

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

REPUBLIC AIRPORT REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) PUBLIC MEETING RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

Introduction

A public meeting regarding the proposed development of parcels at Republic Airport was held from 5:30 pm to 8:30 pm on Thursday, April 6, 2017 at Molloy College Suffolk Center, 7180 Republic Airport - Atrium Room, Farmingdale, New York. The subsequent comment period remained open through April 20, 2017.

This document summarizes and responds to the substantive oral and written comments relating to the proposed development at Republic Airport received during the public comment period.

Below is a summary of the RFP process. Section 1 identifies the organizations and individuals who provided comments. Section 2 contains a summary of the relevant comments and a response to each. These summaries convey the substance of the comments made, but do not necessarily quote the comments verbatim.

Summary of the RFP Process

The New York State Department of Transportation (“Department”) proposes to execute leases with Stratosphere Development Co. LLC (“Stratosphere”), an affiliate of Talon Air Inc. (“Talon”), for the development of five parcels at the Republic Airport (“Airport”) in the Town of Babylon, County of Suffolk, New York (“Project”). The Department is the fee owner of the Airport and seeks to enter into the leases to further promote, accommodate, and enhance general aviation and economic development at the Airport.

On February 9, 2016, the New York State Urban Development Corporation d/b/a Empire State Development (“ESD”) issued a Request for Proposals (“RFP”) on behalf of the Department for the development and long-term use of Parcels A, B, C, D and E at the Airport. Respondents could include the Echo Ramp and/or Delta Ramp as part of their proposal for Parcel C. Responses were due by April 15, 2016 at 2 p.m. A copy of the RFP is available at <https://esd.ny.gov/doing-business-ny/requests-proposals/republic-airport-development-parcels>.

The development objectives for the RFP were as follows:

- Maximize value to NYSDOT through monthly lease payments;
- Enhance Republic Airport as an economic engine for Long Island;
- Provide a source of quality jobs for area and New York State residents;
- Maximize incorporation of green building and sustainable design practices; and
- Feature meaningful participation of Minority-Owned Business Enterprises, Women-Owned Business Enterprises and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned-Businesses.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

The selection criteria for the RFP was as follows:

- **Financial Offer (30%):** Provision of competitive terms for the leasing of the proposed site.
- **Development Concept (25%):** Quality of proposal, design, sustainable building practices and use including consistency with allowed uses at the airport.
- **Respondent Qualifications (20%):** Experience, development skills and financial resources necessary to complete a high-quality project pursuant to the terms of the RFP.
- **Schedule and Timing (10%):** Proven ability to complete the project in a timely manner.
- **Employment Impact (5%):** Creation of construction and permanent on-site jobs and payroll. Indirect job creation through on-site job training programs may also be considered.
- **Economic Impact (5%):** Projected expenditures, construction costs, annual operating costs and other direct spending that will help spur economic activity. The impact of indirect spending that the project will generate and any applicable tax revenue.
- **Diversity Practices (5%):** Respondents to the RFP will be evaluated for Diversity Practices using the attached Diversity Practices Scoring Matrix (see Appendix J of the RFP). Up to 5 percent will be awarded based upon the contents of the Diversity Practices Questionnaire (see Appendix J of the RFP) submitted by each Respondent to the RFP.

By letter dated August 31, 2016, the Department conditionally designated Stratosphere as the developer of the Airport parcels A, B, C (inclusive of the Echo Ramp) and D and entered into a term sheet for such parcels. Parcel E was initially conditionally designated to another developer, but that initial bidder/developer failed to provide the required non-refundable good faith deposit for such parcel which was required under the RFP and subsequently also did not sign the conditional designation letter (P.6 of the RFP). Thereafter, by letter dated November 10, 2016, Stratosphere was conditionally designated as the developer for Parcel E and entered into a term sheet for such parcel. Pursuant to the designation letters, the Department agreed to negotiate exclusively with Stratosphere towards the execution of leases for the parcels pending completion of the Department's review and determination under the State Environmental Quality Review Act ("SEQRA").

Stratosphere provides fixed base operator ("FBO") services at Republic Airport, which include the storage, maintenance, and temporary housing of small to mid-sized personal, charter, and corporate planes and jets. The Project will accommodate the organic growth of Stratosphere's existing operations at the Airport currently located in Hangars 6 and 7. Stratosphere has proposed to use the parcels subject to the proposed leases, generally, as follows:

- Parcel A – construction of a 57,600 square-foot storage hangar and maintenance facility, as well as additional parking spaces.
- Parcel B – construction of a 67,356 square-foot hangar with FBO/office/support areas.
- Parcel C – demolition of an abandoned restaurant and construction of an aircraft parking ramp area. No additional construction is proposed for the Echo Ramp.
- Parcel D – construction of a general aviation ramp and tie-down area to support the relocation of small aircraft currently located at the existing Echo Ramp.
- Parcel E – construction of a general aviation ramp and T-hangars for general aviation purposes as well as a tie-down area.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

The Department held two public meetings on the Project. The first public hearing occurred on March 2, 2017. At the March 2, 2017 meeting, the public was permitted to ask questions. Those questions and answers were then published on Republic Airport's website. Thereafter, a second public meeting occurred on April 6, 2017 at Republic Airport from 5:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. Although public comments were finished prior to 8:30 p.m., the meeting was held open until 8:30 p.m. Written comments were accepted until April 20, 2017. The Department considered these comments during its review of the Project and has consolidated and addressed them below.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Section 1: List of Elected Officials, Organizations, and Individuals Who Commented

ELECTED OFFICIALS

1. John E. Brooks, New York State Senator – 8th Senate District - oral comment (Brooks)

LOCAL AGENCIES

2. Frank Nocerino, Chair, Republic Airport Commission - oral comment (Nocerino)
3. Tom Dolan, Town of Babylon Industrial Development Agency - oral comment (Dolan)

INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

4. Scott Warantz, UFC Gym - oral comment (Warantz)
5. Kevin Mauro, Talon Air - oral comment (Mauro)
6. Eric Zeller - oral comment (Zeller)
7. Jim Brundige - oral comment (Brundige)
8. John Ramsen - oral comment (Ramsen)
9. Jay Baron, Talon Air - oral comment (Baron)
10. Peter Byrne, Talon Air - oral comment (Byrne)
11. Greg Zucker, Talon Air, Stratosphere - oral comment (Zucker)
12. Frank D'Angelone, Talon Air - oral comment (D'Angelone)
13. Erik Pike - oral comment (Pike)
14. Andy Hall, Talon Air - oral comment (Hall)
15. Mike Freedberg, Suffolk Industrial Properties - oral comment (Freedberg)
16. Helen Norjen, Woodland Civic Association - oral and written comment (Norjen)
17. Nancy Schliwka, Woodland Civic Association - oral and written comment (Schliwka)
18. Leonard Kirsch, Esq. - oral comment (Kirsch)
19. Michael Canders, Farmingdale State College of Aviation - oral comment (Canders)
20. Jessica Santangelo - oral comment (Santangelo)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

21. Patricia Furino - oral comment (Furino)
22. Rob Forrier, Dynaire Corporation - oral comment (Forrier)
23. Pat Burns - oral comment (Burns)
24. Marc Saffren, Patient Airlift Services - oral comment (Saffren)
25. Paul Pilipshen, American Power Museum - oral comment (Pilipshen)
26. Julia Blum - oral comment (Blum)
27. Michael Meehan, W.B. Mason - oral comment (Meehan)
28. John Lisi, Daniel Street Civic Association - oral comment (Lisi)
29. Denis Garbo, Lighthouse Point Civic Association - oral comment (Garbo)
30. Kevin Lareche - oral comment (Lareche)
31. Edward Thompson, Molloy College - oral comment (Thompson)
32. Linda Berke - oral comment (Berke)
33. Adam Katz, Talon Air - oral comment (Katz)
34. Diane Radner - oral comment (Radner)
35. Alissa Sue Taff, President, Civic Association of Sweet Hollow Incorporated - oral comment (Taff)
36. John Copobianco, Trustee, Farmingdale Board of Education - oral comment (Copobianco)
37. Tina Diamond, President, Concerned Citizens Association of Farmingdale - oral comment (Diamond)
38. Mike Schaeffer - oral comment (Schaeffer)
39. Anonymous - written comment (Anonymous)
40. Sean Brady - written comment (Brady)
41. Glen Radovich, Executive Vice President, Insight Companies, Inc. - written comment (Radovich)
42. Doug Aloise on behalf of Republic Airport Civic Coalition for Integrity and Compliance - written comment (Aloise)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

43. Nancy Schliwka and Helen Norjen on behalf of Woodland Civic Association - written comment (Schliwka; Norjen)
44. Nancy Cypser - written comment (Cypser)
45. Kevin S. Law, President & CEO, Long Island Association - written comment (Law)
46. Frances Orlando, Executive Board Member, N. Lindenhurst Civic Association - written comment (Orlando)
47. The Republic Airport Civic Coalition for Integrity and Compliance – written comment (RACCIC)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Section 2: Comments and Responses

A. General

Comment 1: The community has received no specific information indicating an environmental review was in progress. (Schliwka; Norjen on behalf of Woodland Civic Association, written comment)

Response 1: Stratosphere submitted a full Environmental Assessment Form (EAF) for the Project to the Department on January 12, 2017. The Department held an information public meeting to discuss Stratosphere's Project on March 2, 2017. The meeting was publicized (see below for list of publications). During the meeting, a slideshow presentation was given of the proposed project and the public had an opportunity to ask questions to ESD and the proponent – Stratosphere Development LLC. In addition to notifying the Republic Airport Commission of the meeting, information on the meeting was sent on February 15, 2017 to the following media outlets with a request to post in their Calendar of Events sections: Farmingdale Observer, South Bay Neighbor/Neighbor News, Newsday Long Island Events, Long Island Business News, The Long Islander, Amityville Record, Massapequa Post, Beacon, Long Island Business News, Long Island Wins, Bilingual News, Notica Long Island, La Tribuna Hispana and Airport Metro News. Following the meeting, ESD and the Department prepared a response to questions raised at the meeting, which was made available on the Republic Airport website. The slideshow presentation providing the details of the proposed project was also posted on the Republic Airport website. A second meeting was held on April 6, 2017 to accept public comments on Stratosphere's Project. Notice of the meeting was published in *Newsday* and on the Department's and ESD's websites, and was provided to local civic groups and elected officials. The public also had an opportunity to provide written comments until April 20, 2017.

Comment 2: More public meetings are needed and should be scheduled at times that will allow more people to attend. (Kirsch, p. 44; Burns, p. 56; Blum, p. 63; Lisi, pp. 65-66)

Response 2: See Introduction and Response A(1). Two public meetings were held to discuss and accept comments on the proposed project. At the April 6, 2017, public meeting, although public comments were finished prior to 8:30 p.m., the meeting was held open until 8:30 p.m., and a written comment period was held open thereafter until April 20, 2017.

Comment 3: Questions from the previous public meeting have not been addressed. The public was not given notice that responses to questions were available. (Kirsch, p. 44; Blum, p. 61; Lisi, p. 66)

Response 3: See Introduction and Response A(1). As indicated by ESD at the March 2, 2017 meeting, responses to the questions raised at the March 2, 2017 meeting were posted on the Republic Airport website.

Comment 4: There was a lack of transparency during the RFP process (Taff, p. 84; Brady)

Response 4: As described within the Introduction, the RFP was advertised publicly, and proposals were scored in accordance with the selection criteria provided in the RFP. The RFP process was conducted in accordance with all applicable State procurement laws.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 5: The procedures used during the bidding process were improper. The State rescinded the designation letter to the original developer. The economic value of other proposals was 4-5 times greater than Talon's proposal (Brady).

Response 5: See Introduction. The process was consistent New York State law and procurement guidelines. Parcel E was initially conditionally designated to another developer, but that initial bidder failed to meet the provisions required in the RFP.

Comment 6: The Department is ignoring legislation designating parcels for non-aviation or aviation use. (Schliwka, p.43; Burns, p. 56)

Response 6: Aviation use at the airport is consistent with the initial deed for Republic Airport dated May 6, 1971 by and between the United States of America and the Metropolitan Transportation Authority, which provides, among other things: (i) the property was conveyed for airport purposes (*see* Deed at p. 3); (ii) the grantee will use the property interest for airport purposes (*see id.* at p. 3, paragraph 1); (iii) any subsequent transfers of the property interest shall be subject to all of the covenants, conditions and limitations contained in the deed (*see id.* at p. 4, paragraph 5); (iv) the grantee will not erect or permit the erection of structures or facilities which would materially interfere with the use, operation or future development of the airport (*see id.* at p. 6, paragraph 9); (v) the grantee agrees, for itself and all future successors and assigns, that such airport, together with all appurtenant areas, buildings and facilities, whether or not on the land being conveyed, will be operated as a public airport (*see id.* at p. 7-8, paragraph 11); and (vi) in the event the grantee (or its successors or assigns) fails to comply with the foregoing, the land shall automatically revert to the United States of America (*see id.* at p. 3 and p. 4, paragraph 2). It is also consistent with the FAA's rules, regulations and procedures. The FAA expects that airport land will be used for aviation purposes, and if there is a request for aviation use for land at an airport, the land should be used for aviation purposes. The grant agreements between the DOT and the FAA contain an assurance that the DOT, as the airport sponsor, will provide reasonable access to the airport for aeronautical uses. In addition, some of the parcels are in close proximity to areas subject to Air Traffic Control Tower control (movement areas and safety areas) at Republic Airport.

The FAA's rules and regulations mandate (for safety reasons) that there be height restrictions as to how high buildings and structures can be built in the proximity of these areas. The terms "non-aviation use" and "aviation use" are planning terms that are used on the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) for the Airport. It is common for areas designated with these terms to change in response to evolving airport needs.

B. Environment

Comment 1: Considering the scale and impact of this development plan on the community, there should be a comparison done between the EIS and the development plan. If it's not planned to do a comparison, reconsideration of a comparison should be given. (Schliwka, p. 43)

Response 1: The Department will determine the appropriate level of environmental review in accordance with New York State law and the criteria established within the Department's implementing regulations found at 17 NYCRR Part 15. It is not clear from the comment what the purpose or benefit would be of conducting a comparison between the current proposed Project and an Environmental Impact Statement ("EIS") done for another project. At this time, the Department has received an Environmental Assessment Form ("EAF") and

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

various other environmental site and project data, and will analyze the magnitude, importance, and significance of potential impacts based upon the facts and merits of the development proposal. As part of its review, the Department will determine whether there is a need for an EIS pursuant to SEQRA and the Department's aforementioned implementing regulations. A federal environmental review process will also be undertaken, for which the Federal Aviation Administration ("FAA") will determine the appropriate level of environmental review, and the need for preparation of an EIS will be assessed by the FAA in accordance with its established rules under the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA").

Comment 2: Talon Fuel Farm was not included in a prior Environmental Assessment. (Norjen, p. 40)

Response 2: The fuel farm operated by Stratosphere is not part of the proposed parcel development covered by this procurement. The fuel farm was a separate tenant enhancement that was subject to a lengthy and comprehensive environmental review process prior to construction. On March 15, 2012, Stratosphere applied to become a fixed base operator, which included the operation of a fuel farm. By letter dated September 24, 2015, the Department authorized Stratosphere to commence FBO operations. By letter dated April 19, 2013, the Department issued a Notice of SEQRA Negative Declaration with respect to Stratosphere's fuel farm (*i.e.*, a Notice of Determination of Non-Significance for the purpose of Article 8 of the Environmental Conservation Law).

Comment 3: An Environmental Impact Statement should be considered during development because an EA does not provides a sufficient opportunity for public involvement. (Norjen, p. 40; Schliwka, p.43)

Response 3: See responses to Comments A(2) and B(1). The Department, as lead agency, applies the criteria set forth in the Department's regulations at 17 NYCRR Part 15.11 to determine whether an action may have a significant effect on the environment and whether an EIS is required. Based on the Department's environmental assessment of these criteria, the information submitted by Stratosphere, and comments from the public, the Department will make a determination whether the proposed Project may have a significant environmental effect requiring an EIS. Additionally, the FAA will review the project under NEPA to determine whether a federal EIS is needed.

Comment 4: An EIS is needed to study cumulative impacts, including past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions and the theoretical maximum build-out of the airport. (Norjen, p. 40)

Response 4: See responses to Comments B(1) and B(3) above. The Department will evaluate whether there is a need for the preparation of an EIS in accordance with the respective criteria set forth at 17 NYCRR Part 15.11, including the criteria regarding potential cumulative impacts.

Comment 5: There is a strong smell from aviation fuel at the airport. (Radner, p. 81)

Response 5: There are no significant quantities of fuel storage proposed as part of the proposed Project. Potential emissions and air quality impacts are considered as part of the overall environmental review process. The tanks are routinely inspected and there have not been leaks or other breaches identified. The installed tanks were not only inspected, reviewed, and certified by DOT engineers, but third party, independent engineers and inspectors from Homeland Security. The tanks also comply with FAA and National Fire Prevention Association standards.

Comment 6: With consideration being given to the balance of economics and quality of life, Talon's specific development proposal is environmentally-sensitive. (Thomas, p. 70)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 6: Comment noted. If potential significant adverse environmental impacts are identified, the SEQRA process provides for the balancing of environmental effects with social, economic, and other essential considerations as part of agency findings and decision-making.

C. Vehicle Traffic

Comment 1: There is a concern regarding the exacerbation of vehicle traffic in the immediate area of the proposed development. Route 110 is a very small road. (Radner, p.81)

Response 1: The Airport property is located between New York State Route 110 to the west and New York State Route 109 and the Southern State Parkway to the south. The first two of these three roadways are major state arterials that provide six and four through travel lanes, respectively. The Southern State Parkway is a controlled access freeway that provides four through travel lanes in the vicinity of the Airport. Access to the Airport is provided directly from New York State Route 109 via Seversky Road and New York State Route 110 via Grumman Lane.

Given that the nature of the operations after implementation of the proposed Project will be similar to those of Stratosphere's and Talon's existing operations, the increases in peak hour vehicle traffic can be estimated directly from the relative increase in employment and the existing peak hour traffic levels. Stratosphere's RFP response provided that Talon, Stratosphere and their respective affiliates have approximately a total of 179 employees and/or positions at the Airport. As indicated in the RFP, a total of 240 new jobs are anticipated as a result of the proposed action.

Stratosphere performed a Traffic Analysis to assess current traffic levels at access points around the Airport. Based on peak period traffic counts performed at Talon's existing operations, and applying a factor based on number of anticipated new jobs as compared to existing jobs, the number of new peak period trips was estimated. The estimated number of new trips (all combined entering and exiting trips) are 53 during the weekday a.m. peak hour, 43 during the weekday p.m. peak hour and 10 during the Saturday peak hour. This increase is modest and represents an average of less than one new trip per minute during the peak hour due to the Project. Additionally, these trips will arrive and depart the Airport using one of two routes--via Grumman Lane to New York State Route 110 or via Seversky Road to New York State Route 109. Based on existing traffic patterns, it is expected that the majority of this traffic will arrive and leave via Seversky Road and NY 109.

The Traffic Analysis concluded that Airport's internal roadways, access points and the adjacent roadways serving the airport can easily accommodate the additional nominal level of traffic that may be generated by the Project.

D. Noise/Aviation

Comment 1: Prior statements made indicating that commercial use of the airport is not currently being contemplated, fails to assure the community regarding the possible future use. (Garbo, p. 68)

Response 1: The proposed Project does not authorize any development to accommodate larger commercial planes. In accordance with the RFP, the taxi lanes and aircraft maneuvering areas on the proposed lease parcels will be designed for the same FAA Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A spatial width requirements for obstacle clearance as the existing general aviation areas for the Airplane Design Group

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

at the Airport. Moreover, there are no proposed changes to the size or alignment of any runways at the Airport. Stratosphere's future operations will continue to utilize similarly-sized aircraft as those in its current operations.

Comment 2: In regard to the topic of commercial use, there is belief that the considerable improvements being made in the infrastructure that surrounds the airport is more than coincidental. (Garbo, p. 68)

Response 2: The comment does not identify the specific improvement projects to which the commenter refers. To the extent infrastructure improvements are being made in the surrounding community outside of the Airport parcels subject to the RFP, those improvements are not part, nor are they being conducted in coordination with the environmental process for the proposed Project.

Comment 3: In order to ease the minds of citizens, language should be included in the proposal stating that commercial aviation will be forever precluded at Republic Airport. (Garbo, p. 68)

Response 3: See response to Comment D(1). The purpose of the Department's review is to evaluate the potential impacts of Stratosphere's proposal. The proposed Project does not authorize improvements designed to accommodate commercial flights.

Comment 4: There is a concern about nighttime flights. (Santangelo, p. 49)

Response 4: See response to Comment D(12).

Comment 5: Talon Air will never have 121 commercial flights. (Zucker, p. 33)

Response 5: The commenter is referring to commercial flights as defined in Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 121 - scheduled air carrier (airliners). Comment noted.

Comment 6: The applicant, Stratosphere, pledged that it will not schedule air carrier operations at Republic Airport. (Katz, p. 76)

Response 6: Comment noted.

Comment 7: Because of its fundamental requirements, New York State prohibited air carrier operations from Stratosphere's application. (Katz, p. 76)

Response 7: Comment noted.

Comment 8: An assumption can be made that airplane traffic is going to worsen. (Radner, p. 81)

Response 8: Stratosphere's operation is tailored to accommodate aircraft that operate and are projected to operate at the Airport and its business is structured to service aircraft that are operating at the Airport. Currently, Stratosphere services¹ approximately five to six aircraft per day that arrive and depart from the Airport. These 5 to 6 aircraft could easily be served by the other FBOs at the Airport.

¹ Service or servicing refers to ground handling of aircraft for the purposes of fueling, maintaining, or general catering to the operational needs of the aircraft user.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Prior to Stratosphere becoming an FBO, those 5 to 6 aircraft were serviced by one of the other FBOs at the Airport.

Although the majority of Stratosphere's business model is designed to serve aircraft operating at the Airport, some modest induced growth in aircraft operations could be anticipated from this development. Recently, Stratosphere has entered into aircraft maintenance and servicing agreements that could result in some aircraft utilizing Republic that normally would not have used the Airport.

As a result of the recent maintenance and servicing agreements, Stratosphere attracts approximately six new aircraft operations² per year that would not have operated at the Airport without Stratosphere. Currently, approximately 210,000 annual operations occur at the Airport, based on FAA data. With the six aircraft operations attracted by Stratosphere, this equates to approximately 0.003 percent (6 operations/210,000 total operations). It is anticipated that Stratosphere's proposal will be operational by 2020 at which time annual operations at the Airport will be approximately 212,000. At that time, Stratosphere anticipates being able to attract 10 new aircraft operations per year that would not have operated from the Airport without Stratosphere's facility. This equates to 0.005 percent of the total operations at the Airport (10 operations/212,000 total operations), or approximately one aircraft operation per month.

This induced growth would be in addition to the aircraft that Stratosphere normally services and that would normally use the Airport anyway. At full build-out in 2020, Stratosphere estimates that it will be able to service 10-12 aircraft per day over the next one to two years, 15 aircraft per day in three to five years, and 20 aircraft per day after five years. These are mostly aircraft that would use the Airport. The induced growth would be an additional aircraft per month that Stratosphere would be able to attract.

Comment 9: According to the information received today at the 4/6/17 public meeting, there will be an increase in the amount of loud jets that are flying to the airport. (Santangelo, p. 48)

Response 9: See responses to Comment D(1) and D(8). Although there will be a modest increase in the number of planes serviced by Stratosphere that are not already based at the Airport, it is not anticipated that the small increase in the number of flight operations (actual takeoffs and landings), which are nominal when compared with the total aircraft operations at the Airport, will cause an increase in noise levels that are incompatible with surrounding uses in the community.

Comment 10: There is a concern about an increase in charter flights. (Burns, p. 55)

Response 10: Stratosphere does not provide scheduled charter operations. See responses to Comments D(1) and D(8).

Comment 11: There is concern regarding commercial use of the airport due to airplane noise, potential damage to homes and quality of life issues. (Berke, p. 71-73)

Response 11: See response to Comments D(1), D(8), D(9) and D(12). The proposed Project does not authorize developments to accommodate scheduled commercial flights.

² Aircraft Operation: a landing or a takeoff by an aircraft. Assuming an aircraft that arrives at the Airport would at some point depart, each aircraft would result in two operations – a landing and a takeoff.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 12: The level of airplane noise in the vicinity disrupts social engagements and the area is unable to support the incredible amount of air traffic. (Rader, p. 80; Berke, p.72)

Response 12: See response to Comment D(8). A noise analysis was prepared evaluating the potential change in noise levels (referred to as contours), based on the projected increase in the total aircraft operations (takeoffs and landings) at the Airport resulting from the proposed action. Stratosphere utilized the FAA's Area Equivalent Method ("AEM") to determine if any change in the existing noise contours would occur as a result of the Project. The AEM uses calculations to estimate the change in the 65 DNL noise contour area. DNL is the standard metric used by the FAA and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for identifying noise impacts. Levels that exceed 65, 70, and 75 DNL are considered incompatible with residential, commercial, and industrial uses, respectively. The FAA identifies a 17 percent increase in the noise contour area as a significant increase that could result in a DNL 1.5 dBA or greater increase in noise exposure, which would then trigger the need for further noise analyses. The AEM was used to compare the Future 2020 No-Build³ vs. the Future 2020 Build⁴.

Based on an increase of 6 aircraft operations (takeoffs and landings) as a result of the Project, and assuming a worst-case scenario using one of the loudest types of aircraft that can be operated at the Airport, the Noise Analysis concluded that there will be no increase in the total acreage of the 65 DNL noise contour area, and therefore, no exceedance of the 17% threshold that would trigger additional studies.

Comment 13: In comparison to years ago, the amount of airplanes and airplane noise has worsened. (Taff, p. 85; Berke, p. 71-72)

Response 13: See responses to Comment D(8) and D(12).

Comment 14: The statistics provided regarding the percentage of flights currently attributed to Stratosphere, are erroneous because they are .3% as opposed to the reported .003%. (Santangelo, p.48)

Response 14: See response to Comment D(8). Currently, approximately 210,000 annual operations occur at the Airport, based on FAA data. With the six aircraft operations (actual takeoffs and landings) attracted by Stratosphere, this equates to approximately 0.003 percent (6 operations/210,000 total operations). It is anticipated that Stratosphere's proposal will be operational by 2020 at which time annual operations at the Airport will be approximately 212,000. At that time, Stratosphere anticipates being able to attract 10 new aircraft operations per year that would not have operated from the Airport without Stratosphere's facility. This equates to 0.005 percent of the total operations at the Airport (10 operations/212,000 total operations), or approximately one aircraft operation per month.

This induced growth would be in addition to the aircraft that Stratosphere normally services and that would normally come to the Airport anyway. At full build-out in 2020, Stratosphere estimates that it will be able to service 10-12 aircraft per day over the next one to two years, 15 aircraft per day in three to five years, and 20 aircraft per day after five years.

Comment 15: There must be a balance struck between jobs/economic growth and mitigation of airplane noise. (Santangelo, p. 49)

³ No-Build: This pertains to an assumption that the proposed project is not built in the future (year 2020).

⁴ Build: This pertains to an assumption that the project is built in the future (year 2020).

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 15: See Introduction and responses to Comments D(1), D(2), D(3), D(8), D(12), and E(1).

Comment 16: Of primary concern is the introduction of commercial flights and an additional 15 flights landing at the airport daily. (Berke, p. 72)

Response 16: See responses to Comments D(1), D(2), D(3), D(8), D(12), and D(14).

Comment 17: While being supportive of jobs/economic growth; there is the concern of planning around airplane noise for home visits during retirement stage of life and the potential for new incidence of cracking of kitchen walls in homes. (Berke, p. 72)

Response 17: See Introduction and Comments to D(1), D(2), D(3), D(8), D(9), D(12), D(14), and E(1).

Comment 18: While accomplishing the expansion of jobs and the solicitation of new business for the area, there is a request that planes fly a different flight path and that the size of the planes flying overhead be limited. (Berke, p. 72)

Response 18: See responses to Comments D(1), D(8), D(9), and D(12). There are no proposed changes to the locations of any runways or flight paths for arriving or departing aircraft. Stratosphere's future operations will continue to utilize similarly-sized aircraft as those in its current operations and no commercial flights are proposed.

E. Community Character

Comment 1: Residents living in the surrounding areas of the airport have no interest in and do not want an increase in incoming and outbound flights at Republic Airport. (Orlando, written comment; Radovich, written comment)

Response 1: The increase to incoming and outgoing flights will be minor, see response to Comment D(8).

Comment 2: There is concern that the development may impact events such as the annual air show, including the Blue Angels. (Burns, p. 55)

Response 2: The Project is consistent with the use of the Airport and will not conflict with current or proposed operations, in addition to special events. All planning associated with the buildings and facilities included in Stratosphere's proposal have been designed in accordance with current FAA design standards. During the engineering phase, Stratosphere will coordinate the design effort with both Republic Airport management and with the FAA to ensure that there are no conflicts with normal airport operations or planned special events.

Comment 3: The project will not generate tax revenues and will not benefit the community. (Copobianco, p. 88; Diamond, p. 90)

Response 3: See Introduction. The proposed development will enhance the Airport as an economic engine for Long Island and bring jobs to the Airport and the surrounding community.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 4: A 25-year master plan is needed that considers other aspects of community development. (Copobianco, p. 89)

Response 4: See Introduction regarding the RFP process.

F. Safety

Comment 1: The Department should take into account the fact that the Airport is used to bring in supplies in emergency situations (*e.g.* Superstorm Sandy). (Furino, pp. 52-53)

Response 1: The proposed development will not constrain the ability of the Airport to accommodate aircraft operations during normal activity or emergency situations. In fact, the proposed development could potentially support emergency response activity by providing additional aircraft parking ramp space and additional aircraft servicing capabilities.

Comment 2: There is a general concern about safety of the community from flights. (Berke, p. 73)

Response 2: See response to Comment D(8). Stratosphere is required to comply with all applicable federal, state, and local safety standards.

G. RFP Process

Comment 1: There are concerns regarding transparency; the RFP process and its award; and how New York State is handling the project process. (Kirsch, p. 44; Lisi, p. 66)

Response 1: Comment noted. The RFP process followed New York State procurement protocols;

Comment 2: The assurances received of there being no commercial flights at the airport and the RFP award is in question because the State and agencies are not disclosing future plans for the airport. (Lisi, p. 66-67)

Response 2: There are no development plans to accommodate 121 scheduled commercial flights at Republic Airport.

Comment 3: The RFP was posted inconspicuously on Republic Airport's website which resulted in fewer views. (Lisi, p. 66)

Response 3: The RFP was advertised in the New York State Contract Reporter and the ESD website. In addition, there was a press release on the RFP and several articles appeared in Newsday regarding the solicitation during the procurement.

Comment 4: As has been portrayed by DOT and ESD, the April 30, 2015 meeting was not community outreach for the current RFP. The community meetings held in 2015 were held to address the prior RFP, dated March 23, 2015, which included a proposal for commercial service. (Taff, p. 84; Schliwka; Norjen on behalf of Woodland Civic Association, written comment)

Response 4: Comment noted.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 5: The manner in which Talon was designated seems improper, given the campaign contributions that were made. (Cypser, written comment; Brady, written comment)

Response 5: The designation process followed New York State procurement protocols; was the subject of a published RFP; and was evaluated in strict adherence to publicly released scoring criteria.

Comment 6: Because developers, civic associations, and the Republic Airport Commission were not notified, State law was violated when the RFP process was terminated and awarded to Talon Air. (Brady, written comment)

Response 6: The RFP process was not terminated. Moreover, the conditional designation under the current RFP complies with applicable State procurement law.

Comment 7: Pursuant to State law, at the conclusion of the evaluation period, an announcement of NYS DOT's designation(s) must be posted on NYSDOT's website and all prospective developers must be offered the opportunity to attend a briefing; however, no notice was given. (Brady, written comment)

Response 7: See response to Comment G(6). DOT will announce the designation and provide a briefing opportunity for Respondents who were not awarded a contract through this process at the time of award.

Comment 8: After an initial developer was designated, a different developer received a designation letter from the State of New York. (Brady, written comment)

Response 8: Both the 2015 NYSDOT Airport Operations/Management RFP and the 2016 NYSESD Parcel Development RFP for Republic Airport followed New York State procurement laws. Parcel E was initially conditionally designated to another developer under the NYSESD procurement process, but that initial bidder failed to meet the provisions required in the RFP Introduction. As a result, the State moved onto the second highest scoring respondent.

Comment 9: DOT should not have entered into a contract with a different developer after a qualified developer was designated. (Brady, written comment)

Response 9: See response to Comment G(8).

Comment 10: The Talon/Stratosphere response to the February 2016 RFP was 476 pages in length, and consisted of appraisals, milestone schedules, economist reports, schematics and renderings. (Zucker, p. 32)

Response 10: Comment noted.

Comment 11: After reviewing the two responses to the RFP, the merits of the decision making process are in question and the degree to which economic impact played a role because it appears that the only beneficiaries are Talon Air and the Governor. (Schaeffer, p. 92-93)

Response 11: The proposal from Stratosphere will create 73 direct aviation-related jobs and 226 construction jobs. The proposal will also generate approximately \$1 million in annual revenue to

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

support the operation of Republic Airport, eliminating the required subsidy, and allow the airport to reinvest in Long Island's future.

H. Talon Air

Comment 1: There is no concern regarding Talon Air and the airport, but there is concern around quality of life issues. (Berke, p. 72)

Response 1: Comment noted.

Comment 2: Talon Air, a family oriented company, provides employment opportunities and careers for approximately 170 people. (Katz, p. 74)

Response 2: Comment noted.

Comment 3: Talon Air provides services that are important for the people of the community and for its employees. (Katz, p. 75)

Response 3: Comment noted.

Comment 4: Development at the airport is needed in order for Talon Air to expand and for opportunity to grow for the community. (Mauro, p. 22; Hall, p. 37; Katz, p. 75)

Response 4: Comment noted.

Comment 5: Talon Air has provided a positive experience as a business partner in the area. (Forrier, p. 53)

Response 5: Comment noted.

Comment 6: Talon Air has provided individuals with every opportunity to evolve both personally and professionally. (D'Angelone, p. 35)

Response 6: Comment noted.

Comment 7: Talon Air supports its employees and will support others in the community as well. (Lareche, p. 69)

Response 7: Comment noted.

Comment 8: Talon Air has flown more than 200 families and their loved ones for hospital medical services and is a main supporter of Patient Airlift Services and the work it does. (Saffron, p. 57)

Response 8: Comment noted.

Comment 9: Talon Air is the main sponsor of Patient Airlift Services' main fundraising event and has lent its support to the organization. (Saffron, p. 57)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 9: Comment noted.

Comment 10: Talon Air is a phenomenal organization that has been supportive of Patient Airlift Services and has accommodated the move of its corporate facility to Republic Airport. (Saffron, p. 58)

Response 10: Comment noted.

Comment 11: Talon Air contributes to the community in a manner that is rarely experienced by non-profit organizations. (Saffron, p. 58)

Response 11: Comment noted.

Comment 12: There is gratitude for the airport staff, Adam Katz and Talon Air for their support of Patient Airlift Services. (Saffron, p. 58)

Response 12: Comment noted.

Comment 13: Talon Air is a reliable, responsible, quality provider of fuel to its SUNY Aviation Center customers. (Canders, p. 45)

Response 13: Comment noted

Comment 14: In inclement weather, Talon Air has offered to provide available space for aircraft, in order to assist young student pilots at the SUNY Aviation Center to evacuate their aircraft. (Canders, p. 46)

Response 14: Comment noted.

Comment 15: When the American Air Power Museum needed assistance in transporting the oldest flying B25 aircraft, Talon Air offered to lend the museum the machinery needed when other operators refused to offer assistance. (Pilipshen, p.59)

Response 15: Comment noted.

I. Transparency

Comment 1: New York State is not complying with legislation and Republic's current FAA approved Airport Layout Plan ("ALP") when it selected the development proposal that ignores non-aviation development requirements. (Norjen, p. 41; Schliwka, p. 43)

Response 1: The parcel development process has been conducted in accordance with all applicable State and federal laws. The ALP is an FAA planning document. As part of the approvals process, a package to the FAA will be submitted for review and approval which will include a modification to the current ALP for these sites.

Comment 2: The East Farmingdale Group wants to remain informed and included regarding project decision-making. (Burns, p. 56)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 2: Comment noted.

Comment 3: The community's input at the public meeting is important and the public is urged to express their concerns. (Brooks, p. 18)

Response 3: Comment noted.

Comment 4: The Republic Airport Civic Coalition for Integrity and Compliance requests a follow-up public meeting for questions and further discussion regarding the development at Republic Airport. (RACCIC, written comment)

Response 4: Comment noted.

Comment 5: Following comments by a Talon representative that no public relations material was going to be released regarding the expansion, and that there were no flying restrictions in the area which is in conflict with long standing flight rules, there is a lack of transparency on the proposed development plan. (Orlando, written comment)

Response 5: As noted above, plans were presented to the community on March 2, 2017 and are available on the Republic Airport website (www.republicairport.net).

Comment 6: Transparency is requested from DOT and ESD. (Nocerino, p. 19)

Response 6: Comment noted.

Comment 7: A 25-year Master Plan needs to be created, with the assistance of the community, for the assessment of roads, bridges, East Farmingdale train station, bus area, and rapid transit. (Copobianco, p. 87-88)

Response 7: Comment noted.

Comment 8: The project should contribute to the community and community involvement is important. (Copobianco, p. 89)

Response 8: Comment noted.

Comment 9: The State's lack of disclosure regarding future plans for the project is a cause for concern. (Lisi, p. 67)

Response 9: See response to Comment I(5).

Comment 10: Responses to inquiries regarding the project were posted on the Republic Airport's website, in an inconspicuous manner, after the public was informed that individuals would be providing follow up with information. (Lisi, p. 66)

Response 10: The materials are prominently linked on the main page of the Republic Airport website (www.republicairport.net).

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 11: There is an understanding of the importance of economics, while underscoring the need for transparency about the project. (Blum, p. 62)

Response 11: Comment noted.

Comment 12: There is a desire to see continued development at the airport in a manner that is transparent and responsible. (Blum, p. 63)

Response 12: Comment noted.

Comment 13: There is concern that inquiries, pertaining to the project, remain unanswered. (Blum, p. 62)

Response 13: See Introduction and Response A(1) and A(5). As indicated by ESD at the March 2, 2017 meeting, responses to the questions raised at the March 2, 2017 meeting were posted on the Republic Airport website.

Comment 14: A meeting should be scheduled, after answers are provided to the community, in order to conduct an informed discussion. (Kirsch, p. 44)

Response 14: Please see response to Comment I(13).

Comment 15: Emergency operations should be considered during planning of the project. (Furino, p. 50-53)

Response 15: Comment noted.

Comment 16: FEMA should be involved in the decision making process on how the airport would be transformed for emergency situations. (Furino, p. 53)

Response 16: Comment noted.

Comment 17: Very little notice was provided to the residents regarding scheduled public meetings and information about the RFP/Project. (Taff, p. 83-86)

Response 17: See response to Comment A(1).

Comment 18: More community outreach, in a more active way, is required to help the community understand what's going on with this project. (Santangelo, p. 49)

Response 18: Comment noted.

Comment 19: Talon Air should not be designated to develop all five parcels of land for aviation use. (Cypser, written comment)

Response 19: Comment noted.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 20: Even though there has been a public relations effort to convince people that the community has been involved in the process, the public has had to go through extraordinary efforts to learn what has already occurred. (Cypser, written comment)

Response 20: See response to Comment A(1).

Comment 21: Five other companies were originally given conditional rights to develop these parcels, which were withdrawn without explanation and then given entirely to Talon Air. (Cypser, written comment)

Response 21: This statement is incorrect. There are only two conditional designation letters that were signed. In the Introduction, that developer did not sign and return it with the required security deposit. Parcel E was initially conditionally designated to another developer, but that initial bidder failed to meet the provisions required in the RFP.

Comment 22: The same level of transparency and community involvement should be given to the community as has been in the past with other projects. (Schliwka, p. 43)

Response 22: Comment noted.

Comment 23: Concerned that the development will impact lift services and the annual air show. (Burns, p. 55)

Response 23: The proposed development is consistent with the use of the airport and will not conflict with existing operations or special events.

Comment 24: Transparency is important and the community should be informed of the development's plan process and should be included in the decision-making process. (Burns, p. 56)

Response 24: Comment noted.

Comment 25: The community insists that Talon Air and the State keep the community informed of the process and plans of the Project. (Aloise on behalf of Republic Airport Civic Coalition for Integrity and Compliance, written comments)

Response 25: Comment noted.

Comment 26: A conference call with the State and individuals working on the project to go over the RFP process was held and State Senator Brooks participated in the call. (Brooks, p. 17)

Response 26: Comment noted.

Comment 27: Senator Brooks requested transparency in addressing the community's concerns in the planning process of the development plan. (Brooks, p. 17)

Response 27: Comment noted.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 28: New York State used a private realty management company to negotiate with developers in the process other than Talon Air. Fees to the realty company are to be paid by the developer and Talon Air is not paying those fees. (Brady, written comment)

Response 28: ESD retained the use of Newmark Knight Frank (“Newmark”) to assist with negotiations on Parcel E. Stratosphere has complied with all requirements in the RFP, including but not limited to the security deposit (per the RFP) and administrative fee.

Comment 29: The private realty management company hired also has ties to Mr. Katz, information which has been disclosed to the State, and no action has been taken. (Brady, written comment)

Response 29: The staff from Newmark assigned to this project signed conflict of interest disclosure forms as well as non-disclosure forms, and no conflicts arose from that process. Moreover, Newmark, a firm with over 14,000 professionals did not at the time of the solicitation and does not currently have any exclusive marketing agreements with Stratosphere or its principals.

Comment 30: The terms of the State leases were being negotiated by the private realty company prior to having authorization from the State. (Brady, written comment)

Response 30: This statement is incorrect. Newmark was authorized by ESD to negotiate on its behalf for Parcel E.

Comment 31: Misinformation leads to a lack of transparency, frustration, and a concern that influence creates an appearance of impropriety. (Brady, written comment)

Response 31: Comment noted.

Comment 32: Any subsequent public meetings should be held at a more convenient time to enable more community members to attend. (Santangelo, p. 47-48; Lisi, p. 65-66; Burns, p. 56, Aloise on behalf of Republic Airport Civic Coalition for Integrity and Compliance, written comments)

Response 32: Comment noted. The public meeting was held from 5:30 – 8:30 on April 6, 2017. In addition, parties had the opportunity to submit written comment by April 20, 2017.

Comment 33: Additional detailed information should be released in advance of the next public meeting. (Santangelo, p. 50)

Response 33: Comment noted.

Comment 34: There are concerns regarding the format of the meeting due to a lack of answers being provided in response to questions. (Blum, p. 62)

Response 34: See Introduction and Response A(1) and A(5). As indicated by ESD at the March 2, 2017 meeting, responses to the questions raised at the March 2, 2017 meeting were posted on the Republic Airport website.

J. Jobs/Economic Growth/Taxes

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 1: Republic Airport should pay local taxes. (Norjen, p. 81)

Response 1: Due to State ownership, the property is not subject to taxation consistent with the transfer legislation from the MTA to DOT. However, as set forth in the law, certain payments in lieu of taxes (“PILOT”) are envisioned to be generated from non-aviation uses.

Comment 2: The financial losses incurred by the airport are currently being paid by taxpayers. (Zucker, p. 33)

Response 2: Comment noted.

Comment 3: This project is exempt from New York State income tax under Governor Cuomo’s program. (Copobianco, p. 89)

Response 3: See response to Comment J(1).

Comment 4: The progress of the project could be exciting for the residents of Farmingdale and Long Island having subsidized Republic Airport at the expense of \$260,000 or more. (Diamond, p. 89-90)

Response 4: Comment noted.

Comment 5: Some of the parcels were to be used for non-aviation purposes, which would have generated tax revenue for the Town of Babylon; however, the revenue will not be forthcoming. (Cypser, written comment)

Response 5: Aviation and aviation-related uses are preferred by the FAA and that preference was reflected in the RFP (the FAA may veto any non-aviation uses).

Comment 6: The project will create economic benefits and a gateway for business development in the area. (Zeller, p. 24)

Response 6: Comment noted.

Comment 7: The development of Talon Air has created job growth in the local area and economic benefits for local businesses. (Zeller, p. 23)

Response 7: Comment noted.

Comment 8: There is an understanding of the opportunities that a project, such as the Republic Airport renovation, can provide to the local community. (D’Angelone, p. 35)

Response 8: Comment noted.

Comment 9: The project will create new jobs, allow for the growth of local businesses, and will provide assistance to the local community. (Ramsen, p. 28; Zucker, p. 33; Freedberg, p. 38-39; Law, written comment)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 9: Comment noted.

Comment 10: The development of the parcels proceeding as planned will provide construction revenue, permanent jobs, and revenue from employee spending in the area. (Brundige, p. 26; Baron, p. 29)

Response 10: Comment noted.

Comment 11: Business aviation provides a vital link in our transportation system and a powerful engine for job creation and economic growth. (Brundige, p. 26)

Response 11: Comment noted.

Comment 12: The proposed development at Republic Airport will become an essential aspect of economic growth. (Brundige, p. 26)

Response 12: Comment noted.

Comment 13: The four hundred and ninety jobs being created will not be Fairchild Republic jobs. (Copobianco, p. 88)

Response 13: Comment noted.

Comment 14: The statistics provided regarding the amount of jobs that will be created is nonsensical, and must be reviewed due to the project being tax exempt. (Copobianco, p. 89)

Response 14: Comment noted.

Comment 15: The project should provide a benefit for the community. (Copobianco, p. 89)

Response 15: Comment noted.

Comment 16: The project will provide vision and growth for the community. (Ramsen, p. 28)

Response 16: Comment noted.

Comment 17: The community is in need of career opportunities that offer employee benefits and wages that provide for the affordability of living expenses. (Mauro, p. 22)

Response 17: Comment noted.

Comment 18: The benefits of the project are important to the success and sustainability of our region. (Law, written comment)

Response 18: Comment noted.

Comment 19: The Long Island Association agrees with Governor Cuomo's vision in that Republic Airport holds enormous possibilities to be an economic driver on Long Island, and it believes the current proposed plan is important to unlocking the potential. (Law, written comment)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 19: Comment noted.

Comment 20: The project is supported because of the prospect of employment opportunities for aviation graduates on Long Island. (Canders, p. 46)

Response 20: Comment noted.

Comment 21: Talon Air has had a positive impact on the community with respect to economic development. (Meehan, p. 64)

Response 21: Comment noted.

Comment 22: The project will review socioeconomic impacts to the community and will quantify revenues that will be provided to the community. (Byrne, p. 31)

Response 22: Comment noted.

Comment 23: Jobs need to be created for the airport and for the community and to bring more income to its members. (Warantz, p. 20-21)

Response 23: Comment noted.

Comment 24: The Town of Babylon Industrial Development Agency supports the project. (Dolan, p. 54)

Response 24: Comment noted.

Comment 25: There is a concern that the promise of new jobs coming to the area will not be available to residents and those new companies will bring in their own workers. (Radner, p. 82)

Response 25: Comment noted and is being discussed with Stratosphere.

Comment 26: New development plans to increase growth in new businesses and permanent jobs in the community is supported; however, there are concerns about the noise that this development plan may bring into the community. (Santangelo, p. 49)

Response 26: Comment noted. A review of noise will be conducted as part of the environmental review process.

Comment 27: The development plan and the new jobs it will bring to the community is supported. (Berke, p. 72)

Response 27: Comment noted.

Comment 28: Many young people of Long Island are not able to live on Long Island due to limited jobs and new jobs will be good for the community. (Thompson, p. 70)

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Response 28: Comment noted.

Comment 29: Talon Air Company provides jobs, opportunities and careers for the community. (Katz, p. 73-76)

Response 29: Comment noted.

Comment 30: There is support for new well-paying jobs as well as the revenue and prosperous economy that the development plan will generate in the community. (Forrier, p. 53)

Response 30: Comment noted.

Comment 31: It's important to generate consistent work within the community which will allow people to support their families. (Pike, p. 36-37)

Response 31: Comment noted.

Comment 32: By creating good paying jobs, the development currently taking place all around Long Island shows consistency in striving to make Long Island a better place for its residents. (Pike, p. 36-37)

Response 32: Comment noted.

Comment 33: In comparing the Talon Air proposal to the other proposals, the economic benefit of other proposals is four to five times greater than the economic value of the Talon Air proposal to the state and community including far more jobs and economic output for the community. (Brady, written comment)

Response 33: The designation process followed New York State procurement protocols; was the subject of a published RFP; and was evaluated in strict adherence to publicly released scoring criteria.

Comment 34: The district will see no benefit from the proposed project, because the project is tax exempt, and the project will result in a perpetual increase of property taxes. (Copobianco, p. 87-89)

Response 34: Comment noted.

K. Miscellaneous

Comment 1: There is a shortage of T-hangars. More facilities are needed for the general aviation community, not large commercial operations. (Radovich)

Response 1: There is currently a lengthy waiting list for T-hangars at the Airport. The proposed project would provide additional T-hangars and tie-down areas for light aircraft.

Comment 2: Republic Airport is in need of renovation and the project will help with that. (Law, written comment, Hall, p.37)

Response 2: Comment noted.

Republic Airport - Response to Comments

Comment 3: Republic Airport has been plagued by vacant parcels and abandoned aircraft for years. (Law, written comment)

Response 3: Comment noted.

Comment 4: All future improvements to the airport appear to be mainly for large commercial tenants, and that the needs of private pilots for items, such as hangar space, are not being met. (Radovich, written comment)

Response 4: Parcel E development contemplates T-hangars for smaller aircrafts.