.htm)

☒ Yes (Specify: PH 945, EH 126) ☐ No

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES:

Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?

☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☒ No

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources? ☐ Yes (Specify _____) ☐ No

No archaeological sites are known to occur on airport property, but some impact areas still need to be reviewed, and will be investigated as part of this project.

WATER RESOURCES:

Is there an Outstanding Resource Water (ORW) on or within a half-mile radius of the project site?
____ Yes X No; if yes, identify the ORW and its location.

(NOTE: Outstanding Resource Waters include Class A public water supplies, their tributaries, and bordering wetlands; active and inactive reservoirs approved by MassDEP; certain waters within Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, and certified vernal pools. Outstanding resource waters are listed in the Surface Water Quality Standards, 314 CMR 4.00.)

Are there any impaired water bodies on or within a half-mile radius of the project site? ____ Yes X No; if yes, identify the water body and pollutant(s) causing the impairment:

Is the project within a medium or high stress basin, as established by the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission? ____ Yes X No

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT:

Generally describe the project's stormwater impacts and measures that the project will take to comply with the standards found in MassDEP's Stormwater Management Regulations:

The proposed permanent and temporary stormwater management measures have not yet been designed for each component but will be designed to comply with stormwater regulations where applicable.

MASSACHUSETTS CONTINGENCY PLAN:

Has the project site been, or is it currently being, regulated under M.G.L.c.21E or the Massachusetts Contingency Plan? Yes X No ____ ; if yes, please describe the current status of the site (including Release Tracking Number (RTN), cleanup phase, and Response Action Outcome classification):

RTN 4-0012087: Compliance status PSNC

Martha's Vineyard Airport is currently listed under Release Tracking Number (RTN) 4-0012087. Two secondary RTNs associated with this incident, 4-0022067 and 4-0022138, were closed and rolled into the primary RTN. A portion of Martha's Vineyard Airport, where the terminal building was constructed in 1999, was formerly operated as a dry cleaning facility. During demolition of the facility in 1995, elevated

concentrations of PCE were detected in the groundwater. Since 1997, several remediation activities and strategies have been completed, and as of a report submitted on July 15, 2017, PCE levels were below MCP GW-1 standards.

RTN 4-0016797: Compliance Status: RAO

Martha's Vineyard Airport is also listed under RTN 4-0016797 associated with a groundwater monitoring well (RIZ-20) installed at 11 Coffinsfield Road due to the presence of tetrachloroethylene (PCE) in a private drinking well. The release of PCE is associated with RTN 4-0012087, and the monitoring well was installed to monitor downgradient properties. A response action outcome (RAO) was issued January 21, 2005 by Rizzo Associates, stating a permanent solution had been achieved and that an Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) was not required.

There is a former wellhouse associated with the former military ownership and occupation of the airport that contains asbestos and hazardous building materials. The building is anticipated to be removed to classify the area as non-aeronautical use, however, this is a separate project and is not included in this ENF.

Is there an Activity and Use Limitation (AUL) on any portion of the project site? Yes ____ **No X**
if yes, describe which portion of the site and how the project will be consistent with the AUL:

Are you aware of any Reportable Conditions at the property that have not yet been assigned an RTN?
Yes ____ **No X** ; if yes, please describe:

SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE:

If the project will generate solid waste during demolition or construction, describe alternatives considered for re-use, recycling, and disposal of, e.g., asphalt, brick, concrete, gypsum, metal, wood:

The quantities of construction and demolition material or debris have not yet been determined. Disposal of construction debris will be accomplished in accordance with applicable laws and regulations.

(NOTE: Asphalt pavement, brick, concrete and metal are banned from disposal at Massachusetts landfills and waste combustion facilities and wood is banned from disposal at Massachusetts landfills. See 310 CMR 19.017 for the complete list of banned materials.)

Will your project disturb asbestos containing materials? Yes ____ **No X** ;
if yes, please consult state asbestos requirements at <http://mass.gov/MassDEP/air/asbhom01.htm>

Describe anti-idling and other measures to limit emissions from construction equipment:

Construction contracts will instruct that all diesel equipment have after-engine emissions controls, utilize ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel, and minimize idling.

DESIGNATED WILD AND SCENIC RIVER:

Is this project site located wholly or partially within a defined river corridor of a federally designated Wild and Scenic River or a state designated Scenic River? Yes ____ **No X** ;
if yes, specify name of river and designation:

If yes, does the project have the potential to impact any of the "outstandingly remarkable" resources of a federally Wild and Scenic River or the stated purpose of a state designated Scenic River?
Yes ____ No ____ ; if yes, specify name of river and designation: _____;
if yes, will the project will result in any impacts to any of the designated "outstandingly remarkable" resources of the Wild and Scenic River or the stated purposes of a Scenic River. Yes ____ No ____ ;
if yes, describe the potential impacts to one or more of the "outstandingly remarkable" resources or

stated purposes and mitigation measures proposed.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. List of Attachments
2. U.S.G.S. Location Map
3. Airport Layout Plan (Existing Conditions)
4. Priority and Estimated Habitat
5. Proposed Conditions Plans
6. ENF Distribution List
7. List of Municipal and Federal Permits

LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. Thresholds / Permits

- A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **land** (see 301 CMR 11.03(1)) **X Yes** ___ No; if yes, specify each threshold:

II. Impacts and Permits

- A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Footprint of buildings	<u>ND*</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>ND*</u>
Internal roadways	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>
All impervious surfaces	<u>77.4</u>	<u>17.4</u>	<u>94.8</u>
Other altered areas	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>
Undeveloped areas	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>	<u>ND*</u>
Total: Project Site Acreage	688	0	688

* ND = Not Determined. The airport includes a large number of existing structures, roadways, and parking areas, and the acreages have not been individually calculated. There are 77.4 acres of impervious surfaces, and the remaining 611 acres includes a variety of land types with varying degrees of alteration, including unaltered forest, second growth forest, cleared and mowed grasslands, regraded turf and lawns, stormwater treatment areas, dirt trails, and unpaved aircraft parking areas.

- B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last five years?
___ Yes **X No**; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with prime state or locally important agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use?
- C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use?
___ Yes **X No**; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a forest management plan approved by the Department of Conservation and Recreation:
- D. Does any part of the project involve conversion of land held for natural resources purposes in accordance with Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97? ___ Yes **X No**; if yes, describe:
- E. Is any part of the project site currently subject to a conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction or watershed preservation restriction?
___ Yes **X No**; if yes, does the project involve the release or modification of such restriction? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:
- Portions of airport property are managed for the benefit of rare species, in accordance with a Conservation and Management Permit.
- F. Does the project require approval of a new urban redevelopment project or a fundamental change in an existing urban redevelopment project under M.G.L.c.121A? ___ Yes **X No**; if yes, describe:
- G. Does the project require approval of a new urban renewal plan or a major modification of an existing urban renewal plan under M.G.L.c.121B? Yes ___ **No X** ; if yes, describe:

III. Consistency

- A. Identify the current municipal comprehensive land use plan
Title: West Tisbury Community Development Plan Date: July 27, 2004
Title: Edgartown Community Development Plan, Date: July 30, 2004

- B. Describe the project's consistency with that plan with regard to:
- 1) Economic development: According to the West Tisbury Community Development Plan, future development should "encourage economic activity that is in harmony with the rural character of the town." Goals for economic development outlined in the Edgartown Community Development plan focus on encouraging more year round business and encouraging development that avoids the use of cars. Improving facilities at Martha's Vineyard Airport provides a means of reliable year-round transportation to the island. While vehicles can be brought to the island via ferry, further congesting the island roadways, transportation via air avoids this issue.
 - 2) Adequacy of infrastructure: Given that West Tisbury is one of just six towns that comprises Martha's Vineyard, much of the discussion pertaining to infrastructure is related to housing development, with transportation and commercial development discussions reserved for island-wide consideration. In regard to Edgartown's Community Development Plan, discussions around infrastructure focused on preventing urban sprawl with future development. Given the proposed projects are all located on Airport property, the projects are consistent with infrastructure goals for Edgartown.
 - 3) Open space impacts: The West Tisbury Community Development Plan identified various goals for open space including to protect water quality, increase open space, and maintain existing open space. Similarly, the Edgartown plan outlined goals to preserve open space and provide better access to conservation land. The proposed projects are located on Airport property and will not impact existing open space.
 - 4) Compatibility with adjacent land uses: The proposed projects are located on airport property and are consistent with existing land use. Adjacent land use includes rural development. Additionally, both Community Development Plans support the airport as one of the best locations for commercial development.

- C. Identify the current Regional Policy Plan of the applicable Regional Planning Agency (RPA)
RPA: Martha's Vineyard Commission

Title: Martha's Vineyard Commission Island Plan. Date: December 10, 2009

- D. Describe the project's consistency with that plan with regard to:
- 1) Economic development: Economic goals included in the Island Plan focus on increasing the year-round economy while supporting the existing seasonal tourism-driven economy. Improving facilities at the airport will support seasonal tourism by easing peak demand constraints. The project will support the year-round economy by accommodating year-round access to the island, and is thus consistent with the economic goals of the Island Plan.
 - 2) Adequacy of infrastructure: The goals outlined in the Island Plan pertaining to infrastructure include "promoting alternate modes of travel so the island is less dependent on private automobiles." Improving facilities at the airport will better accommodate existing and projected airport traffic, providing an alternative to vehicular travel.
 - 3) Open space impacts: The Island Plan proposed to increase open space protection and restore compromised areas. The project may reduce sandplain habitat but will occur on land dedicated to airport services and uses. Mitigation will minimize and compensate for impacts to the extent practicable. The Airport currently operates under a Habitat Management Plan that helps maintain the unique sandplain habitat at the Airport.

RARE SPECIES SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

- A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **rare species or habitat** (see 301 CMR 11.03(2))? **X Yes** ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

The projects will result in the conversion of 21.4 acres of Priority Habitat grassland (including 0.3 acres of Estimated Habitat) to impervious surface. There will be 11.4 acres of existing impervious surface within Priority Habitat (including 0.3 acres of Estimated Habitat) converted to grass. It is assumed there will be a take of state-listed plant species. The amount of the take has not yet been determined.

(NOTE: If you are uncertain, it is recommended that you consult with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) prior to submitting the ENF.)

- B. Does the project require any state permits related to **rare species or habitat**? **X Yes** ___ No
- D. Does the project site fall within mapped rare species habitat (Priority or Estimated Habitat?) in the current Massachusetts Natural Heritage Atlas (attach relevant page)? **X Yes** ___ No.
- D. If you answered "No" to all questions A, B and C, proceed to the **Wetlands, Waterways, and Tidelands Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Rare Species section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

- A. Does the project site fall within Priority or Estimated Habitat in the current Massachusetts Natural Heritage Atlas (attach relevant page)? **X Yes** ___ No. If yes,
1. Have you consulted with the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP)? **X Yes** ___ No; if yes, have you received a determination as to whether the project will result in the "take" of a rare species? ___ Yes **X No**; if yes, attach the letter of determination to this submission.
 2. Will the project "take" an endangered, threatened, and/or species of special concern in accordance with M.G.L. c.131A (see also 321 CMR 10.04)? **X Yes** ___ No; if yes, provide a summary of proposed measures to minimize and mitigate rare species impacts

Mitigation measures for rare species have yet to be determined, but will be developed in consultation with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program and other agencies. Mitigation may consist of habitat management measures in existing rare species habitat on airport property, habitat restoration on airport property, payments in lieu of formal mitigation, or other measures. In addition, there may be "surplus" mitigation from past airport projects which could be applied to this project.

3. Which rare species are known to occur within the Priority or Estimated Habitat?

Consultation with the NHESP in 2012 for the Master Plan Update identified 28 rare species potentially occurring at the Airport. Surveys for the rare species identified in the NHESP response were conducted by GZA in 2012, during which 21 of the species were observed. Observed species included three species of plants, two species of birds, Purple Tiger Beetle, and 15 species of moths. In 2017, GZA performed supplemental surveys for grassland areas of potential impact that were not originally included in the Master Plan Update. Populations of sandplain blue-eyed grass and papillose nut sedge were identified in the 2017 survey areas.

4. Has the site been surveyed for rare species in accordance with the Massachusetts

Endangered Species Act? **X Yes** ____ No

5. If your project is within Estimated Habitat, have you filed a Notice of Intent or received an Order of Conditions for this project? ____ Yes __X_ No; if yes, did you send a copy of the Notice of Intent to the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program, in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act regulations? ____ Yes ____ No

- B. Will the project "take" an endangered, threatened, and/or species of special concern in accordance with M.G.L. c.131A (see also 321 CMR 10.04)? **X Yes** ____ No; if yes, provide a summary of proposed measures to minimize and mitigate impacts to significant habitat:

Mitigation measures for rare species have yet to be determined, but will be developed in consultation with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program and other agencies. Mitigation may consist of habitat management measures in existing rare species habitat on airport property, habitat restoration on airport property, payments in lieu of formal mitigation, or other measures. In addition, there may be "surplus" mitigation from past airport projects which could be applied to this project.

WETLANDS, WATERWAYS, AND TIDELANDS SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **wetlands, waterways, and tidelands** (see 301 CMR 11.03(3))? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits (or a local Order of Conditions) related to **wetlands, waterways, or tidelands**? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Water Supply Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Wetlands, Waterways, and Tidelands Section below.

II. Wetlands Impacts and Permits

A. Does the project require a new or amended Order of Conditions under the Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. c.131A)? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, has a Notice of Intent been filed? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, list the date and MassDEP file number: ____; if yes, has a local Order of Conditions been issued? ____ Yes ____ No; Was the Order of Conditions appealed? ____ Yes ____ No. Will the project require a Variance from the Wetlands regulations? ____ Yes ____ No.

B. Describe any proposed permanent or temporary impacts to wetland resource areas located on the project site:

There are no impacts to wetland resources associated with the proposed projects. The only potentially jurisdictional wetland resource area is an isolated detention basin constructed in approximately 1998. No work is proposed within 100 feet of the detention basin.

C. Estimate the extent and type of impact that the project will have on wetland resources, and indicate whether the impacts are temporary or permanent:

<u>Coastal Wetlands</u>	<u>Area (square feet) or Length (linear feet)</u>	<u>Temporary or Permanent Impact?</u>
Land Under the Ocean	_____	_____
Designated Port Areas	_____	_____
Coastal Beaches	_____	_____
Coastal Dunes	_____	_____
Barrier Beaches	_____	_____
Coastal Banks	_____	_____
Rocky Intertidal Shores	_____	_____
Salt Marshes	_____	_____
Land Under Salt Ponds	_____	_____
Land Containing Shellfish	_____	_____
Fish Runs	_____	_____
Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage	_____	_____
<u>Inland Wetlands</u>		
Bank (If)	_____	_____
Bordering Vegetated Wetlands	_____	_____
Isolated Vegetated Wetlands	_____	_____
Land under Water	_____	_____
Isolated Land Subject to Flooding	_____	_____
Bordering Land Subject to Flooding	_____	_____
Riverfront Area	_____	_____

D. Is any part of the project:

1. proposed as a **limited project**? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, what is the area (in sf)? ____
2. the construction or alteration of a **dam**? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, describe:
3. fill or structure in a **velocity zone** or **regulatory floodway**? ____ Yes ____ No
4. dredging or disposal of dredged material? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, describe the volume of dredged material and the proposed disposal site:
5. a discharge to an **Outstanding Resource Water (ORW)** or an **Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC)**? ____ Yes ____ No
6. subject to a wetlands restriction order? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, identify the area (in sf):
7. located in buffer zones? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, how much (in sf) ____

E. Will the project:

1. be subject to a local wetlands ordinance or bylaw? ____ Yes ____ No
2. alter any federally-protected wetlands not regulated under state law? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, what is the area (sf)?

III. Waterways and Tidelands Impacts and Permits

A. Does the project site contain waterways or tidelands (including filled former tidelands) that are subject to the Waterways Act, M.G.L.c.91? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, is there a current Chapter 91 License or Permit affecting the project site? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, list the date and license or permit number and provide a copy of the historic map used to determine extent of filled tidelands:

C. Does the project require a new or modified license or permit under M.G.L.c.91? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, how many acres of the project site subject to M.G.L.c.91 will be for non-water-dependent use? Current ____ Change ____ Total ____
If yes, how many square feet of solid fill or pile-supported structures (in sf)?

C. For non-water-dependent use projects, indicate the following:

Area of filled tidelands on the site: N/A

Area of filled tidelands covered by buildings: N/A

For portions of site on filled tidelands, list ground floor uses and area of each use: N/A

Does the project include new non-water-dependent uses located over flowed tidelands?

Yes ____ **No X**

Height of building on filled tidelands: N/A

Also show the following on a site plan: Mean High Water, Mean Low Water, Water-dependent Use Zone, location of uses within buildings on tidelands, and interior and exterior areas and facilities dedicated for public use, and historic high and historic low water marks.

D. Is the project located on landlocked tidelands? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, describe the project's impact on the public's right to access, use and enjoy jurisdictional tidelands and describe measures the project will implement to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse impact:

D. Is the project located in an area where low groundwater levels have been identified by a municipality or by a state or federal agency as a threat to building foundations? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, describe the project's impact on groundwater levels and describe measures the project will implement to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse impact:

We are not aware of any "low groundwater levels" on site.

F. Is the project non-water-dependent **and** located on landlocked tidelands **or** waterways or tidelands subject to the Waterways Act **and** subject to a mandatory EIR? ☐ Yes **X No**;
(NOTE: If yes, then the project will be subject to Public Benefit Review and Determination.)

G. Does the project include dredging? ☐ Yes **X No**; if yes, answer the following questions:

What type of dredging? Improvement ☐ Maintenance ☐ Both ☐

What is the proposed dredge volume, in cubic yards (cys) _____

What is the proposed dredge footprint _____ length (ft) _____ width (ft) _____ depth (ft);

Will dredging impact the following resource areas?

Intertidal Yes ☐ No ☐; if yes, _____ sq ft

Outstanding Resource Waters Yes ☐ No ☐; if yes, _____ sq ft

Other resource area (i.e. shellfish beds, eel grass beds) Yes ☐ No ☐; if yes _____ sq ft

If yes to any of the above, have you evaluated appropriate and practicable steps to: 1) avoidance; 2) if avoidance is not possible, minimization; 3) if either avoidance or minimize is not possible, mitigation?

If no to any of the above, what information or documentation was used to support this determination?

Provide a comprehensive analysis of practicable alternatives for improvement dredging in accordance with 314 CMR 9.07(1)(b). Physical and chemical data of the sediment shall be included in the comprehensive analysis.

Sediment Characterization

Existing gradation analysis results? ☐ Yes ☐ No; if yes, provide results.

Existing chemical results for parameters listed in 314 CMR 9.07(2)(b)6? ☐ Yes ☐ No; if yes, provide results.

Do you have sufficient information to evaluate feasibility of the following management options for dredged sediment? If yes, check the appropriate option.

Beach Nourishment ☐

Unconfined Ocean Disposal ☐

Confined Disposal:

Confined Aquatic Disposal (CAD) ☐

Confined Disposal Facility (CDF) ☐

Landfill Reuse in accordance with COMM-97-001 ☐

Shoreline Placement ☐

Upland Material Reuse ☐

In-State landfill disposal ☐

Out-of-state landfill disposal ☐

(NOTE: This information is required for a 401 Water Quality Certification.)

IV. Consistency:

A. Does the project have effects on the coastal resources or uses, and/or is the project located within the Coastal Zone? **X Yes** ☐ No; if yes, describe these effects and the projects consistency with the policies of the Office of Coastal Zone Management:

The proposed project is located within the Massachusetts Coastal Zone, but due to its centralized location on the island, the project is not anticipated to have effects on coastal resources. There are no coastal resource areas under the jurisdiction of the Wetlands Protection Act on the airport.

B. Is the project located within an area subject to a Municipal Harbor Plan? ☐ Yes **X No**; if yes, identify the Municipal Harbor Plan and describe the project's consistency with that plan:

WATER SUPPLY SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **water supply** (see 301 CMR 11.03(4))? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

The proposed project is expected to result in an approximate 1,750 additional gallons per day (GPD) of water use, and therefore will not exceed review thresholds related to water supply.

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **water supply**? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Wastewater Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Water Supply Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe, in gallons per day (gpd), the volume and source of water use for existing and proposed activities at the project site:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Municipal or regional water supply	_____	_____	_____
Withdrawal from groundwater	_____	_____	_____
Withdrawal from surface water	_____	_____	_____
Interbasin transfer	_____	_____	_____

(NOTE: Interbasin Transfer approval will be required if the basin and community where the proposed water supply source is located is different from the basin and community where the wastewater from the source will be discharged.)

B. If the source is a municipal or regional supply, has the municipality or region indicated that there is adequate capacity in the system to accommodate the project? ____ Yes ____ No

C. If the project involves a new or expanded withdrawal from a groundwater or surface water source, has a pumping test been conducted? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, attach a map of the drilling sites and a summary of the alternatives considered and the results. _____

D. What is the currently permitted withdrawal at the proposed water supply source (in gallons per day)? _____ Will the project require an increase in that withdrawal? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, then how much of an increase (gpd)? _____

E. Does the project site currently contain a water supply well, a drinking water treatment facility, water main, or other water supply facility, or will the project involve construction of a new facility? ____ Yes ____ No. If yes, describe existing and proposed water supply facilities at the project site:

	<u>Permitted Flow</u>	<u>Existing Avg Daily Flow</u>	<u>Project Flow</u>	<u>Total</u>
Capacity of water supply well(s) (gpd)	_____	_____	_____	
Capacity of water treatment plant (gpd)	_____	_____	_____	

F. If the project involves a new interbasin transfer of water, which basins are involved, what is the direction of the transfer, and is the interbasin transfer existing or proposed?

G. Does the project involve:

of

1. new water service by the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority or other agency the Commonwealth to a municipality or water district? ____ Yes ____ No
2. a Watershed Protection Act variance? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, how many acres of alteration?
3. a non-bridged stream crossing 1,000 or less feet upstream of a public surface drinking water supply for purpose of forest harvesting activities? ____ Yes ____ No

III. Consistency

Describe the project's consistency with water conservation plans or other plans to enhance water resources, quality, facilities and services:

WASTEWATER SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **wastewater** (see 301 CMR 11.03(5))? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

The proposed project is expected to result in approximate 1,400 additional GPD of wastewater, and therefore will not exceed any review thresholds related to wastewater.

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **wastewater**? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Transportation -- Traffic Generation Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Wastewater Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe the volume (in gallons per day) and type of disposal of wastewater generation for existing and proposed activities at the project site (calculate according to 310 CMR 15.00 for septic systems or 314 CMR 7.00 for sewer systems):

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Discharge of sanitary wastewater	_____	_____	_____
Discharge of industrial wastewater	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____
	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Discharge to groundwater	_____	_____	_____
Discharge to outstanding resource water	_____	_____	_____
Discharge to surface water	_____	_____	_____
Discharge to municipal or regional wastewater facility	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL	_____	_____	_____

B. Is the existing collection system at or near its capacity? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, then describe the measures to be undertaken to accommodate the project's wastewater flows:

C. Is the existing wastewater disposal facility at or near its permitted capacity? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, then describe the measures to be undertaken to accommodate the project's wastewater flows:

D. Does the project site currently contain a wastewater treatment facility, sewer main, or other wastewater disposal facility, or will the project involve construction of a new facility? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, describe as follows:

	<u>Permitted</u>	<u>Existing Avg Daily Flow</u>	<u>Project Flow</u>	<u>Total</u>
Wastewater treatment plant capacity (in gallons per day)	_____	_____	_____	

E. If the project requires an interbasin transfer of wastewater, which basins are involved, what is the direction of the transfer, and is the interbasin transfer existing or new?

(NOTE: Interbasin Transfer approval may be needed if the basin and community where wastewater will be discharged is different from the basin and community where the source of water supply is located.)

F. Does the project involve new sewer service by the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) or other Agency of the Commonwealth to a municipality or sewer district? ____ Yes ____ No

G. Is there an existing facility, or is a new facility proposed at the project site for the storage, treatment, processing, combustion or disposal of sewage sludge, sludge ash, grit, screenings, wastewater reuse (gray water) or other sewage residual materials? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, what is the capacity (tons per day):

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Storage	_____	_____	_____
Treatment	_____	_____	_____
Processing	_____	_____	_____
Combustion	_____	_____	_____
Disposal	_____	_____	_____

H. Describe the water conservation measures to be undertaken by the project, and other wastewater mitigation, such as infiltration and inflow removal.

III. Consistency

A. Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with applicable state, regional, and local plans and policies related to wastewater management:

B. If the project requires a sewer extension permit, is that extension included in a comprehensive wastewater management plan? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, indicate the EEA number for the plan and whether the project site is within a sewer service area recommended or approved in that plan:

TRANSPORTATION SECTION (TRAFFIC GENERATION)

I. Thresholds / Permit

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **traffic generation** (see 301 CMR 11.03(6))? ____ Yes X No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

The proposed project includes the creation of a right turn only lane exiting Airport Road onto Edgartown-West Tisbury Road, but does not exceed thresholds related to traffic generation per 301 CMR 11.03(6). The project is intended to meet the existing and projected needs of the Airport and is not expected to increase the amount of traffic at the Airport. The increase in parking is intended to address a severe current shortage of parking at the Airport.

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **state-controlled roadways**? X Yes ____ No; if yes, specify which permit:

The proposed project may require an access permit, as the project would result in non-signalized modifications to the Airport entrance via a right-turn-only lane exiting Airport Road onto Edgartown-West Tisbury Road. The project is not expected to result in increases in traffic volumes.

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Roadways and Other Transportation Facilities Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Traffic Generation Section below.

II. Traffic Impacts and Permits

A. Describe existing and proposed vehicular traffic generated by activities at the project site:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Number of parking spaces	<u>369</u>	<u>549</u>	<u>918</u>
Number of vehicle trips per day	<u>1,300+-</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,300+-</u>
ITE Land Use Code(s):	<u>021*</u>	<u></u>	<u>021*</u>

* Also 022, 492, 640, 730, 899, and 931

B. What is the estimated average daily traffic on roadways serving the site?

<u>Roadway</u>	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. <u>Edgartown-West Tisbury Road</u>	<u>1,687</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,687</u>
2. <u>Barnes Road</u>	<u>No data</u>	<u>No data</u>	<u>No data</u>
3. <u>Airport Road</u>	<u>1,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,000</u>

C. If applicable, describe proposed mitigation measures on state-controlled roadways that the project proponent will implement:

No impacts are anticipated so no mitigation is proposed.

C. How will the project implement and/or promote the use of transit, pedestrian and bicycle facilities and services to provide access to and from the project site?

The existing ped/bike path along airport property will be retained. The airport will continue to serve as a Bus Hub.

C. Is there a Transportation Management Association (TMA) that provides transportation demand management (TDM) services in the area of the project site? ____ Yes X No; if yes, describe if and how will the project will participate in the TMA:

D. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation

facilities? X Yes No; if yes, generally describe:

Airport

- E. If the project will penetrate approach airspace of a nearby airport, has the proponent filed a Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission Airspace Review Form (780 CMR 111.7) and a Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) (CFR Title 14 Part 77.13, forms 7460-1 and 7460-2)?

It is not yet known whether any protected airport surfaces will be penetrated. The appropriate state and federal forms will be prepared and procedures followed as needed.

III. Consistency

Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with municipal, regional, state, and federal plans and policies related to traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities and services:

The Edgartown and West Tisbury Community Development Plans, prepared in 2004, have little on the subjects of traffic, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities. There are a few general statements, such as "Encourage use of public transportation." The Edgartown plan notes that issues like traffic are better addressed in island-wide planning.

The Martha's Vineyard Transportation Plan 2016-2040 is the regional transportation plan for the Vineyard and was prepared by the Martha's Vineyard Commission (the regional planning agency) and the Martha's Vineyard Joint Transportation Committee. The Transportation Plan includes the following sections pertaining to traffic, transit, pedestrian, or bicycle transportation facilities:

1. The Air Transportation section does not contain any objectives or proposed projects specifically pertaining to transit, pedestrian, or bicycle transportation facilities. The following long-term projects are proposed relating to traffic:
 - Construct General Aviation Terminal facilities, including vehicle parking areas and access roads
 - Construct airline and Connector Roads to reduce vehicle traffic at the intersection of Edgartown-West Tisbury Road and Barnes Road, and complete the inter-airport roadway system associated with the development of the airport business park and the terminal areas

The first of these is proposed in the form of increased vehicle parking and an expanded terminal. The second project is not currently in the Capital Improvement Plan, since the connector road would be in the runway approach.

2. The Buses and Taxis section identifies the airport as one of four "Bus Hubs" on the island. The objectives for this transportation mode are general, and include improving efficiency, encouraging growth in ridership, optimizing passenger facilities, providing efficient taxi service, and similar measures. The Transportation Plan contains no proposed projects related to the airport (other than signage). The projects proposed in this ENF are not directly targeted to bus or taxi service, but the terminal area improvements will improve traffic flow and reduce vehicle congestion in that area, which should result in more efficient bus and taxi service.
3. The Bicycles and Pedestrians section includes the general objective of promoting and facilitating walking and bicycling. It also includes the proposed action of addressing bicycle safety and access in the planning and design of airport and other projects. The pedestrian and bicycle trail along the airport will not be materially affect by the proposed projects. The airport will continue to be accessible by bicycle. Pedestrians are not expected to access the airport facilities on foot.

The Martha's Vineyard Commission also prepares the Martha's Vineyard Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The most recent TIP is a draft for federal fiscal years 2018-2022. The TIP addresses road, transit and multimodal projects, specifically multimodal paths, buses, road drainage, and road improvements. The TIP does not directly address airport or aviation activities or projects. Pedestrian/bicycle trails occur along the public roads adjacent to the airport, and may intersect the proposed terminal access road improvements. This will allow bicycle access to the airport facilities. No sidewalks are proposed along the airport access road, but people are not expected to access the airport on foot. The trails are not expected to be adversely affected by any of the proposed airport projects. For this reason, the proposed projects are assumed to be consistent with the State Bicycle Plan and State Pedestrian Plan.

TRANSPORTATION SECTION (ROADWAYS AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES)

I. Thresholds

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **roadways or other transportation facilities** (see 301 CMR 11.03(6))? X Yes **No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

A taxiway will be relocated and a new stub taxiway may be constructed, so the project may meet the threshold for new taxiways at 301 CMR 11.03(6)(b)4. The additional terminal area parking may exceed 300 spaces, exceeding the threshold at 301 CMR 11.03(6)(b)15.

The proposed project also includes approximately 17,500 square feet of renovation and approximately 15,000 square feet of expansion to the existing terminal building at the Airport, which do not exceed the thresholds at 301 CMR 11.03(6)(a)4 or 301 CMR 11.03(6)(b)7.

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **roadways or other transportation facilities**? X Yes **No**; if yes, specify which permit:

The proposed project may require an access permit, as the project would result in non-signalized modifications to the Airport entrance via a right-turn-only lane exiting Airport Road onto Edgartown-West Tisbury Road.

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Energy Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Roadways Section below.

II. Transportation Facility Impacts

A. Describe existing and proposed transportation facilities in the immediate vicinity of the project site:

The project is located at an airport. The airport also serves as a hub for bus services on the island.

B. Will the project involve any

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| 1. Alteration of bank or terrain (in linear feet)? | <u> none </u> |
| 2. Cutting of living public shade trees (number)? | <u> undetermined </u> |
| 3. Elimination of stone wall (in linear feet)? | <u> none </u> |

III. Consistency -- Describe the project's consistency with other federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities and services, including consistency with the applicable regional transportation plan and the Transportation Improvements Plan (TIP), the State Bicycle Plan, and the State Pedestrian Plan:

See the Land Section above for a description of the project's consistency with the transportation sections of local land use plans.

The Martha's Vineyard Transportation Plan 2016-2040 is the regional transportation plan for the Vineyard and was prepared by the Martha's Vineyard Commission (the regional planning agency) and the Martha's Vineyard Joint Transportation Committee. Chapter 7, Air Transportation, lists the following objectives for Martha's Vineyard Airport:

- Improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the airport facility as a transportation resource for the community.
- Improve the airport facilities in response to present needs and growing demand, with a priority on increasing ramp areas and hangars for airplane parking, and on ensuring adequate facilities to accommodate aviation activity.

The projects proposed here are intended to meet these broad objectives.

The Transportation Plan goes on to list specific short- and long-term proposed projects. Many of these are part of this proposed project list, including:

- Acquire/relocate existing hangars to provide increased apron space adjacent to terminal complex
- Construct... terminal facilities, including vehicle parking areas and access roads
- Air safety improvements
- Re-construct or add taxiways as appropriate
- Expand existing airline terminal building

The Martha's Vineyard Commission also prepares the Martha's Vineyard Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The most recent TIP is a draft for federal fiscal years 2018-2022. The TIP addresses road, transit and multimodal projects, specifically multimodal paths, buses, road drainage, and road improvements. The TIP does not directly address airport or aviation activities or projects. Pedestrian/bicycle trails and activity are addressed above in the Traffic Generation section.

ENERGY SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **energy** (see 301 CMR 11.03(7))? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **energy**? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Air Quality Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Energy Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe existing and proposed energy generation and transmission facilities at the project site:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Capacity of electric generating facility (megawatts)	_____	_____	_____
Length of fuel line (in miles)	_____	_____	_____
Length of transmission lines (in miles)	_____	_____	_____
Capacity of transmission lines (in kilovolts)	_____	_____	_____

B. If the project involves construction or expansion of an electric generating facility, what are:

1. the facility's current and proposed fuel source(s)?
2. the facility's current and proposed cooling source(s)?

C. If the project involves construction of an electrical transmission line, will it be located on a new, unused, or abandoned right of way? ____Yes ____No; if yes, please describe:

D. Describe the project's other impacts on energy facilities and services:

III. Consistency

Describe the project's consistency with state, municipal, regional, and federal plans and policies enhancing energy facilities and services:
for

AIR QUALITY SECTION

I. Thresholds

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **air quality** (see 301 CMR 11.03(8))? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to **air quality**? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Solid and Hazardous Waste Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Air Quality Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Does the project involve construction or modification of a major stationary source (see 310 CMR 7.00, Appendix A)? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, describe existing and proposed emissions (in tons per day) of:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Particulate matter	_____	_____	_____
Carbon monoxide	_____	_____	_____
Sulfur dioxide	_____	_____	_____
Volatile organic compounds	_____	_____	_____
Oxides of nitrogen	_____	_____	_____
Lead	_____	_____	_____
Any hazardous air pollutant	_____	_____	_____
Carbon dioxide	_____	_____	_____

B. Describe the project's other impacts on air resources and air quality, including noise impacts:

III. Consistency

A. Describe the project's consistency with the State Implementation Plan:

B. Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with other federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to air resources and air quality:

SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits

A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to **solid or hazardous waste** (see 301 CMR 11.03(9))? ☐ Yes ☒ **No**; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

C. Does the project require any state permits related to **solid and hazardous waste**?
☐ Yes ☒ **No**; if yes, specify which permit:

The proposed project includes renovating approximately 17,500 square feet of the existing terminal building and redeveloping the southwest apron, including removal of four existing hangars. These projects will require pre-demolition hazardous waste surveys. If hazardous materials are identified in the pre-demo surveys, a permit will be required for abatement prior to demolition.

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the **Historical and Archaeological Resources Section**. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Is there any current or proposed facility at the project site for the storage, treatment, processing, combustion or disposal of solid waste? ☐ Yes ☐ No; if yes, what is the volume (in tons per day) of the capacity:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Storage	_____	_____	_____
Treatment, processing	_____	_____	_____
Combustion	_____	_____	_____
Disposal	_____	_____	_____

B. Is there any current or proposed facility at the project site for the storage, recycling, treatment or disposal of hazardous waste? ☐ Yes ☐ No; if yes, what is the volume (in tons or gallons per day) of the capacity:

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Storage	_____	_____	_____
Recycling	_____	_____	_____
Treatment	_____	_____	_____
Disposal	_____	_____	_____

C. If the project will generate solid waste (for example, during demolition or construction), describe alternatives considered for re-use, recycling, and disposal:

D. If the project involves demolition, do any buildings to be demolished contain asbestos?
☐ Yes ☐ No

E. Describe the project's other solid and hazardous waste impacts (including indirect impacts):

III. Consistency

Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with the State Solid Waste Master Plan:

HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES SECTION

I. Thresholds / Impacts

A. Have you consulted with the Massachusetts Historical Commission? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, attach correspondence. For project sites involving lands under water, have you consulted with the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, attach correspondence

B. Is any part of the project site a historic structure, or a structure within a historic district, in either case listed in the State Register of Historic Places or the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, does the project involve the demolition of all or any exterior part of such historic structure? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, please describe:

There are only a few buildings over 50 years old on the airport and none have previously been determined to be eligible for the State or National Registers. Investigation is ongoing to determine their current eligibility.

C. Is any part of the project site an archaeological site listed in the State Register of Historic Places or the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth? ____ Yes **X No**; if yes, does the project involve the destruction of all or any part of such archaeological site? ____ Yes ____ No; if yes, please describe:

Most of the airport has been investigated and been found to either be not sensitive for archeological resources, or to lack such resources. Investigation is ongoing to determine whether resources may exist within project impact areas.

D. If you answered "No" to all parts of both questions A, B and C, proceed to the **Attachments and Certifications** Sections. If you answered "Yes" to any part of either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Historical and Archaeological Resources Section below.

II. Impacts

Describe and assess the project's impacts, direct and indirect, on listed or inventoried historical and archaeological resources:

No impacts to historical or archeological resources have been identified or are expected, but investigation is ongoing.

III. Consistency

Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to preserving historical and archaeological resources:

If any such resources are identified on the site, there will be coordination with FAA and the State Historic Preservation Office to determine effects and mitigation measures.

CERTIFICATIONS:



1. The Public Notice of Environmental Review has been/will be published in the following newspapers in accordance with 301 CMR 11.15(1):

(Name) The Vineyard Gazette (Date) 12/21/2018

(Name) The Martha's Vineyard Times (Date) 12/20/2018

2. This form has been circulated to Agencies and Persons in accordance with 301 CMR 11.16(2).

Signatures:

<u>11/12/18</u>		<u>12/12/18</u>	
Date	Signature of Responsible Officer or Proponent	Date	Signature of person preparing ENF (if different from above)

<u>Ann Richart</u>	<u>Jed Merrow</u>
Name (print or type)	Name (print or type)
<u>Martha's Vineyard Airport Commission</u>	<u>McFarland Johnson</u>
Firm/Agency	Firm/Agency
<u>71 Airport Road</u>	<u>53 Regional Drive</u>
Street	Street
<u>West Tisbury, MA 02575</u>	<u>Concord NH 03301</u>
Municipality/State/Zip	Municipality/State/Zip
<u>508-693-7022</u>	<u>603-225-2978</u>
Phone	Phone