



## 6. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) gives Federal agencies instructions on NEPA's public involvement process at 40 CFR 1506.6. In addition, FAA Order 5050.4B requires notice and opportunity for public involvement under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. To meet the requirements when an environment assessment is prepared, TTN implemented a proactive approach to ensure effective public participation and access to information through use of traditional meetings and print announcements, virtual meetings, and a project specific website. In addition, TTN made the draft EA, notices, public information (scoping) meetings and hearing readily accessible to the public.

The NEPA process included a 45-day public comment period for the Draft EA, starting from initial publication of the Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Hearing (NOA) on May 3, 2021 in local newspapers (*Times of Trenton* and *Bucks County Courier Times*). Throughout the NEPA review process, the TTN and the FAA sought input in writing from the public and federal, tribal, state and local agencies. The comment period closed on June 16, 2021, giving time to the public and agencies to provide input and comments to the Proposed Action. Copies of the notices are included in **Appendix I**.

Overall, the following actions were conducted by the TTN as part of their public participation approach, which are further detailed in **Section 6.2**.

- Establish website with project information accessible to the public
- Establish a project specific email for the public to submit written comments
- Two (2) public scoping meetings during early stage of EA
- Publication of the Draft EA (electronic version and hardcopies)
- Publication of the Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Hearing
- A dedicated phone line was established during the public comment period for administrative and logistical questions about the virtual public hearing (e.g., "how do I log in to the meeting"). The outgoing message from the phonenumber was provided in both, English and Spanish. (No messages were received.)
- One (1) virtual public hearing

### 6.1 AGENCY, TRIBAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT COORDINATION

As part of the agency review and public comment process, this EA was made available to federal, state and local agencies, and interested Tribal nations, as applicable. No response from Tribal nations was received. The following public agencies entities provided written comments during the 45-day public comment period:

- New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
- Yardley Borough
- Princeton Mercer Regional Chamber of Commerce
- Princeton Mercer Regional Convention and Visitors Bureau



Comments received are included **Appendix I**. These have been addressed as part of the Final EA and responses are presented in **Section 6.2**.

## 6.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

The NOA for this Draft EA was published in the Times of Trenton and Bucks County Courier Times. The notice included a project specific email and postal address for the public to submit written comments, as discussed in the following section. The public comment period closed on June 16, 2021. Over 400 individual written (e-mailed and mailed) comments were received during the 45-day public comment period. The written comments; public hearing transcript; and responses are included in **Appendix 6**. Several common themes emerged from the public comment period, which are summarized and addressed in **Section 6.2.2**.

### 6.2.1 Summary of Public Participation

Following is a summary of the public participation efforts conducted as part of this EA and disposition of the comments received.

A project specific website ([www.ttnterminal.com](http://www.ttnterminal.com)) was maintained throughout the project duration. The website provided information pertinent to the Environmental Assessment and included an link for the public to submit written comments by a project specific email ([trenton@mjinc.com](mailto:trenton@mjinc.com)). The project specific e-mail address was established and received comments through the conclusion of the public comment period on June 16, 2021. A mailing address for written comments was also provided.

A public scoping meeting was held on October 23, 2018 and a second public meeting was held on January 23, 2019. Both meetings were held in person. Display materials were made available for public inspection prior to and following a formal presentation. Both meetings included public question and answer sessions with the consultant team preparing the EA. The presentation materials are included in Sections 3 and 6 of **Appendix I**.

Public comments received at the October 23, 2018 and January 23, 2019 meetings as well as comments received between the project initiation to the start of the formal public comment period are included for reference in **Appendix I**.

A NOA / Notice of Public Hearing was published in the newspaper of record, the Times of Trenton as well as the Bucks County Courier Times on May 03, 2021, May 05, 2021, and May 07, 2021. Supplemental notices, including Spanish language notices were published in the Times of Trenton and the Bucks County Courier Times on May 24, 2021. Copies of the Affidavits of Publication for the NOA / Notice of Public Hearing are included in **Appendix I**.

The Draft EA was made available for public review on the Trenton Mercer Airport webpage as well as the project specific website. Physical copies of the Draft Environmental Assessment were made available at three (3) public libraries in Mercer County (NJ), one (1) public library in Pennsylvania, and the Yardley, Pennsylvania Borough office.

The Public Hearing was held virtually on June 02, 2021. The meeting was held virtually due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. This format was chosen to ensure the health and safety of all meeting participants and the project team. The hearing format included closed captioning for the hearing impaired and Spanish



language translation services. Neither the translation services nor special accommodations were requested by the public. The hearing began at 7:00 pm (Eastern Time) with a short welcome and presentation. Public comments were received following the presentation. A transcript of the presentation and public comments is included in **Appendix I**. The hearing was scheduled to conclude at 9:00 pm; however, the hearing continued until no more comments were offered. The hearing concluded at approximately 10:15 pm.

### 6.2.2 Responses to Common Themes Raised During the Comment Period

As indicated before, several common themes emerged from the public comment period and were repeated in several public comments. Following are upfront responses to the common themes. Refer to **Section 6.2.2.1** for additional and individual comment responses.

#### 1. Definitions of Terminal and Airfield Capacity

##### a. Response:

***Airfield Capacity is the capacity of the individual runways that are available for simultaneous use for take-offs and landings.*** The number and type of aircraft operations are a function of market demand as well as airfield capacity and the capacity of the individual runways that are available for simultaneous use for take-offs and landings. The airfield capacity is governed by the size and length of the runways, the wind direction, the configuration of the airfield, size and speed of the aircraft, flight paths and approved approach and departures procedures, and the ability of the air traffic control tower to coordinate approaches and departures. Additionally, TTN's runways are intersecting which does not allow for simultaneous use of the runways as one operation needs to clear the intersection before another operation can begin. The physical constraints, property layout, and other factors make significant changes to the runway layout infeasible at TTN.

At TTN, the size and length of the runways are fixed due physical constraints (e.g., roads and a railroad) which make runway extensions impractical. Additionally, the use of Engineered Material Arresting Systems (EMAS) at the ends of each runway to minimize the ability for aircraft to over-run the end of the runway further limits the possibility of runway extension(s). In fact, EMAS was installed at the runway ends to achieve an equivalent level of safety based in part on the inability of TTN to reasonably achieve fully graded Runway Safety Areas in accordance with FAA standards due to the presence of surrounding road and railways.

**Terminal Capacity is the ability of the terminal to accommodate the throughput of passengers and the ability of passengers to move through the terminal between the ticketing counter and landside of a terminal through security and to the gates and airside of a terminal.** Insufficient terminal capacity can lead to an undesirable Level of Service (LOS) for airport passengers. The Terminal Capacity is governed and impacted by numerous factors that include the number of aircraft gates; the number of aircraft parked simultaneously at gates; forecast and scheduled aircraft arrivals and departures; delays at the airport; sizes of aircraft; staffing of the ticketing, baggage, gates, and security checkpoint; and number of both usable and staffed lanes within the security checkpoint, number of baggage drop positions at the ticketing counter, length of the baggage claim display devices, and number of ticketing counter positions. The number of enplanements coupled with the desire to meet a minimum LOS "C" for terminal planning set the sizing and layout of the replacement terminal. Planning and design for LOS C within the terminal is further described in this chapter and Chapter 3 - Alternatives Analysis.



Commentor's concerns with capacity are generally more focused on airfield capacity than terminal capacity. The Proposed Action addresses terminal deficiencies and will have no effect on airfield capacity.

The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. Additionally, the size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal's ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements however no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned.

2. Mercer County Fiscal Responsibility, Accounting, and Taxes

- a. Response: The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. The EA is intended to assess the Environmental Consequences, see public input, and allow the federal agency to make an informed decision.

Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. It is based on the County's desire for the airport to safely and efficiently serve as a non-hub commercial air carrier airport providing air carrier service to the Central NJ and Eastern PA region to a limited number of destinations. The proposed program for the replacement terminal is a priority of Mercer County to replace its functionally obsolete four parking position terminal with a new, modern facility. The replacement terminal will provide employment opportunities for good paying wages for people who will work to construct the terminal and in permanent positions for people working at the airport or in businesses surrounding and supporting the airport. The program and budget for future development will continue to be refined and evaluated by the County if or when the project proceeds to design and construction. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County. Mercer County intends to utilize Passenger Facility Charge revenues to fund a portion of the terminal construction.

3. Why doesn't the Airport or FAA undertake an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in lieu of an Environmental Assessment (EA)?

- a. Response: The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. Therefore, and EIS is not required or warranted.

The CEQ regulations at Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ Regulations), establish procedures for complying with the NEPA. In accordance with 40 CFR § 1507.3 of the CEQ Regulations, FAA Order 1050.1F provides the Federal Aviation Administration's policies and procedures to ensure agency compliance with NEPA.

§1501.3 of the CEQ Regulations instructs agencies to consider whether the proposed action is categorically excluded. Actions that are not likely to have significant effects, or the significance of the effects is unknown are appropriate for an EA. Actions likely to have



significant effects are appropriate for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Part 1502 of the CEQ Regulations describes the procedures for an EIS.

The Proposed Action is not contained on the FAA's list of actions normally requiring an EIS, which is located at 3-1.3 of FAA Order 1050.1F. Based on the preliminary planning information provided by the sponsor, the FAA agreed to review the Proposed Action in an EA. The results of the EA would then be used by the FAA to determine whether an EIS was necessary.

§1501.3(b) of the CEQ Regulations states that "In considering whether the effects of the proposed action are significant, agencies shall analyze the potentially affected environment and degree of the effects of the action. Agencies should consider connected actions consistent with §1501.9(e)(1). §1501.3(b)1 further states that "Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend only upon the effects in the local area."

§1502.1 states "The primary purpose of an environmental impact statement prepared pursuant to section 102(2)(C) of NEPA is to ensure agencies consider the environmental impacts of their actions in decision making. It shall provide full and fair discussion of significant environmental impacts and shall inform decision makers and the public of reasonable alternatives that would avoid or minimize adverse impacts or enhance the quality of the human environment."

FAA Order 1050.1F Section 4-3.3 states that the FAA uses thresholds that serve as specific indicators of significant impact for some environmental impact categories. FAA proposed actions that would result in impacts at or above these thresholds require the preparation of an EIS unless the impacts can be reduced below threshold levels. Other environmental impact categories have factors the FAA must consider in determining whether there would be a significant impact.

Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. Based on this analysis, no significant impacts were identified from the Proposed Action. Additionally, agencies with permitting authority over the Project have outlined the permitting and mitigation requirements; however, to date, none have raised concerns about potential unmitigable impacts in accordance with the pertinent regulations.

§1501.6 describes "Findings of no significant impact" (FONSI). According to §1501.6(a), a FONSI is prepared when the agency determines based upon the EA, not to prepare an EIS because the Proposed Action will not have significant effects. §1501.6(c) states that "The finding of no significant impact shall state the authority for any mitigation that the agency has adopted and any applicable monitoring or enforcement provisions. If the agency finds no significant impacts based on mitigation, the mitigated finding of no significant impact shall state any enforceable mitigation requirements or commitments that will be undertaken to avoid significant impacts."

4. In accordance with CEQ regulations, the results of the EA are being submitted to the responsible federal agency to assist in their decision-making process. The FAA will review the contents of the EA and determine based on the level of impacts and the associated mitigation, whether a FONSI can be issued or an EIS will be required for the proposed action. Roadway Traffic Congestion



- a. Response: Based on the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (e.g., congestion and delays) because the Proposed Action will not induce additional traffic nor will it induce additional enplanements. Temporary impacts to traffic during construction are not anticipated. Congestion is due to background increases in traffic that are the result of increases in development and growth in the surrounding areas and the limitations of the existing and future roadway networks. These impacts are the reasons for the current and future level of service for roadways serving TTN. Chapter 5, paragraph 5.10 Traffic describes the current and future roadway traffic conditions.

#### 5. Concerns about accidents

##### Response:

- a. Vehicular - The Project will not change any roadway configurations or functionality, nor will it degrade intersection performance. As a result, the proposed project is not expected to have any effect on the risk of vehicular accidents.
- b. Aircraft - As this is not an airfield capacity enhancement project, the only effect on aircraft movements related to this project is a change in location of parking positions at the terminal. No change to flight paths, runway use or other aircraft operations is expected. No change in the risk of aircraft accidents is expected as a result of the proposed project. The minor changes to the apron included in the Proposed Action will meet relevant FAA safety standards.
- c. Passenger Boarding - This project will improve the safety of boarding and de-boarding passengers by reducing ground boarding, and thus the risk of conflicts between passengers and aircraft, ground service equipment and other hazards. Accordingly, the Project will enhance the safety of passengers using TTN.

#### 6. General Increases in Noise

- a. Response: As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the proposed project (see Appendix E).

#### 7. Concerns about the airport not taking noise complaints seriously

##### Response:

- a. The airport takes noise complaints seriously and has specific noise abatement procedures and noise complaint procedures.
- b. The current noise abatement procedures for the airport are based on the weight and size of the aircraft. Departures over 12,500 pounds (lbs) are instructed to fly the Runway heading until they reach 1,700 feet in elevation and departures under 12,500 lbs are instructed to fly the Runway heading until they reach 1,200 feet in elevation. After reaching those elevations, aircraft then are following their flight plans for departures to their destinations. See <https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/for-pilots>
- c. For noise complaint reporting, when a noise complaint is submitted by either the online portal, telephone, or mail it is entered into the database in the Noise Reporting Portal for



TTN. This database includes date, time and location as well as type of aircraft, operation and type of complaint or distraction the individual encountered. Upon receipt of the report, the TTN Airport staff calls the individual owner, operator, or pilot with the phone number they provide to inform them of the complaint or voluntary curfew violation. In the event the complaint was a curfew violation a notice will be mailed out to the registered owner of the aircraft. TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. The registered owner of all aircraft that violate this voluntary curfew receive a Notice of Violation as well as information on all noise abatement procedures at TTN. This occurs regardless of whether or not a noise complaint was filed. The Trenton-Mercer Airport Noise Reporting Form is located at <http://ttnairport.com.php72-4.lan3-1.websitetestlink.com/>. Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions can be found at <https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs>.

- d. Chapter 5 (Environmental Consequences) of EA and Appendix E - Air and Noise Technical Memorandum includes the noise analysis. As noted, the only change to the noise contour resulting from the Proposed Action results from the shift in aircraft parking positions for the proposed terminal. No changes to the noise contour would occur off airport property.
8. Concerns about missing public comments from the scoping meetings that took place
    - a. Response: Public and agency comments provided from the beginning of the Terminal EA through to the beginning of the Public Comment Period from May 3 through June 16, 2021, are included and the responses to those comments are included in Appendix I and were addressed within the body of the EA document. Comments received from the beginning of the Public Comment Period from May 3 through June 16, 2021 are also included in Appendix I and are addressed herein.
    - b. Comments received from the referenced scoping meetings were collected, reviewed and are included in Appendix I. Consistent with FAA Order 1050.1F, these comments were utilized in the preparation of the document. The contents of the EA address the comments that were received from those meetings.
  9. Airplanes flying low to ground
    - a. Response: Flight paths are designed to ensure safe air operations and must be integrated into the busy and complex airspace that surrounds TTN. The elevation of aircraft above ground is determined by approach and departures procedures that are published for pilots by the FAA. Navigation and aircraft operations in the air around the airport by aircraft is outside the scope of the Proposed Action and are not intended to change, nor are they expected to change as a result of the terminal improvements. The replacement terminal is not an airfield capacity enhancement project. Further discussion of aircraft flight and elevations above ground are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at:  
<https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs>.
  10. Approaches and Departures Flight Path
    - a. Response: Flight patterns, approach paths, and other navigation by aircraft in the air and around the airport is outside the scope of the Proposed Action and are not intended change, nor are they expected to change due to the terminal improvements. The



replacement terminal is not an airfield capacity enhancement project. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs>.

11. Operational changes to the airport

- a. Response: As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, no change to flight patterns, approaches and departures to the runway ends, and other navigation by aircraft around the airport are planned or intended as a result of the Proposed Action. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs>.

12. Property values are being impacted by the development of the airport and noise

- a. Response: Property values are influenced by a variety of factors such as land use, zoning, school districts, transportation access, employment opportunities, and many other factors that are outside of the scope of this EA. Commenters raised concerns about increased noise levels, air quality, and general increases in traffic as factors that could affect property values. As described in the EA, aircraft operations are the same under the No Action and Proposed Action. The only changes to noise exposure occur in areas that are considered compatible land use on airport property. Construction air quality emissions do not exceed NAAQS de minimis thresholds and would be temporary. Additionally, the Proposed Action will not degrade intersection performance. Based on these findings, it is unlikely that the Proposed Action would negatively impact property values.

13. Quality of life

- a. Response: Quality of life is a subjective measure of an individual's health, comfort, and ability to participate in life events. Quality of life varies by individual, and is subject to their personal preferences. Based on the comments received, quality of life is being measured in terms of noise, air quality, traffic, and concerns about health. As described in the EA, the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action were carefully considered. The project impacts are generally occurring within airport property and where off airport impacts do occur, they are limited to temporary impacts and mitigation measures have been considered. The EA concluded that the effects of the Proposed Action are less than significant or can be mitigated to less than significant. Although certain state and local regulatory and permitting requirements will require compensatory mitigation (e.g., wetlands, stormwater), no significant impacts were identified, and the regulatory agencies with authority over those resource categories have not raised significant concerns about the Project. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. As noted previously, the Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity. No impacts related to noise, air quality, traffic, human health and safety are anticipated. Nor the Project impacts recreational facilities and opportunities.

14. Comparisons between the 2006 EA and this EA.

- a. Response: The 2006 EA considered construction of a 44,000 sf replacement terminal, apron expansion, realignment of the terminal access road, additional parking, construction of a new snow removal equipment storage building, and several taxiway improvements. The 2006 FONSI notes that the Purpose and Need for that project is based



on air service available at TTN at that time. Specifically, Boston-Maine Airways (Pan-Am), which offered service between Trenton and Bedford, MA, and briefly Baltimore, MD and Elmira, NY, utilizing 19 seat BAe Jetstream 31 aircraft. Boston-Maine Airways ceased operating in early 2008.

The 2006 FAA Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) notes that Mercer County was interested in service by a low fare/high frequency carrier, but at the time of the FONSI was issued, no arrangement between Mercer County and a low fare/high frequency carrier existed. That EA considered an alternative where new low fare/high frequency carrier service would be introduced AND construction of a new larger terminal. The FONSI noted that introduction of the new carrier “would likely result in exceeding the 1.5 Ldn threshold of significance for noise impacts and necessitate the preparation of an environmental impact statement”. The FONSI notes that should expansion become necessary in the future, appropriate environmental documentation must be prepared. Adoption of ICAO Stage 5 requirements, which govern the noise performance of aircraft, by the U.S. in 2015-2016 has and will continue to result in reduced aircraft noise compared to the aircraft fleet that was operating in 2006.

This EA considers construction of an approximately 125,000 sf terminal building with 4 gates, parking, construction of a new Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting building, and roadway access improvements. The Proposed Action includes aircraft apron modifications to allow aircraft access to the new terminal building, however no taxiway or runway improvements are proposed. The critical difference between the 2006 EA and this project, is that low fare service is well established at TTN, with Frontier Airlines having served TTN continuously since 2013. In 2006, low fare high frequency service did not exist at TTN. As opposed to the 2006 EA, the Proposed Action does not contemplate or consider introduction of service by new air carriers at TTN.

The 2006 EA considered a range of alternatives, including the previously mentioned introduction of low fare/high frequency service. The noise analysis conducted in that EA found that the preferred alternative would not result in an increase within the 65 dBA Ldn contour or greater on any sensitive noise receptor, therefore it would have no significant noise impact. The noise analysis that for an alternative that included introduction of a low fare high frequency carrier and a terminal expansion found that 12 residences would experience increases of 1.5 Ldn or greater and would result in an adverse impact to 12 sensitive receptors. That analysis is not comparable because this EA does not contemplate introduction of new service.

As described in Chapter 2, the purpose of this project is to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements at TTN, address terminal deficiencies, and provide an improved the Level of Service for airline passengers at TTN. The EA does not contemplate or consider introduction of a new carrier at TTN. No changes in aircraft operations, flight paths, aircraft routing, etc. are expected as a result of the Proposed Action. As a result, the noise analysis described in Chapter 5 and Appendix E of this EA, found no change in the noise contours outside of airport property, thus no adverse impact. The only change in the noise contours is from the relocated aircraft parking positions to accommodate the new terminal, and changes to the noise contour are entirely on airport property.



As noted, aircraft operations are constrained by the existing airfield configuration and other physical constraints. Accordingly, the Proposed Action is not expected to induce additional operations. Finally, introduction of new service would be subject to a separate analysis under NEPA.

#### 15. Health Impact Assessment

- a. Response: The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations governing air and water quality standards. The Analysis provided in the Draft EA has addressed the requirements under FAA's orders. A Public Health Impact Assessment is not required. The impacts to the environment are discussed in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.

#### 16. Why is the terminal so large?

- a. Response: The forecasted future growth in enplanements at TTN requires the planning and design of a new terminal to replace the obsolete and outdated existing terminal with a terminal that can operate at a higher level of service. The current and future enplanements at the existing terminal continue to experience chronic and worsening congestion and operational difficulties associated with passenger overcrowding. Additionally, security and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements increase the size of the various spaces within the terminal building.

The planning for the TTN Terminal was based on sizing and space planning guides and guidelines set forth by the FAA, Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) that include:

- FAA Advisory Curricular (AC) 150/5360-13, Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities
- FAA AC 150/5360-9, Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations
- TSA Checkpoint Design Guide (CDG)
- ACRP Report 25, Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design
- ACRP Report 55, Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals

The Airport Master Plan Update previously performed a concept study to identify the size of the terminal that would be required to meet the passenger demands while also providing a comfortable and pleasing experience as part of their air travel. The two main guides for terminal planning are the ACRP Report 25 and the TSA Checkpoint Design Guide. The TSA CDG specifically identifies specific operations spaces, numbers of checkpoint lanes and passenger queuing lengths, and equipment sizing and spacing within the Security Checkpoint. The ACRP Report 25 provides guidance for sizing the various areas within the terminal based on a standardized LOS for passengers. LOS for airport terminal planning is a generic term that describes the service provided to airport travelers at various points within the airport terminal building. It often relates to the degree of congestion or crowding experienced by travelers at the passenger and baggage processing facilities in the terminal building. It also includes the amount of waiting and processing time that are encountered by passengers within the terminal. The definitions for ACRP (based on



International Air Transport Association LOS definitions) is within ACRP Report 25 and included in Chapter 2 - Purpose and Need.

As noted in Chapter 2, the starting point for all areas within the terminal planning for TTN began with an LOS C. Sizing is based on the approved 20-year planning forecasts from the AMPU. LOS C was chosen because it strikes a reasonable balance between cost and passenger convenience and comfort. Higher LOS generally requires more space, thus increasing construction cost. From defining an approximate size in the AMPU and followed by subsequent further planning and design identified in Chapter 3 and Appendix B, the terminal planning and concept/schematic design was advanced and a more detailed analysis performed to determine the terminal needs. The analysis and schematic design resulted in a required terminal size just over 125,000 square feet. LOS C is intended to strike a balance between competing constraints of the adjacent areas, peak hour use by passengers within the terminal, passenger experience and comfort, and cost. The public space within the Terminal that is intended to function at a LOS C includes the ticketing lobby, baggage claim, entrance and exit circulation space, and meeter/greeter space on the public side of the terminal; the security checkpoint and hold rooms/gates on the secure side of the terminal; and other spaces in secure and unsecure areas for public use that include concessions and restrooms. Hand in hand with the public spaces, the terminal also supports airline operations, airport operations, baggage screening, baggage handling, and numerous mechanical, electrical, and life safety systems to support the various functions and areas within the building.

The design of a new terminal also needs to look forward at trends in aviation and the traveling public that may include:

- Providing more space in hold rooms/gates and public spaces for people with carry on or roll aboard bags to minimize or reduce baggage fees paid to the airlines
- Improving technology for wayfinding and signage, improved public notification, and improved connectivity of passengers to the airport or the spaces within the airport
- Providing a single level of passenger travel from the curb to the gate removes vertical transportation (escalators, elevators, stairs) and simplifies wayfinding and reduces pinch points for passenger queuing

Additionally, during the pandemic, everyone has become used to social distancing. Translating that into a crowded terminal in a post-pandemic world, the traveling public is holding onto maintaining personal space and social distancing from other passengers in ticketing lines, TSA check points, hold rooms/gates, and baggage claims. Social distancing will continue to be held over from the pandemic and while the terminal is not oversized for social distancing, it will provide adequate passenger spacing with an LOS C as the basis for its layout and design.

It is Mercer County's intent to provide a safe, secure, cost efficient and architecturally pleasing terminal that provides an acceptable level passenger comfort and convenience.

#### 17. Extending the study radius out beyond the immediate vicinity of the airport

- a. Response: The study area was not constrained by any arbitrary boundary. The study area is established based on anticipated limits of disturbance with additional buffer factored in, as well as any area than can reasonably expected to experience a change due to the Project



(haul routes, traffic, noise, air quality, etc.). As described in Chapter 5, each environmental resource category identified in Orders 1050.1F and 5050.4B was evaluated to identify potential impacts. The geographic limits of those impacts defined the study area. Arbitrarily extending the study radius would not identify any additional impacts. For example, analysis of the noise and air quality impacts show that those impacts do not continue beyond the airport property because there is no change in aircraft operations as a result of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action results in limited environmental impacts, not significant to the natural and human environment.

18. Mitigation of PFAS contaminants

- a. Response: PFAS is addressed in detail within Chapter 5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of PFAS is governed by an established NJDEP procedure. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN. As described in Chapter 5 and Appendix F, PFAS encountered during construction will be addressed in accordance with NJDEP requirements. This will likely involve removal and disposal of the contaminated materials in accordance with the regulations. However, remediation methods are subject to individual site conditions and may be adjusted based on conditions encountered in the field. PFAS contamination not directly encountered during construction will also be addressed in accordance with NJDEP Site Remediation Program requirements. This long term process will be under the direction of a Licensed Site Remediation Professional and is expected to continue beyond the construction of the terminal. Implementation of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will reduce runoff from the site compared to existing conditions. The EA describes the engineering, health and safety, and regulatory processes that will be utilized in the event PFAS or other contaminants are encountered during construction.

19. Number of gates has increased from the existing for the proposed terminal

- a. Response: The existing terminal has four (4) boarding positions for boarding and de-boarding passengers served by two (2) doors along the existing terminal. The Proposed Action will have four (4) boarding positions, each served by a passenger boarding bridge for boarding and de-boarding passengers. The hold room in the existing terminal serves all of the gates from the two exit doors for ground loading onto the apron. The hold rooms for the replacement terminal will have independent hold rooms for each parking position. Passengers will board and de-board via passenger boarding bridges with a higher level of service and passenger comfort than is presently experienced at the existing terminal. Methodology for planning and design of the terminal for LOS C is described in Chapter 2 (Purpose and Need) and Chapter 3 (Alternatives Analysis).

20. Performing a Part 150 Noise Study

- a. Response: The CFR 14 Part 150 noise analysis studies are applicable when the airport voluntarily enters the Part 150 program. TTN has opted not to participate in the Part 150 program, but rather addresses noise through other measures. Regarding the noise associated with the proposed project, the analysis of the noise contained in Chapter 5 of the EA shows that the 65 DNL contour is unchanged outside of airport property because there is no change in operations between the No Action and the Proposed Action. As documented in the EA, no noise impacts related to the Project were identified. The Proposed Action results in limited environmental impacts, not significant to the natural and human environment. The replacement terminal does not enhance airfield capacity.



The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 - Environmental Consequences and Appendix E.

21. Alternative Noise Metrics

- a. Response: There is no mandate to develop or implement alternative noise metrics. Section 188 of the Reauthorization Act instructed the FAA Administrator to evaluate alternative metrics and to prepare a report to Congress. The FAA transmitted this report to Congress on April 14, 2020. ([https://www.faa.gov/about/plans\\_reports/congress/media/Day-Night\\_Average\\_Sound\\_Levels\\_COMPLETED\\_report\\_w\\_letters.pdf](https://www.faa.gov/about/plans_reports/congress/media/Day-Night_Average_Sound_Levels_COMPLETED_report_w_letters.pdf))

**6.2.2.1 Compilation of Public Comments**

All public comments received have been compiled and are presented in the following table with their respective responses, as applicable. Full copies of public comments as submitted are included in Appendix I. Four (4) lengthy comments (Comment pages 164-175, 336-337, 338-354, and 442-511) are presented first in the following table. These comments capture many of the sentiments of subsequent comments and are presented first to inform the responses of the other comments and provide easier cross-referencing throughout.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.17.21	LO	Maria Willhoit TRENTON THREATENED SKIES' RESPONSE	442-511	<p>A lengthy comment letter with background information and airport history from the commenter’s perspective was provided. The summary included in that letter is provided below. The entire comment letter is included in Appendix I.</p> <p>Mercer County must follow the FAA’s recommendation and perform the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A comprehensive, transparent Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), using accurate, post-expansion volume predictions...</li> <li>2) A Public Health Impact Assessment</li> <li>3) Noise studies</li> <li>4) An Independent Cost Benefit Analysis</li> <li>5) Delay construction until toxic contaminants have been thoroughly evaluated and remediated.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Re-Issue EA as an Environmental Impact Statement:</b> See Section 6.6.2 Item 3 for further discussion of EA vs. EIA. The decision to prepare an EA does not preclude the FAA from preparing an EIS if the results of the EA indicate that a significant impact is expected. The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. Based on this analysis, no significant impacts were identified from the Proposed Action. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts following the incorporation of all required mitigation measures from the NEPA process and permitting in accordance with applicable regulations will be less than significant.</p> <p><b>Interrelated / Segmentation / Cumulative Impacts:</b> The commenter cites repeatedly a recent Runway Protection Zone/Obstruction Removal project at TTN as somehow linked to the Proposed Action. That project was intended to improve the safety of aircraft operations at TTN. The Proposed Action is not a safety project. It is intended to improve the Level of Service (LOS) for passengers utilizing the TTN terminal. The Proposed Action has independent utility from the Runway Protection Zone project. As noted, the Proposed Action is a single and complete action with independent utility and not dependent on other actions or projects. All elements of the Proposed Action were considered in the EA without broken them down into small projects. The Proposed Action was evaluated in accordance and consistent with CEQ guidelines and the process of determining overall environmental consequences, direct and cumulative impacts.</p> <p>Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA. The analysis was conducted in accordance with 40CFR Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA and FAA Order 1050.1F, and evaluated projects completed within the past 3 years (at the time of the analysis) and projects expected in the next 5 years. Due to the lack of environmental resources present within the project areas at TTN and the limited amount of impacts to the natural and human environment, cumulative impacts are not a significant issue for the Proposed Action. All the previously discussed impacts associated with the Proposed Action are considered less than significant. The past three (3) years and projects within the next five (5) years were presented in Draft EA, Section 5.13, Table 5-12. Independent utility of those projects is described in that Table. Past projects were subject to NEPA review as applicable.</p> <p>The projects listed in Exhibit 1 of the comment have independent utility from the Proposed Action. It is noted that the cited “50 projects” includes multiple phases of the same project (Design and Construction). Additionally, some of the projects are phased over a number of years to fit funding availability, making a single project appear as multiple entries on the referenced table (Exhibit 1). Projects such as the various taxiway improvements and edge lighting rehabilitations were intended to repair and maintain failing infrastructure such as pavement and lighting. Additionally, correcting non-standard taxiway geometry was identified as a key safety improvement identified in the most recent Master Plan. Obstruction removal and Runway Protection Zone projects are intended to remove hazards to aircraft utilizing the airport and improve the safety of people on the ground. The Proposed Action is fundamentally intended to provide a safe, efficient, and comfortable terminal for passengers. The cited projects in Exhibit 1 did not/do not in any way enable the Proposed Action from an operational or financial perspective and were determined to be necessary with the existing terminal. See Table 5.12 for description of the independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p> <p><b>Forecasts/Growth:</b> The approved forecasts were established based upon the best information available at that time. Forecasts are based upon local and regional demographics and economic information, industry trends, historical data, and data from similar airports in the region. The Master Plan Update, including the forecast chapter is available for review on the project website <a href="http://www.tnterminal.com">www.tnterminal.com</a>. As noted in the Forecast Chapter of the Master Plan Update, forecasting at TTN was challenging because of the inconsistent history of air service at TTN. Four (4) forecast scenarios were considered, with the approved forecast being an average of the four. As noted in the Master Plan forecast, enplanements growth and declines can be volatile because of TTN’s proximity to two (2) large hub airports (EWR and PHL). In other words, enplanement growth is expected to be irregular due to a variety of factors outside of Mercer County control. Therefore, it is unreasonable to assume that the recent enplanement growth will continue unabated, indefinitely.</p> <p><b>Forecasts / Growth Rate and Number of Operations:</b> See Chapter 1 for discussion of forecast vs actual operations in 2019, 2020 and 2021. As shown, airlines operations were less than forecast. General aviation operations exceeded forecast. The forecast developed with the master plan which was used in this EA is reasonable and demonstrates that an EIS is not required. Growth is already occurring with the existing Terminal.</p> <p><b>Commercial Service vs. Primary Airport:</b> This FAA designation is based on enplanements. A Commercial Service Airport has less than 10,000 annual enplanements. Once the 10,000 annual enplanement threshold is crossed, it becomes designated a Primary Airport.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Terminal Development Prerequisites:</b> The citation provided does not indicate that other projects were completed to make the Proposed Action eligible for AIP funds. The citation discusses desired infrastructure for airports, including safety and security equipment, and passenger access equipment . Furthermore, to date, use of AIP grant funds for the proposed terminal has not been considered.</p> <p><b>Runway Protection Zone (RPZ) –</b> The RPZ project is a safety project intended to address tree obstructions and improve the Runway Protection Zone. Per FAA Order 150/5300-13A Airport Design, the Runway Protection Zone is intended to “enhance the safety and protection of people and property on the ground”. That project has independent utility from the terminal project and has no effect on airfield capacity.</p> <p><b>Public Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. The Analysis provided in the Draft EA has addressed the requirements under FAA’s orders. In this instance, because there was no impact on air quality, an analysis of downwind Environmental Justice impacts was not required. The EA considered construction emissions. Based on the overall findings of the EA, a Public Health Impact Assessment is also not required.</p> <p><b>Proposed Terminal:</b> The existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor LOS. As described in the EA, Chapter 1 (Introduction and Proposed Action), the Project consists in the replacement of the existing terminal building with a proposed new terminal building at the Trenton-Mercer Airport (TTN or the Airport). The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal’s ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements; however, no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned. The design of the new terminal building is defined by careful planning and the minimum LOS, needed for a useful framework to support the current airport needs and forecast, providing comfort factors to passengers and airlines such as space, maximum waiting time, seating, occupancy, social distancing and security. LOS standards described in ACRP Report 55 “Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals” were utilized as a starting point for the design. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p> <p>The planning for the TTN Terminal was based on sizing and space planning guides and guidelines set forth by the FAA, Transportation Security Administration (TSA), and Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAA Advisory Curricular (AC) 150/5360-13, Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities</li> <li>• FAA AC 150/5360-9, Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations</li> <li>• TSA Checkpoint Design Guide (CDG)</li> <li>• ACRP Report 25, Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design</li> <li>• ACRP Report 55, Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals</li> </ul> <p><b>Number of gates: / parking positions:</b> The existing terminal has four (4) aircraft parking positions that can be utilized for boarding and de-boarding of aircraft. The statement that only two (2) of the current aircraft parking positions can safely accommodate A320 aircraft is incorrect; the current terminal has two (2) doors providing apron access to the four (4) positions, which can all (and have, on occasion) simultaneously accommodate an A320 with the current apron striping. A320 aircraft are currently operating on a regular basis at TTN and will continue regardless of the Proposed Action. As noted elsewhere, the runway length limits the ability of larger aircraft to operate at TTN. Based upon the forecasts, simultaneous use of the four (4) gates is not expected, except during unusual conditions such as irregular operations. Furthermore, the proposed four (4) gates provide important operational flexibility for staging of aircraft, enplaning and deplaning during peak times. For example, thunderstorms in Florida can result in departing aircraft needing to be held at the gate until weather conditions improve. The proposed terminal would allow that. As described in the EA, the existing terminal offers a poor passenger level of service as evidenced by the lengthy queues in the functional areas and congestion exhibited under existing conditions. The Proposed Action would allow for the four (4) parking positions to be used at a higher level of service. The statements regarding naming conventions applied to the project as a whole do not change the analytical requirements established by FAA orders and regulations established for the project, and would not change the findings as presented in the EA. Furthermore, in all documents it has been acknowledged that the Terminal footprint and Terminal capacity will increase to provide higher level of passenger service as described throughout the document. As noted the proposed improvements would not affect airfield capacity or aircraft operations. See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for a discussion of capacity.</p> <p>Regarding Figure 3-11, the figure depicts the proposed condition compared to existing conditions in that location. The statement that the project creates seven possible parking positions in incorrect; the Proposed Action includes demolition of the existing terminal building, as well as de-commissioning as aircraft parking positions of the area currently used for such. The Proposed Action would provide 4 aircraft parking positions sized for A320’s, consistent with the</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>current configuration.</p> <p><b>Larger Aircraft:</b> The size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The replacement terminal is not an airfield capacity enhancement project. As this is not an airfield capacity enhancement project, the only effect on aircraft movements related to this project is a change in location of parking positions at the terminal. No change to flight paths, runway use, or other aircraft operations is expected. Flight patterns, approach paths, and other navigation by aircraft in the air and around the airport are outside the scope of the Proposed Action and are not expected to change due to the terminal improvements.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity:</b> The parallel taxiway program identified in the master plan / ALP update was intended to provide standard runway/taxiway separation, address "hot spots", or areas of potential pilot confusion, and provide standard 90 degree taxiway/runway connections, and improve wayfinding. Measures such as high speed taxiway exits that typically would increase airfield capacity were specifically not included in the taxiway improvement program.</p> <p><b>Automatic Triggers:</b> Referenced Table 4-4 provides guidelines for when an airport might start planning for capacity improvements. Implementation of those improvements is not required when those thresholds are achieved. Therefore, meeting the criteria does not commit or require the Sponsor to undertaking the improvements. Nor is development along the course suggested in the comment letter a prerequisite for maintaining eligibility under Federal grant in aid programs administered by the FAA.</p> <p><b>Forecasts;</b> See Chapter 1 for a discussion of Forecast vs actual 2019, 2020, and 2021 operations. As shown, commercial operations have been below forecasts. General aviation local and itinerant operations have exceeded the FAA approved forecasts.</p> <p><b>2006 EA:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 14.</p> <p><b>Noise Impacts:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT). The specific statements raised under the Noise Studies topic are unrelated to this project as explained elsewhere because the changes in the noise contours are very limited to the Terminal area, and the land use changes resultant from the project are in areas designated as compatible land uses per regulation. Although there will be noise impacts related to construction activities, the analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project.</p> <p><b>Air Quality Impacts / Emissions:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action.</p> <p>Regarding Ultra Fine Particles (UFP), the project doesn't result in changes to aviation source emissions. While AEDT has the capability to model ultra-fine emissions, there are currently no standards in place for these emissions. Furthermore, research is still being undertaken to identify source attribution for UFP and their relative contribution as a source.</p> <p><b>Independent Cost Benefit Analysis:</b> This is outside the scope of the EA. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 and #16.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. All remediation activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA The Naval Air Warfare Center is a separate site (NJDEP PI#006048) and has separate stormwater drainage from the terminal. Site investigations were conducted in accordance with NJDEP requirements. As described in the Phase II ESA, additional testing was recommended to further delineate the boundaries and the nature of contamination at the ARFF site. The additional testing will be conducted in subsequent phases.</p> <p>The construction of the project will result in direct and indirect benefits by implemented better environmental controls, creating opportunity to remediate regulated contaminants and address recognized environmental conditions (RECs) per the Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs). Additionally, the Airport will conduct soil remediation investigations and remediation actions in advance or concurrent with construction activities. However, soil or groundwater remediation is managed as an independent action and separate from the Terminal Area Improvements Project. A Phase I ESA was completed by Urban Engineers, Inc. (Urban) in May 2019 to investigate potential recognized environmental conditions (RECs). The complete Phase I ESA report was provided in Appendix F of the Draft EA. The RECs identified in the Phase I ESA were further investigated as part of a Phase II ESA. The purpose of the Phase II ESA was to evaluate the presence, or absence of, petroleum products or hazardous substances in the subsurface of the site. The areas or RECs subject to the Phase II ESA included the existing terminal building and ARFF building as well as the locations of the proposed terminal and ARFF buildings, located within the TTN property. Remediation of soil and groundwater contamination is progressing in accordance with NJDEP requirements. In summary, if encountered during</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>construction, contaminated materials will be handled in accordance with NJDEP requirements. It is anticipated that this would involve removal and disposal of the contaminated material at an appropriate facility, however this approach may be modified, if necessary, based upon actual site conditions. Modifications would be in accordance with applicable state and federal regulatory requirements. PFAS contamination that was identified but won't be directly affected by construction will continue to be investigated and remediated in accordance with the NJDEP prescribed regulatory path in the Site Remediation Program regulations.</p> <p><b>Stormwater Permit Compliance:</b> The Proposed Action will comply with applicable water quality regulations. Best Management Practices that may be utilized may include retention basins, grass-lined swales, revegetation of disturbed areas, and other measures that will be further defined during the design process. Permits will need to be issued prior to construction. NJDEP retains permit enforcement authority for all NJDEP issued permits.</p> <p><b>Water Resources / Runoff:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p>Stormwater runoff from the proposed terminal and ARFF relocation project areas would be designed and managed in accordance with state and federal regulations. Proposed stormwater management features would address new impervious areas from the project. As noted in Chapter 5, NJDEP regulations require no net increase in runoff from the project.</p> <p><b>NAWC:</b> As noted in the Runoff section above, no net increase in runoff is permitted by NJDEP regulations. Based on the current understanding of ground and surface water hydrology and existing drainage patterns, surface drainage from the Proposed Action is not expected to reach the NAWC site.</p> <p><b>Failure to take a hard look at Noise Impacts:</b> No operational changes nor will there be induced operations as a result of the Proposed Action compared to the No Action. Therefore, no change in noise exposure is associated with the Proposed Action, aside from those documented in the terminal, as documented in Chapter 5.</p> <p><b>Failure to take a hard look at Socioeconomic Impacts:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 12 for a discussion of property values. Property taxes are imposed at the discretion of Mercer County.</p> <p><b>De-icing Operations:</b> Aircraft are currently de-iced at the Signature Flight Support ramp at TTN. After the boarding process is completed, airline aircraft taxi to the ramp where de-icing and anti-icing chemicals are applied as needed. After the aircraft departs the ramp, spent de-icing fluid is captured using a vacuum truck. No change to de-icing operations is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Runway and RPZ:</b> The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. As this is not an airfield capacity enhancement project, the only effect on aircraft movements related to this project is a change in location of parking positions at the terminal. No change to flight paths, runway use or other aircraft operations is expected. Flight patterns, approach paths, and other navigation by aircraft in the air and around the airport are outside the scope of the Proposed Action and are not intended change, nor are they expected to change due to the terminal improvements. The FONSI-ROD for the RPZ project was signed on September 20, 2019. The EA found no significant impacts, in accordance with the requirements of FAA Order 1050.1F.</p> <p><b>NJDEP Oversight:</b> Every project at TTN is subject to NJDEP jurisdiction in accordance with the applicable regulations. Projects are completed in compliance with those regulations.</p> <p><b>Previous and planned taxiway improvements:</b> These are projects with independent utility from the terminal. The taxiway project was intended to improve safety by eliminating the oblique angled taxiway connections between Runway 16-34 and Taxiways F and C. Each of the projects cited was reviewed under applicable FAA Orders, Federal and State regulations in place at the time of the project.</p> <p><b>X shaped intersection:</b> It is assumed the commentor is referring to the intersecting runways when referring to the "X shape". In general, the Taxiway projects were done because the existing pavement was due for repair. In doing so the taxiways were and are being reconstructed to meet FAA standards. One example is Taxiway G which was a straightforward pavement rehabilitation that also addressed deficiencies relating to FAA geometric standards. Taxiway F was</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>similar in that the Runway Taxiway intersection standards require 90 degree (or perpendicular) intersections to reduce runway incursions. When all of the taxiway work is completed there will be one additional crossing for a complete parallel taxiway for each runway. This is the preferred configuration to maximize safety. It is unclear what the 9 crossings in the letter refers to. The Master Plan Update outlines in great detail, the need for and the independent utility of the taxiway improvements.</p> <p><b>De-icing containment:</b> This project will have no impact on runway or aircraft de-icing, nor will it have any impact on jet fuel storage or consumption.</p> <p><b>Future Technology and Impact on Farmland:</b> The Proposed Action would not result in changes to flights at TTN. Future changes attributed to technological advancements are outside the scope of this EA.</p> <p><b>Climate and Greenhouse Gases:</b> As noted previously, no change in aircraft operations, is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action does not include modifications to the airfield, nor would it effect airfield capacity. Greenhouse Gas Emissions during construction are addressed in Chapter 5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Environmental Justice:</b> Information was presented in Section 4.12 and 5.9. As described in Chapter 4, an Environmental Justice community is not present in the study area.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity:</b> As described in Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11, this is not an airfield capacity project and aircraft operations are not expected to change as a result of the Proposed Action in comparison to the No Action. Aircraft operations are constrained by physical features around the airfield.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12. Property values are influenced by a variety of factors such as land use, zoning, school districts, transportation access, employment opportunities, and many other factors that are outside of the scope of this EA.</p> <p><b>Economic Impacts:</b> Many have cited the economic benefits of the TTN and project. As described in the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action is to improve the Level of Service for passengers utilizing TTN. Economic benefits are ancillary to the core purpose of the project. As discussed in the EA, the Trenton-Mercer Airport currently and will continue to contribute to jobs, payroll and output to the local economy in a positive manner. Trenton-Mercer is one of the three largest employing airports of general aviation employment in NJ. The Airport is a crucial part of New Jersey's overall economy including on-airport contributors, such as airport tenants and capital expenditures, to off-airport contributors, such as hotels, restaurants recreation and business travelers. With the Proposed Action, the TTN would continue to support existing jobs, local economy and accessibility of low-cost fares. See Section 5.9.1 for positive economic impact discussed in the EA.</p> <p>Also, as discussed in the EA, the Trenton-Mercer Airport and the Proposed Action contributes to jobs, payroll and output to the local economy in a positive manner. Trenton-Mercer is one of the three largest employing airports of general aviation employment in NJ. The Airport is a crucial part of New Jersey's overall economy including on-airport contributors, such as airport tenants and capital expenditures, to off-airport contributors, such as hotels, restaurants recreation and business travelers. With the Proposed Action, the TTN would continue to support existing jobs, local economy and accessibility of low-cost fares. See Section 5.9.1 for positive economic impact discussed in the EA.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Holly Bussey, President of BRRAM	164-175	<p>Detailed document with references to EA: <b>Terminology:</b> Project is not labeled as an expansion. Objects to the use of "rebuild" or "improve".</p> <p><b>2006 EA :</b> 2006 EA suggested that an EIS would be required for a terminal expansion.</p> <p><b>Overall Environmental Impact:</b> Concern about health hazard associated with PFAS contamination. Wants project deferred until PFAS is remediated. Refers to Wilcox comment letter.</p> <p><b>Water Quality Impact:</b> Tree removal and wetland clearing will lead to adverse impacts and contribute to other impacts</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> The EA describes accurately in several places that the new terminal will be larger than the existing terminal. It also describes the additional parking, roadway and access improvements, and construction of the new ARFF. All of the terminal related improvements will provide an improved customer experience compared to existing conditions. The new ARFF facility will be fully compliant with FAA design standards, unlike the existing facility. See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor level of service. As described in the EA, Chapter 1 (Introduction and Proposed Action), the Project consists in the replacement of the existing terminal building with a proposed new terminal building at the Trenton-Mercer Airport (TTN or the Airport). The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. Additionally, the size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal's ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements however no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned. The design of the new terminal building is defined by careful planning and the minimum LOS, needed for a useful framework to support the current airport needs and forecast, providing comfort factors to passengers and airlines such as space, maximum waiting time, seating, occupancy, social distancing and security. LOS standards described in ACRP Report 55 "Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals" were utilized as a starting point for the design. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p><b>Tree Removal and Wildlife:</b> Project would remove 30+ acres of trees. Risk to endangered species such as Bald Eagle. Increased operations; increase risk of air strikes.</p> <p><b>Wetlands Endangerment:</b> Wetlands are regulated by NJDEP. Excavating wetlands poses a significant environmental impact. Have the wetlands been tested for PFAS. Build after the mitigation has occurred.</p> <p>PFAS remediation should be further explained and should be a top priority. Remediation should be completed prior to construction so that neighbor resident's health is not impacted.</p> <p><b>Community Impact:</b> Commenter cites several residential areas, schools, places of worship, and outdoor areas that are in the general vicinity of TTN. States those should be considered.</p> <p><b>Study area:</b> Study area should extend due to the length of the flight paths. Impacts don't stop at the fence.</p> <p>Impact on property values not addressed.</p> <p><b>Floodplain Impacts:</b> No description how purchase of credits for riparian zone impacts will mitigate increased flooding in the area.</p> <p><b>Financial Soundness:</b> Disagrees with economic impact of the airport on the community.</p> <p><b>Failure to be a Good Neighbor:</b> Airport has not convened an advisory panel. Mitigation measures for noise have not been considered. Why not follow Part 150 requirements.</p> <p><b>Lack of Transparency and Manipulation:</b> Public involvement was not broad based. Comments were not able to be raised during the hearing. No public meeting in Pennsylvania. Adhered to bare minimum requirements for public notification. Other concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enplanement growth is understated.</li> <li>• Use of "improvement" vs. expansion</li> <li>• Deferred Action on PFAS</li> <li>• Concern about segmentation and cumulative impacts</li> <li>• Arbitrarily decide the study area and magnitude of the impacts to "benefit their case".</li> <li>• Omitting facts of evidence (soil sample S-15)</li> <li>• Use of BMPs not well defined. Gives the Sponsor ability to do whatever it wants.</li> <li>• Ignored downwind impacts of noise and air quality</li> <li>• Ignored wild and scenic designation of Delaware River</li> <li>• DRCC approval process</li> </ul>	<p>The planning for the TTN Terminal was based on sizing and space planning guides and guidelines set forth by the FAA, TSA, and Airport Cooperative Research Program (ACRP) that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAA Advisory Curricular (AC) 150/5360-13, Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities</li> <li>• FAA AC 150/5360-9, Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations</li> <li>• TSA Checkpoint Design Guide (CDG)</li> <li>• ACRP Report 25, Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design</li> <li>• ACRP Report 55, Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals</li> </ul> <p><b>2006 FAA recommendation:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 14.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment, including risks to Children's Health and Safety (Section 5.9.4) in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. All remediation activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Construction won't cause spread or exacerbate contamination. Cite PFAS sections of EA.</p> <p><b>Soil Sample S-15:</b> Table 3-1 referenced in the comment provides a list of constituents that were tested at the various sample points. No results are presented in Table 3-1. As shown in Appendix Table D-1 of the Phase II ESA, PFAS was not detected in Samples S-15A and S-15 B.</p> <p><b>Best Management Practices (BMPs) not well defined:</b> The EA describes in general terms BMPs that may be utilized for the project. BMPs are site specific and will be determined as the design progresses.</p> <p><b>Water Quality:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements, and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>Tree Removal and Wildlife:</b> Tree removal cited is from obstruction removal project. Tree removal for this project is 3.5 acres 1.68 acres would be revegetated. The areas within the Airport property consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the project areas and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. Based on the above and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources nor does it have the potential to exceed the significant thresholds listed above for non-listed species. USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. The project review for the Proposed Action was conducted to formalize the above guidance. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. As discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is <u>no</u> work proposed in this area. Therefore, potential impacts to the vernal pool habitat are not anticipated. As described in time of year restrictions on tree clearing address NJ and USFWS concerns regarding endangered species. Bald eagles were not raised as a concern for this project. According the USFWS Bald and Golden Eagle Fact Sheet, (<a href="https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering">https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering</a>), bald eagles require a good food base, perching areas, and nesting sites. Their habitat includes estuaries, large lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and some seacoasts. In winter, the birds congregate near open water in tall trees for spotting prey and night roosts for sheltering bald eagle. Large open water features such as those described are not present in the project area.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project should be viewed holistically.</li> <li>NJ State Endangered Species not addressed.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Wetland Impacts:</b> The Proposed Action minimizes direct impacts to approximately 0.22 acre within state-regulated (jurisdictional) wetlands (designated as Wetland “AA”) and 0.86-acre within the 50 feet wetland transition area (“buffer”). Wetland impacts would result from the filling and excavation for construction of the terminal building, terminal apron, conversion of existing terminal access road to lawn/landscaping, stormwater management features, and roadway resurfacing. Moreover, the proposed ARFF relocation avoids direct impacts to NJDEP-regulated wetlands, State open waters, and the 50 feet wetland transition area. A small portion of project impacts may be considered temporary disturbances. Temporarily impacted freshwater wetlands, State open waters, and/or the associated 50 feet wetland transition areas would be restored to pre-construction condition or improved. Wetland impacts will be fully mitigated through the purchase of NJDEP-approved mitigation bank credits within the watershed. Applicable permits will be obtained from regulatory agencies.</p> <p>A receptor evaluation will be conducted as part of the PFAS investigations. No known impacts have been identified in the wetlands at this time; however, PFAS investigations and remediation will not exacerbate contamination. Additionally, planned stormwater management systems are intended to improve stormwater runoff management thereby eliminating PFAS contaminant pathways.</p> <p>PFAS in wetlands – not sampled to date. Project won’t exacerbate PFAS in wetlands. Project does not introduce new PFAS sources and will remediate existing contamination. SWM system required by recently updated DEP stormwater regs would inherently help control PFAS from spreading by controlling runoff, preventing it from getting to the Delaware River.</p> <p><b>Community Impacts:</b> The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with applicable regulations. The replacement of the existing terminal is not an airfield capacity enhancement project. As discussed, the study is limited to area of proposed construction and surrounding environs. The project area is primarily on airport with no identified impacts off airport property as demonstrated throughout Chapter 5. The impacts to the human environment are discussed in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Environmental Justice:</b> The referenced areas are outside the 65 day-night average sound level (DNL) contour and the area of expected impacts. As explained in Sections 4.12.2 and 5.9.3, , the EA considered whether there was an Environmental Justice population in the project area. The EA found that an Environmental Justice population is not present in the project area. As further described in Section 5.8, aircraft operations are not expected to change as a result of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> As discussed in Section 6.2.2, Item 17, the study is limited to area of proposed construction and surrounding environs. The study area is defined by the Proposed Action and the location and extent of associated impacts.</p> <p><b>Riparian Zone Mitigation:</b> Riparian Zone mitigation would occur in accordance with NJDEP regulations.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> Also, as described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project. Furthermore, as described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Financial / Funding:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 2. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County’s investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County. Chapter 1 describes the economic impact of TTN, as estimated by a 2016 study prepared by NJDOT. As described, the total economic output of TTN was in excess of \$80 million, which is considered to be a meaningful impact.</p> <p><b>Airport Marketing:</b> Mercer County has recently considered retaining marketing firms to assist with airport local branding and messaging within the community. This is common practice among airports. It’s not foreseeable at this time that additional airlines would enter the Trenton market.</p> <p><b>Good Neighbor:</b> Many of the issues raised are outside the scope of the EA. Mercer County convened an Advisory Committee during the Master Plan process that preceded the Terminal EA. Implementation of curfews, changes to flight paths, and similar measures are beyond the authority of Mercer County to implement unilaterally. Implementation of a mandatory curfews would be a violation of Mercer County’s grant assurances (Grant Assurance 19a). Grant assurances are conditions Mercer County must agree to in order to accept FAA AIP program funds.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Public Comments:</b> See Section 6.2.1 for Summary of Public participation. The NEPA process included a 45-day public comment period for the Draft EA, starting from the day of publication (May 03, 2021) of the Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers (<i>Times of Trenton</i> and <i>Bucks County Courier Times</i>). The 45 days exceeds the minimum required 30 days. As is normal practice, questions and comments submitted in writing and/or offered during the hearing are being addressed in the Final EA. The gap between meetings was driving by the longer than expected duration of the evaluation of the project alternatives and associated analysis and identification of potential environmental, social, and economic consequences.</p> <p>Throughout the NEPA review process, the TTN and the FAA sought input in writing from the public. The comment period closed on June 16, 2021, giving time to the public and agencies to provide input and comments to the Proposed Action. A project specific email was also established for the public to submit written comments. At the onset of the EA (prior to the pandemic) it was planned that in person public meetings would be held in NJ and PA. Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, it was determined that no in person meetings would be held. One virtual hearing was held to assure the health and safety of all meeting participants. The decision was made because the project team could not assure social distancing measures and compliance with mask mandates for what was expected to be well attended meeting.</p> <p>The hearing was held virtually and began at 7:00 pm (Eastern Time) with a short welcome and presentation. Public comments were received following the presentation. Representative Santarsiero was afforded an opportunity to comment. The hearing concluded at approximately 10:15 pm after no further oral comments were offered.</p> <p>Meetings with the Commissioners and County Executive and commitments made in those meetings are outside the NEPA process.</p> <p>Enplanements have shown consistent growth since Frontier started service in 2012 and is expected to continue to grow regardless of whether the terminal project proceeds. The growth in enplanements supports the need for the expanded terminal. The terminal expansion space programming is based on the FAA approved forecast of enplanements for TTN.</p> <p>The Proposed Action does not contemplate taxiway or “tarmac” expansion. As noted the terminal sizing is based upon approved forecasts.</p> <p>Mitigation measures become a condition of future funding agreements for the project. Additionally, many of the mitigation measures are triggered by NJDEP regulatory requirements (permit conditions).</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> Property values are driven by a variety of factors. See Section 6.2.2, Item 12</p> <p><b>Wild and Scenic Rivers:</b> The Wild and Scenic designated section of the Delaware River is upstream of TTN and outside of the study area for this EA. See response to comment # 118-120. Implementation of BMPs will prevent adverse impacts to the Delaware River.</p> <p><b>DRCC Approvals:</b> As described in Section 5.12.3, the project will require waivers from DRCC. Initial consultations were held with DRCC to determine the feasibility of securing the required waivers. The required waivers will be sought when the project design advances. All required approvals and permits will be secured prior to construction of the project.</p> <p><b>Endangered Species:</b> As described in Chapter 5, the project will have no effect on state or federally listed endangered species with implementation of time of year restrictions on tree removal.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> The Proposed Action has independent utility from the other projects referenced in this comment. See Section 5.13 and Table 5.12 for a discussion of cumulative impacts and the independent utility of the projects cited.</p>
6.14.21	LO	Don Wilcox	336-337	<p>Member of BRRAM:</p> <p>There have been long standing, repeated misrepresentations made to avoid doing a comprehensive EIS, including the following:</p> <p>☐ In 2006 the FAA concluded that if the airport were to increase the terminal size from 25,000 to 64,000 sq ft, it would have a significant impact in air traffic. However, now it’s argued that</p>	<p><b>2006 EA:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 14.</p> <p><b>Entire Project:</b> The Proposed Action evaluated in the EA is a single and complete project with independent utility from previous and future planned projects. Impacts from the complete Proposed Action are described in detail in Chapter 5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Terminal Building:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor level of service. As described in the EA, Chapter 1 (Introduction and Proposed Action), the Project consists in the replacement of the existing terminal building with a proposed new terminal building at the Trenton-Mercer Airport (TTN or the Airport). The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>increasing the terminal to 125,000 sq ft will have no significant impact.</p> <p>☒ Refusing to look at the ENTIRE airport project as ONE PROJECT. Instead, looking at all impacts as standalone.</p> <p>☒ Stating that capacity is not increasing because the number of gates are not changing. Meanwhile, doubling the number of simultaneous use gates, quadrupling the size of the terminal, adding additional tarmac locations capable of enplaning/deplaning, and creating parallel taxiways that greatly increase density of takeoffs and landings. In fact, they claimed that the D to G connector, which was new construction, was instead a “repair”.</p> <p>☒ Burying the costs of airport projects in esoteric financial reporting with vaguely labelled categories and piecemeal publication, while never providing a true cost/benefit analysis of what they claim are the benefits of airport expansion.</p> <p>☒ Deliberately and systematically, deleting all complaints made to the airport. Resulting in NJ political leaders being unaware of the scope of the problem.</p> <p>☒ Ignoring the cumulative impacts and the harm to their citizens from noise, air, and water pollution, degradation of the historic and rustic environment, and the dramatic impact on property values.</p> <p>☒ Failing to pause airport expansion during the COVID crisis when financial aid was needed elsewhere. Refusing to re-evaluate the soundness of the business plan created over 10 years ago and to examine the COVID economic impact.</p> <p>☒ Failure to hold an EA review meeting in Pennsylvania as promised in 2018.</p> <p>☒ Claiming that removing 20 acres of trees was for safety when such action will permit planes with larger fuel loads at the airport and significantly worsen the noise problems currently experienced.</p> <p>☒ Taking public comments for EA and providing broad stroke responses. This failure to respond with specifics amounts to a rubber stamp of the project without any critical analysis.</p> <p>☒ When the segmented EAs uncovered issues, the remediation was left unresolved or “would be handled during construction.” All this would be done later, with the public in the dark. The deception continues, even today in the current EA, as we will document for written public comment prior to the June 16 deadline.</p>	<p>capacity. Additionally, the size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal’s ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements however no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned. The design of the new terminal building is defined by careful planning and the minimum LOS, needed for a useful framework to support the current airport needs and forecast, providing comfort factors to passengers and airlines such as space, maximum waiting time, seating, occupancy, social distancing and security. LOS standards described in ACRP Report 55 “Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals” were utilized as a starting point for the design. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p> <p>The planning for the TTN Terminal was based on sizing and space planning guides and guidelines set forth by the FAA, TSA, and ACRP that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAA Advisory Curricular (AC) 150/5360-13, Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities</li> <li>• FAA AC 150/5360-9, Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations</li> <li>• TSA Checkpoint Design Guide (CDG)</li> <li>• ACRP Report 25, Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design</li> <li>• ACRP Report 55, Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals</li> </ul> <p><b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity. As described, the Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity at TTN. The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways, taxiways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. Additionally, the size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal’s ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements however no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2</p> <p><b>Noise Complaints:</b> It is assumed that the commenter is referring to the Noise Complaint hotline when discussing deleting complaints. See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting. TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the proposed project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA. The EA found that cumulative impacts are not a concern due to the lack of environmental resources in the project area and impacts associated with Proposed Action are expected to be less than significant. The analysis was conducted in accordance with CFR Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA and FAA Order 1050.1F.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12. Property values are influenced by a variety of factors such as land use, zoning, school districts, transportation access, employment opportunities, and many other factors that are outside of the scope of this EA.</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>COVID -19:</b> Air service at TTN is comprised exclusively of service to domestic destination serving primarily leisure travelers. Industry wide, domestic leisure travel has rebounded to, or exceeds 2019 (pre-COVID) travel. Nationally, domestic leisure travel has returned to or exceeded 2019 levels, and industry experts expect overall air travel to return to 2019 levels in 2024 or 2025. Passenger levels at TTN are rebounding quickly and are expected to resume the growth experienced prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Runway Protection Zone/Obstruction Removal project (20 acres of trees):</b> Tree removal cited is from an unrelated obstruction removal project with independent utility from the Proposed Action. Tree removal for this project is limited to 3.5 acres; 1.68 acres would be revegetated. The areas within the Airport property consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the project areas and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. Based on the above and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources nor does it have the potential to exceed the significant thresholds listed above for non-listed species. USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. The project review for the Proposed Action was conducted to formalize the above guidance. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. As discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot; however, there is no work proposed in this area. Therefore, potential impacts to the vernal pool habitat are not anticipated. As described, time of year restrictions on tree clearing address NJ and USFWS concerns regarding endangered species. Bald eagles were not raised as a concern for this project. According to the USFWS Bald and Golden Eagle Fact Sheet, (<a href="https://www.fws.gov/6-23idwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering">https://www.fws.gov/6-23idwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering</a>), bald eagles require a good food base, perching areas, and nesting sites. Their habitat includes estuaries, large lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and some seacoasts. In winter, the birds congregate near open water in tall trees for spotting prey and night roosts for sheltering. Large open water features such as those described are not present in the project area.</p> <p><b>Unresolved issues or remediation:</b> To the extent they have been identified, all minimization and mitigation measures for the Proposed Action are described in the EA and will be incorporated into the project design. Furthermore, the EA identifies all required permits for the Proposed Action. These mitigation measures and permits would be incorporated as elements in a favorable decision, should one be issued for this project. As project design and permitting progresses, additional minimization and mitigation measures will be incorporated into those documents. Compliance with mitigation measures reporting will be a permit condition.</p> <p><b>EA Review Meetings and Public Comments:</b> See Section 6.2.1 for Summary of Public participation. All comments offered during the Draft EA public comment period are being addressed in the Final EA (Section 6). At the onset of the EA, in person public meetings in Pennsylvania were planned. However, with the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic it was determined that virtual meetings would be held to ensure the health and safety of all participants.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> The Project is a single and complete action with independent utility and not dependable of other actions or projects. All elements of the Proposed Action were considered in the EA without broken them down into small projects. The Proposed Action was evaluated in accordance and consistent with CEQ guidelines and the process of determining overall environmental consequences, direct and cumulative impacts. Past projects under FAA jurisdictions were subject to NEPA review as applicable.</p> <p><b>Remediation of Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential contamination will be addressed and controlled. All remediation activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6/12/21	PC	Donald Wilcox	338-354	My name is Donald Wilcox, and I am a member of the Board of Trustees for the Bucks Residents for Responsible Airport Management (BRRAM). I am writing not only as private citizen, but for the over 800 members of BRRAM as well; an organization that has actively monitored TTN for over 24 years. This document is an addendum to the comments that I made verbally during the public comment period held June 2, 2021. BRRAM's 800+ members are comprised of residents from Lower and Upper Makefield, Newtown, Falls and Langhorne Townships, Yardley, Morrisville, and Newtown Boroughs, as well as many New Jersey residents. They are all justifiably concerned about the discovery of PFAS chemicals at the Naval Air War Center, a portion of which is	<p>Commenter provided a lengthy "fact sheet" regarding PFAS contamination.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> The referenced PFAS contamination at Willow Grove and the Trenton Naval Air Warfare Center (NJDEP PI# 006048) are separate from the Proposed Action. Neither is located on airport property. Commenter requests further investigation into the scope of the PFAS contamination and remediation. The EA considered the potential for encountering PFAS contaminated groundwater during construction and operation of the terminal. It is beyond the scope of the EA to address all contamination on airport property, but rather to identify the potential for encountering PFAS and other hazardous materials. Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential contamination will be addressed and controlled, including the regulatory requirements. PFAS contamination on other portions of airport property are being addressed separately from the terminal project. All remediation activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements, as described in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Site characterization efforts to date are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Section 5.5 notes that engineering controls to limit and remediate PFAS contaminated groundwater during construction will be implemented. It is beyond the scope of the EA, and premature from a regulatory perspective to prepare a detailed mitigation and remediation plan. However, those plans will be incorporated into the construction documents. As was noted in the comment, remediation is expected to be a long-term process that will</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>still part of the Trenton-Mercer Airport, and the subsequent discovery of PFAS chemicals on Airport property. Below are our concerns about the contamination and plan for remediation...  Summary of Findings  The following issues have been raised in the main body of this public comment, and support the Conclusions Section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>☒ PFAS can spread far and wide from the contamination site and can be very costly to remediate.</li> <li>☒ Much like at the Willow Grove Naval Air Center in Warminster, PA, PFAS at the Trenton-Mercer Airport has migrated from its source locations to an aquifer, and is highly likely to be in the watershed that feeds down to the Delaware River, the source of drinking water for those in both Pennsylvania and New Jersey.</li> <li>☒ It is clear that there were significant levels of and locations for PFAS contamination on the airport site.</li> <li>☒ The EA assertion that PFAS located in the groundwater adjacent to wetland AA, that would flow in a southwesterly direction toward wetland AA, should not be considered an impact of the ARFF PFAS contamination and not worthy of addressing in the EA, demonstrates the attempt by the airport to unfairly minimize the impacts that the EA is supposed to address. Hence, there is evidence of PFAS in the western parking lots and along the tree-line. Current conclusions, that further testing in these areas is not required, must be revised to include further testing in these areas.</li> <li>☒ The completion of testing and the delineation of the area of impact should have been able to be concluded before the draft EA was completed. It appears that this delay was deliberate, to minimize the impacts found.</li> <li>☒ The potential impact on wetlands, the streams, and downstream cannot be overstated.</li> <li>☒ Looking at the map of the work area, it seems quite opportune that the work area so sharply cuts off the watershed from the wetlands over which the terminal will be constructed. They are one contiguous wetland and should not be arbitrarily split.</li> <li>☒ Failure to investigate PFAS in the Wetlands (AA) adjacent to the ARFF and proposed new Terminal.</li> <li>☒ As discussed in Appendix A and above, the plan for further identification of PFAS contamination is focused to the south and east of the existing ARFF, away from the wetlands, when it should be equally or more focused on the flow of PFAS into the wetlands.</li> <li>☒ Failure to account for the movement of PFAS currently, or even at a minimum during construction, into the wetland environment, and the impact of high levels of PFAS migrating past neighbors and out into the Delaware River is a deliberate and egregious outcome of this EA's approach to hazardous pollutants.</li> </ul>	<p>extend beyond construction of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Wetland AA:</b> Pursuant to NJAC 7:26C and 7:26E, Mercer County Airport, as persons responsible for conducting remediation for the PFAS spill case at TTN, has a statutory requirement to conduct investigations. These investigations include delineation requirements of media per NJAC 7:26E. A further study of the PFAS impacts are planned as part the remedial investigations (i.e., delineation) that will occur as the project progresses. Remedial investigations will include the installation and sampling of monitoring wells along the boundary of Wetlands AA.</p> <p><b>PFAS Migration and Sampling:</b> An initial receptor evaluation report will be developed as part of the investigations at the Site. The receptor evaluation will be used to dictate the investigations needed for sensitive receptors, including wetlands, floodplains, surface waters, and others. Implementation of BMPs for stormwater management would prevent migration of PFAS off site.</p> <p>Sampling for PFAS in western parking lots and tree line showed one soil boring SB-10 with minor detections of PFAS compounds in soil samples at ~2-2.5 parts per trillion (ppt). PFAS was not detected in samples (S-12 and S-15) along the tree line around the southwestern most parking lot. (See Table XX in Appendix XX Sample S-10 may be an outlier from windblown deposition to this area.</p> <p>The PFAS investigation and remediation planning is progressing in accordance with NJ Site Remediation Program requirements. Additional wells are proposed.</p> <p><b>PFAS can spread far and wide/Comparison to Willow Grove:</b> Noted. The extent of PFAS contamination in general is under ongoing investigation. The PFAS contamination at Willow Grove is unrelated to the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>PFAS Contamination on site:</b> Known contamination that is likely to be encountered by the Proposed Action is described in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>Resolution of all Issues:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. No significant impacts were identified.</p> <p><b>Completion of testing and delineation of area:</b> Testing related to the scope of the Proposed Action is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F. The regulatory requirements for subsequent testing, monitoring, and remediation are described in those Sections of the EA. As described in the EA, engineering controls will be incorporated into the Proposed Action to control and remediate encountered PFAS contamination. Groundwater contamination generally follows surface topography. Investigation of PFAS contamination up gradient from the source is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Impact on streams and wetlands:</b> As described in the EA, engineering controls and remediation measures will be incorporated into the project to prevent downstream impacts. It is expected that these measures will result in a net improvement compared to existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Work area:</b> The “work area” or limits of disturbance are defined by the construction limits of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>PFAS Contamination Investigation Limits:</b> The investigation limits and scope are dictated by NJDEP Regulatory requirements.</p> <p><b>Future Risk to Wetlands:</b> PFAS contamination at the ARFF building is a legacy of federally approved training, certification practices, and use. TTN has modified its training and certification practices so that discharges of Aqueous Firefighting Foam for training and certification are captured and disposed of properly. PFAS free Aqueous Firefighting Foams are under development but have not yet been certified for use by the FAA. The timeline for deployment of those foams is uncertain. Future discharges would only occur in the event of a bonafide emergency.</p> <p><b>NJDEP Regulatory Path/Remediation Delay:</b> Remediation is not being delayed. Characterization and remediation is following the regulatory path is specified by the NJDEP. As described, the process is expected to be long. Remediation plans will be developed in accordance with NJDEP requirements. Following the NJDEP regulatory path is in itself a commitment to timelines to complete the remediation. NJDEP considers the assessments to be the first step in remediation. Using that definition, remediation has been initiated. As noted elsewhere, the remediation is expected to be a long term process of several years. Additionally, the remediation will progress regardless of whether the Proposed Action proceeds, as is required by NJDEP regulations.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>☒ Future risks to the wetlands. The EA plan is to tear down the Aircraft Rescue and Firefighting Facility (hereafter, the “ARFF”), the site of multiple findings of high levels of PFAS contamination and build a new site on the airport property. It’s unclear whether the new ARFF will have chemicals that will only later be found to be harmful to humans and whether they will have the appropriate technologies to mitigate these contaminations. This is important because the proposed location of the new ARFF includes a Stormwater Management area adjacent to Wetland II, which is associated with the Tributary to the West Shabakunk Creek and is classified as Intermediate Resource Value with a standard 50-foot wetland transition area.</p> <p>☒ Excerpts from the NJDEP Regulatory Path suggest that remediation of PFAS could be investigated for up to 6 years before any remediation steps are taken and another decade before remediation is completed. The NJ DEP Regulatory Path spells out an 11 to 16 year process to complete remediation. The Regulatory Path only calls for a brief notice to the public (“post a sign or send out letters”).</p> <p>☒ The solution of proceeding with PFAS remediation concurrent with construction utilizing the NJ DEP Regulatory Path and a reliance on permits as enforcement tools removes the actions of the airport from public oversight while creating risks to remediation, potential high costs, and delays that could extend into the decades.</p> <p>☒ There are risks to deferring remediation efforts.</p> <p>☒ If the FAA approves this approach, there will be no leverage to ensure the remediation occurs.</p> <p>☒ There is no plan to remediate PFAS from the site, only a promise to obtain appropriate permits.</p> <p>☒ Permitting actions do not require sufficient public visibility and comment prior to approval. Therefore, they lack efficacy and inadequately protect the public from the serious risk presented.</p> <p>☒ The plan to deal with PFAS contamination though permitting compliance and concurrent development of the site is fundamentally flawed and will create a situation that cannot be remedied.</p> <p>☒ If costs increase for the construction of the airport or if anticipated passenger fees don’t meet expectations, the financial burden on the airport and community may result in a lowering of standards for remediation or extended delays, potentially costing a generation of citizens health in exchange.</p> <p>☒ The Classification Exception Area excludes areas from PFAS Remediation.</p> <p>☒ In short, a CEA defers action on an area that requires remediation, and for which remediation may be delayed indefinitely.</p>	<p>As noted elsewhere, the remediation is required under state law. Furthermore, adhering to the regulatory path would be incorporated as elements in a favorable decision, should one be issued for this project. In addition, contaminated materials are encountered during construction, those materials would be handled in accordance with NJDEP Site Remediation and Waste Management Program requirements (NJAC 7:26).</p> <p><b>ARFF Stormwater Management:</b> Detailed design of the ARFF facility will commence after the conclusion of the NEPA process. The new facility will be fully compliant with all applicable regulations. Stormwater management measures are required to address impervious surface that will be created through construction of the ARFF (and other proposed improvements). Detailed design of those measures will progress after the conclusion of the NEPA process. The new ARFF facility will include measures for control and countermeasures for spills. As noted previously, TTN has taken steps to significantly reduce the volume of discharges to the environment. Future discharges are expected to be limited to bonafide emergencies.</p> <p><b>Concurrent Construction:</b> The remediation effort is expected to outlast terminal construction. If encountered, contaminated materials will be handled in accordance with NJDEP Site Remediation and Waste Management Program requirements (NJAC 7:26), minimizing the risk of migration of contaminated materials as a result of construction.</p> <p><b>Permits and Enforcement:</b> NJDEP will hold permitting and regulatory over the PFAS remediation (and other regulated activities such as wetlands and water quality). It is beyond the scope of the FAA’s authority to enforce state and local regulations. Public input on the remediation will occur in accordance with NJDEP regulations.</p> <p><b>Financial performance may impact ability to comply with Regulatory Requirements:</b></p> <p><b>Classification Exception Area:</b> The persons responsible for conducting remediation are not allowed to defer action and remediation indefinitely. A CEA must be established at key regulatory milestones pursuant to NJAC 7:26C and NJAC 7:26E. Establishment of a CEA as an institutional control, as part of the remedial action permit (RAP) for groundwater, requires an evaluation of groundwater quality, trends, source mitigation effectiveness, and protectiveness to human health and receptors. These items are to be completed within the regulatory and/or mandatory timeframes for the site pursuant to NJAC 7:26C.</p> <p>Also, a CEA is required to be established in an area that does not meet the NJDEP groundwater quality standards. While CEAs can have varying durations based on contamination type, final establishment of a CEA for a site as part of the institutional control for a remedial action permit (RAP) for groundwater, requires an evaluation of groundwater quality, trends, source mitigation effectiveness, and protectiveness to human health and receptors. NJDEP approval of a groundwater RAP with CEA is required. Additionally, periodic monitoring and evaluation of groundwater quality pursuant to a NJDEP-approved groundwater RAP is required over the duration of the CEA to confirm protectiveness of the remedial action.</p> <p><b>PFAS Lawsuit:</b> As described in the EA, the design and construction of the Proposed Action will consider the potential for encountering PFAS or other contaminants. Engineering controls and mitigation measures will be incorporated into the construction plans.</p> <p><b>PFAS in unrelated projects:</b> The FAA requires that NEPA documents for projects unrelated to the Proposed Action are required to consider the potential for encountering PFAS and other hazardous materials.</p> <p><b>De-icing:</b> No change to aircraft de-icing procedures or quantities of de-icing fluid used are expected as a result of the Proposed Action. Spent de-icing fluid is vacuumed from the apron and disposed of properly.</p> <p><b>Naval Air Warfare Center:</b> The Naval Air Warfare Center is not within airport property and is located on the opposite side of Runway 6-24 from the Terminal Area. Remediation of contamination at the Naval Air Warfare Center is a separate and unrelated project to the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>ARFF:</b> TTN has acquired and utilizes foam testing equipment to eliminate discharge of AFFF during testing, training, and certification of staff and equipment. Both ARFF vehicles are equipped with the “No Foam” system. Acquisition of this equipment eliminates a known source of PFAS discharge. The new ARFF facility will be constructed in accordance current FAA standards which will include spill prevention, control and countermeasures as required by NJDEP.</p> <p><b>Wetlands:</b> As described in Section 5.12.1, approximately 0.33 acres of direct wetland impacts are expected. Implementation of Best Management Practices for water quality control and spill containment and countermeasures is expected to mitigate the potential for hazardous materials impacts on wetlands.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>☒ The establishment of a Classification Exception Area (CEA) give the airport a pathway to identify an area as a CEA and then not need to meet the NJ Ground Water Quality Standards for that area. The is no limit to the potential duration of a CEA.</p> <p>☒ Current construction is estimated to be 26 months, while the estimated remediation could take over a decade.</p> <p>☒ The cost to remediate PFAS, after it is trapped under the Terminal building (as noted above under FEMA designated floodplains) and under the tarmac in the site of the existing ARFF would be prohibitively expensive and might cause the airport to defer remediation indefinitely.</p> <p>☒ The NJ AG and NJDEP have filed a lawsuit against the DOD in January of this year, to clean up PFAS chemicals at the Naval Air War Center. And yet, the airport wants to plow ahead without any regard for what contamination they might inadvertently uncover or disturb.</p> <p>☒ The maintenance projects the airport is pushing through with FAA backing involve moving soil and changing water flow in land adjacent to a PFAS superfund site. That serious contamination has almost certainly migrated onto and beyond airport property.</p> <p>☒ It is unreasonable to assume that it is possible to disturb only ONE section of the stream and wetland when this is one ecological system that contains flowing water.</p> <p>☒ The new ARFF site is adjacent to a Stormwater Management area and to Wetland II, which is associated with the Tributary to the West Shabakunk Creek and is classified as Intermediate Resource Value with a standard 50-foot wetland transition area. The site plan does not consider how adverse conditions such as flooding and unforeseen health risks from the new generation of firefighting chemicals might impact health and how the airport and design of the ARFF might mitigate these. Nor does it consider how it might mitigate de-icing and firefighting training or emergency uses might be mitigated.</p> <p>☒ The design of the new ARFF facility does not consider how to mitigate hazardous material impacts in the future.</p> <p>PFAS, the forever chemical, represents a clear and present danger to residents near the airport and further afield. A proven carcinogen, PFAS causes many significant health issues for those unfortunate enough to live in the broad vicinity of its source. As has been so explicitly demonstrated by the disaster at Willow Grove Naval Air Center, the specter of PFAS contamination has spread far and wide, impacting the drinking water of over 70,000 people in at least 22 towns across two counties. Due to the late and partial response of the airport, contamination continues to this day. PFAS chemicals do not decompose or degrade; they are there forever. As documented in the EA and numerous news reports, the Trenton-Mercer Airport and the adjacent Naval Air Warfare Center are the epicenter of a massive PFAS contamination zone, risking the wellbeing of the citizens surrounding the airport, those fishing in the waters of the</p>	<p><b>Impact Assessment Criteria:</b> The evaluation criteria for each impact category are described are described in Chapter 5 of the EA. The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>PFAS Timeline:</b> The timeline for site characterization and remediation is dictated by NJDEP regulations. As described in the EA, this is expected to be a long term process.</p> <p>Pursuant to NJAC 7:26C and 7:26E, the persons responsible for conducting remediation are not allowed to defer action and remediation indefinitely. Mercer County Airport must comply with regulatory and mandatory timeframes pursuant to NJAC 7:26C to complete the remedial investigations and remedial action(s). As such, investigations will be necessary to meet the statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to the remediation of a contaminated site. An evaluation of the extent of PFAS will be conducted pursuant to NJAC 7:26E and applicable guidance. Upon completion of delineation, a remediation evaluation will be performed. NJDEP allows capping as an acceptable remediation approach pursuant to NJDEP guidance as long as certain standards and criteria are met and under specific conditions.</p> <p><b>Inconsistent Facts:</b> The commenter asserts that the EA is inconsistent regarding PFAS, but doesn't provide specific examples. Given the early stages of the long term characterization and remediation effort, there are several unknowns, including the cost of the remediation effort.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>Delaware, and those whose drinking water comes from nearby wells or living downstream in Trenton, Yardley, Morrisville and elsewhere.</p> <p>The Trenton-Mercer Airport Terminal Area Improvement Environmental Assessment (EA) has documented PFAS contamination across the area where the airport would place the new terminal, the boarding site for passengers, and locations around the wetland area leading to the Delaware River. The NJ EPA has sued the Department of Defense to remediate the Naval Air Warfare Center, which has a large area of contamination (38 acres x 300 feet deep), a portion of which it still owned by the airport. The airport acknowledges that it still requires more investigation to determine the full scope of the contamination. While the EA does a good job of documenting the contamination that is currently known, it fails on many levels, which raise questions about its plan going forward for PFAS remediation and its judgement about all aspects of its plan for expansion of the airport.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to acknowledge the PFAS contamination adjacent to its property at the Naval Air Warfare Center, its ownership of a portion of that property which is now part of the airport itself, and the fact that the NJ DEP has filed suit against the Department of Defense to remediate the site.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to consider, in its environmental assessment, the wetlands immediately adjacent to the epicenter of the on-site contamination, the existing ARFF building, It does not consider its own evidence of contaminated wells adjacent to the wetlands nor the documented flow of groundwater toward the wetlands, in its assessment. A large portion of the wetlands were arbitrarily excluded from the assessment; those wetlands that feed down to the Delaware River, potentially exposing Trenton, Yardley, Morrisville and others to these toxic chemicals.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to apply consistent and documented criteria for determining the area of impact for any Environmental Impact assessment. The EA fails to consider the impact on citizens surrounding the airport or downstream from the airport.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to provide a plan for remediation of PFAS. It admits that its investigation is incomplete. The airport failed to complete the initial investigation even though it had ample time to do so. The EA states that the investigation will continue after the approval of the EA.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to provide a vehicle for public awareness and input to the PFAS Remediation effort, relying on a Permitting process that provides minimal opportunity for public visibility or input.</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to commit to a timeline for remediation of PFAS, risking a disaster like at the Willow Grove Naval Air Center. Instead, it suggests continuing the investigation and later the remediation, concurrent with airport</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>design and construction.</p> <p>☒ The EA has internally inconsistent facts and conclusions about the PFAS contamination on its site.</p> <p>☒ The EA suggests a path toward PFAS remediation that would permit areas of PFAS contamination to be excluded from remediation, through the use of a Classification Exception Area (CEA)</p> <p>☒ The EA fails to consider the costs of PFAS Remediation, the additional costs that could be realized through remediation after construction, the impact that remediation might have on Passenger Fees or the citizens of Mercer County in taxes. The EA does not acknowledge that the significant cost of remediation might result in the use of sub-optimal solutions, remediation exclusion areas, or endless delays in remediation.</p> <p>☒ The EA’s plan to conduct the PFAS investigation and subsequent remediation after the EA approval and concurrently with the design and construction of the terminal, ARFF, and parking garage, et. Al., fails to provide any certainty of the outcome of remediation and no leverage to ensure the adequacy of the solution, which therefore risks citizens health, and removes any decision points that would allow citizens or the County commissioners to provide input, reject alternatives, ensure the project scope is not altered or change the course of the project. There is no way to ascertain how long the remediation will take and to evaluate the risk to community health based on the duration. ☒ The EA fails to consider the impact of the lawsuit for PFAS remediation at the Naval Air Warfare Center. With a lawsuit pending, and a portion of the Naval Air Warfare Center Site now owned by TTN, it seems irresponsible to continue with any projects until this is settled and the PFAS rectified. It is illogical to assume PFAS contamination in one area does not ‘bleed’ into another.</p> <p>☒ The EA, in the design of the new ARFF facility, does not consider how to mitigate hazardous material impacts in the future. The new ARFF site suffers from some of the same design issues as the old ARFF site. The site plan does not consider how adverse conditions such as flooding and unforeseen health risks from the new generation of firefighting chemicals might impact health, and how the airport and design of the ARFF might mitigate these. Nor does it consider how de-icing, firefighting training, and emergency uses might be mitigated.</p> <p>We, the members of BRRAM and I, Donald Wilcox, having reviewed the Terminal Area Improvement EA with regard to PFAS, object to the EA going forward to the FAA. We are gravely concerned about the health hazards associated with these pollutants making their way into our drinking water because of the contamination already found on the site and adjacent to the airport, and the disturbances caused by airport projects. We ask, why is the evaluation limited to the airport property?</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>How is it possible that the airport, and its operations, only be impacted within its own walls? The airport does not function within its own contained biosphere. The impact of the airport goes well beyond the property lines and river. Why isn't the radius of the study larger? 10-mile radius is common practice. We posit that, while NEPA does not have regulatory remediation oversight, the FAA does have a responsibility to understand the true cost of the planned construction represented in the EA and the risks to the financial health of the community that those plans create. We do not understand how the airport can proceed, without knowing the true scope and cost of remediating the PFAS issue.</p> <p>In Conclusion  We respectfully submit that it is not acceptable to wait and perform further testing for PFAS concurrently with construction. It is not acceptable to perform PFAS remediation without public input. It is not acceptable to defer PFAS remediation to a later date, in some cases possibly never identifying the presence of PFAS. We, the citizens of PA and NJ who may potentially be impacted by PFAS cannot afford to wait any longer to understand the extent of the PFAS contamination at the Naval Air Warfare Center and the airport, and when it might be in the airport's interest to remediate it. After EA approval, we will have no public means to ensure the comprehensive and appropriate remediations measures are taken by the airport. We therefore must insist that the full scope of PFAS contamination at the airport must be identified and remediated BEFORE approval of the Terminal Area Improvements EA and BEFORE any further construction starts. The Terminal Area Improvement EA must be rejected until all issues identified have been properly addressed. The airport must halt its development of the site until these toxic chemicals have been removed.</p>	
5.24.21	PC	Eulalia Brooks	1	<p>I am a Ewing, NJ resident. I strongly oppose an expansion of the Trenton-Mercer Airport because it will negatively impact my quality of life. Increased noise and air pollution, as well as potential water pollution, are simply unacceptable.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 for discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Water Pollution:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with Federal and New Jersey regulations and standards governing water quality.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.24.21	PC	Michelle Reyes	2	I live very close to the airport with my children this extension plan is only going to put us exposed to more environmental hazards than what already exists and every family in the area these hazards that the airport causes is proven to show that it causes many diseases and deaths.	The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment, including risks to Children’s Health and Safety (Section 5.9.4) in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations.
5.18.21	PC	Julie Power	3	As a resident of Bucks County, whose house is directly in the flight path of your airport, and whose complaints and protests of your incremental expansion of this airport the last 20 years has fallen on deaf ears.... .I'm making this last complaint to tell you how you have ruined the property value of our home, polluted our environment, and made it extremely difficult to remain in our home. The noise, the addition of many flights and total disregard of Bucks County residents whose homes you fly over is a complete and total disgrace. This sham is our tax dollars at work	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 for discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Noise and Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA for a discussion of Noise. Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p> <p><b>Flight Path and Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11. .</p> <p><b>Tax Dollars:</b> Comment regarding waste of tax dollars is noted. See Section 6.2.2, item 2 regarding Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p>
5.17.21	PC	Toni Gaffney	4	Does the airport have overnight parking? It would just be 1 night or several hours	The airport currently provides and will continue to provide overnight parking. As presented in Chapter 1 of the EA, under the Proposed Action, the Project involves the reconfiguration of parking areas to improve access and circulation within the parking lots and along the adjacent roadways. Addition of a terminal parking garage is proposed to provide covered vehicle parking within walking distance of the new terminal building. See <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport</a> for additional parking information on parking at TTN.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.25.21	PC	Supervisor John Lewis	5	Dear Urban Engineers: I am a Supervisor in Lower Makefield Township and would like to provide a short public comment during the TTS EA Hearing on June 2nd. If possible, I would like to be scheduled between 7:00 and 7:45 as I have a Township Meeting at 7:30 PM. Please provide an email confirmation of my request. Thanks in advance for your help. Sincerely, John B. Lewis Secretary, Board of Supervisors Lower Makefield Township 1100 Edgewood Road Yardley, PA 19067. 267-994-4564 (c) <a href="https://www.lmt.org">https://www.lmt.org</a>	The NEPA process included a 45-day public comment period for the Draft EA, starting from day of publication (May 03, 2021) of the Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers ( <i>Times of Trenton</i> and <i>Bucks County Courier Times</i> ). Throughout the NEPA review process, the TTN and the FAA sought input in writing from the public. The comment period closed on June 16, 2021, giving time to the public and agencies to provide input and comments to the Proposed Action. A project specific email was also established for the public to submit written comments. The meeting was held virtually due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. The hearing began at 7:00 pm (Eastern Time) with a short welcome and presentation. Public comments were received following the presentation. The commentor was afforded an opportunity to speak at the hearing. The hearing concluded at approximately 10:15 pm.
5.25.21	PC	Tricia	6	Go for it. More flights to different areas would be wonderful. Especially nonstop flights to other areas.	Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2, Item 11.
5.25.21	PC	Sharon S	7	I am a Mercer Co. Resident in Lawrenceville and am concerned about the increase in air traffic over our home already. I think the size of the airport is sufficient as is and we need a more comprehensive environmental impact assessment before ANY plans are finalized. Thank you!	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 1, and 11.</p> <p><b>“Environmental Impact Assessment”:</b> It is assumed the commentor is referencing an EIS. See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p>
5.26.21	PC	Brendan Havner	8	Shit's unnecessary	See Chapter 2 of EA for Purpose and Need of the Proposed Action.
5.26.21	PC	C. Wyluda	9	<p><b>Noise:</b> Some planes that flew over would rattle the glass panes in my windows and wake me up after midnight and before 6AM. County used to have interest in noise complaints but now complaint form is no longer helpful. Recently not bothered by rattling, but concerns that might change.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Concerns that the issue of air quality is not addressed.</p> <p><b>Expansion:</b> Overall concerns of expansion; airport has been of limited and manageable size so far.</p>	<p><b>Noise/Mercer County Response to Noise Complaints:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 7 for a discussion of Mercer County’s Noise Complaint Procedures.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p>
5.26.21	PC	Amy Willuski	10	Extremely concerned about the environmental, and community impact of the airport expansion. I would like to request an Environmental Impact Statement. The airport, which is located amid suburban neighborhoods, was never intended to handle the level of air traffic, nor ground traffic, that is anticipated with this expansion.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 for Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p> <p><b>Airport Ability to Handle Air and Ground Traffic:</b> The Proposed Action will have no effect on the TTN’s airfield capacity. See Section 6.2.2. Nor will the Proposed Action affect roadway intersection operations. See Section 5.10 and Appendix G.</p>
5.26.21	PC	R Oktay Kacmaz	11	Concerns about wildlife disruption by way of noise and pollution; request EIS for population to reach decision	<p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species’ habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project’s action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p> <p><b>Noise and Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA for a discussion of Noise. Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality.</p>
5.26.21	PC	Mathhew Ferris	12	<p>Hi, as a resident of Pennington, I would like to express my sincere "NO" vote on the idea of the airport expanding; the surrounding area is simply much too congested and inhabited by too many people who will be negatively impacted by this for it to be taken seriously.</p> <p>Dealing with noise pollution, air pollution and loss in property values are NOT why we and thousands of others moved to this area, and New Jersey is already dealing with population flight due to the property tax situation - this would only make it worse.</p> <p>Please do NOT expand Mercer County Airport!</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA for a discussion of aircraft noise. ,</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Property Value / Property Tax Situation:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p> <p><b>Too Much Existing Congestion/Too Many Negatively Impacted People:</b> As noted in Section 5.10 and Appendix G, Traffic Studies performed as part of this EA found that the project will not affect intersection LOS. It is uncertain what is referred to by "too many people negatively impacted".</p>
5.26.21	PC	Shannon Sticker	13	<p>Good morning, I am writing to request that PA Senator Steve Santarsiero, 10th District, be given priority in the queue for making public comment in the June 2 public meeting. We will be joining the meeting virtually and hope that Senator Santarsiero will be able speak as early as possible during the meeting. Please confirm receipt of this message to Shannon.Sticker@pasenate.com. Thank you in advance and we look forward to participating. Shannon Sticker Local Government Director Senator Steve Santarsiero</p>	<p>See Section 6.2 for a thorough discussion of the Public Involvement for this EA. Representative Santarsiero was afforded an opportunity to comment. The hearing concluded at approximately 10:15 pm.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Anthony Pirone	14	<p>I live in one of the direct path of the planes landing at the airport. They literally come just hundreds of feet over my house. I for one am not happy with any further expansion of the airport. It would be very bad for my family with constant flyovers and I cannot imagine it will be good for our property values. Enough is enough, let us enjoy what peace we can get when a plane does not fly over our homes.</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths / Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9 –11.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discusses the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 or Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Tom & Cornealia Jastrebski	15	<p>We support the mandated environmental impact statement and oppose expansion of the airport</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for a discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions of Airfield and Terminal Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p>See Chapter 2 and Section 6.2.2, Items 16 and 19 for discussion of the rationale and justification for the terminal size.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Kelly	16	<p>Email Subject: Pro Terminal</p>	<p>Subject (comment) noted.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				(No comment attached in the email)	
5.26.21	PC	Kathleen Mooney	17	I oppose the increase in Trenton-Mercer Airport Capacity. I live near the airport and the noise is bad enough already. In addition, traffic congestion has increased significantly on Bear Tavern Road with the new housing developments in the Mountain View areas. Add to that the so-called Ewing Town Center. The last thing we need is more noise, traffic congestion and devalued residential property.	<p>Comment noted. See additional discussion below.</p> <p><b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA and Section 6.2.2, Item 6 for a discussion of noise. As described, the analysis found no change in aircraft noise levels outside of the airport property.</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestion:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4 and Section 5.10 for discussion of traffic.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 12.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Crystal	18	I'm not a fan of any form of expansion of this airport. I don't want to see an increase in planes flying overhead for a number of reasons: noise, aesthetics, pollution etc. Overall, the quality of life in this community will diminish if there's increased flight pattern. Go to EWR if you need to fly.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths / Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for a discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Aesthetics:</b> Visual effects of the Proposed Action are described in Section 5.11 of the EA. As described in Section 5.11, no significant impact was identified.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Quality of life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13.</p> <p>Commentor's opinion regarding use EWR is noted.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Xavier M Le Clainche	19	We purchased a house in what we thought was a quiet community and it definitely was during the pandemic. For the last few weeks, we have been flown over by Frontier aircrafts and they fly very low and frequently turn just over our yard causing noise. Should the frequency increase the value of our property would be drastically impacted. I strongly oppose any expansion of the terminal or anything that would lead to an increase of traffic.	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA and Section 6.2.2, Item 6 for discussion of noise. The analysis found no change in aircraft noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Flight Paths / Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for a discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestion:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4 and the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Nick W	20	Any further expansion of Trenton Mercer Airport would only diminish quality of life in the area. We don't need any more noise, traffic, or pollution. This would also reduce property values in the area. No airport expansion!	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA and Section 6.2.2, Item 6, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestion:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4 and Based on the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of Property Values.
5.27.21	PC	Tom Rizzie	21	Economic growth is my primary concern and this will benefit that goal. Best of luck! P.S. I have received physical mail with statements of exaggerated concerns with absolutely no evidence. Fear will not win in 2021+	Comment noted.
5.26.21	PC	Linda Kuti	22	My family and neighbors greatly oppose expansion to our neighborhood.	Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2 for definitions of Terminal Capacity and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. The Proposed Action would result in a larger terminal compared to existing conditions. The project would have no effect on airfield capacity.
5.27.21	PC	Huong Giang Ferris	23	I live right here and would be afraid of the pollution and danger involved.	Noise and Pollution: See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and as described in Section 5.8 of the EA for a discussion of Noise. Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.
5.27.21	PC	Matthew Ferris	24	Hi, as a resident of Pennington, I would like to express my sincere "NO" vote on the idea of the airport expanding; the surrounding area is simply much too congested and inhabited by too many people who will be negatively impacted by this for it to be taken seriously. Dealing with noise pollution, air pollution and loss in property values are NOT why we and thousands of others moved to this area, and New Jersey is already dealing with population flight due to the property tax situation - this would only make it worse. please do NOT expand Mercer County Airport! Sincerely, Matthew Ferris	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of Property Values.</p> <p><b>Too Much Existing Congestion/Too Many Negatively Impacted People:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4, Section 5.10 and Appendix G, Traffic Studies performed as part of this EA found that the project will not affect intersection LOS. It is uncertain what is referred to by "too many people negatively impacted". As described above, significant impacts resulting from noise or air emissions are not expected as a result of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Population Flight:</b> Population migration occurs for a multitude of reasons that are well beyond the scope of this EA. These include weather, education or economic opportunities, family or personal reasons, cost of living, and many others.</p> <p><b>Property Taxes:</b> Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2, Item 2.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Mary Brown	25	I am a 40 year resident of the Mountainview/West Trenton community. My taxes are very high but worth it for the atmosphere in the neighborhood. The airport expansion would not only bring noise and air pollution to my area, but devalue my property and have a negative influence on the wildlife surrounding us. Please stop this plan.	<p><b>Airport Expansion</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Property Taxes:</b> Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2, Item 2. for a discussion of Mercer County Fiscal Responsibility, Accounting, and Taxes.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Section 6.2.2 Item 6 aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Sections 5.1 and 6.2.2 Item 6, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Kathy Monti	26	I oppose the increase of the reckless plans of the airport expansion of the terminal in mercer airport. We in Hopewell Twp, Pennington, Ewing Twp do not want jets taking off and landing every so many minutes. The noise is unbearable, stop reckless spending plans ,our property values will decrease, the unhealthy environmental conditions also play a big part.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Section 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>Spending:</b> Comment noted. See Section 6.2.2, Item 2 for a discussion of Mercer County Fiscal Responsibility, Accounting, and Taxes.</p>
5.27.21	PC	Kathy Just	27	No comment attached	No comment attached.
5.27.21	PC	Kathy Just	28	No comment attached	No comment attached.
5.27.21	PC	Tamera Matteo	29	We just recently bought a new home with the knowledge that it was in a flight path. However, we have lived in the area for over 23 years and knew that the Trenton Airport was a small airport and we knew the volume of traffic. If the airport was larger, there is no way we would have bought our home at the price we did. We bought a 12 acre farm and would not have bought it if we knew that there would be increased air traffic. An expansion would definitely effect the home values of these farms and other homes.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9 – 11 for a discussion of flight paths and operations.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Michelle Gonzalez	30	No ! No more flights! I can't sleep anymore	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Flight Paths / Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Derrick Sanders	31	No comment or message in email	No comment or message in email
5.28.21	PC	Richard Rabinowitz	32	I am writing in support of expanding the Trenton Mercer Airport, in spite of potential negative impact on some local property values and maybe traffic. The terminal is cramped and its facilities are poorly adapted to 21st century security needs and ADA obligations. The service level to passengers seems ok at the	Comment noted.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				moment, but an expansion would improve access. I recommend, in addition to the terminal expansion, an expansion of transit service from Trenton and West Trenton stations, as well as possibly Princeton.	
5.28.21	PC	Jean Broadway	33	I am directly affected by this airport. Depending on the wind direction, the planes fly over my home. If you expand any further, my homes value and noise issues will be affected . Please, stop any expansion. I am also afraid of possible accidents. Please stop.	<p><b>Comment noted.</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2, item 9 – 11 for flight paths. See Section 5.8 of the EA for noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 12, for property value.</p> <p><b>Accidents:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 65 for a discussion of Accidents. As described in Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 the Proposed Action would not affect flight paths, operations, or other factors that would increase the risk of aircraft accidents.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Joann Rose	34	Please no expansion! I live on Hillside Avenue in Morrisville. Some of the existing flights come over my house! One day it sounded like they were landing on my roof!! As a recent Widow and a homeowner, her for 48 years I'm so sad about all that noise. No more noise!!	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Flight Path and Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>
5.28.21	PC	Jean Kosits	35	I am totally in favor of a new terminal being built at Trenton Mercer Airport with better flow/amenities/seating/ space. That being said, I am also in favor of adequate environmental studies being done to ensure that existing neighborhoods and open space are not negatively impacted.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Sandra Favilla	36	This terminal expansion and other expansion projects are negatively affecting the immediate and surrounding neighborhoods. Please provide the mandated environmental impact statement for this project to the public and STOP the expansion.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.28.21	PC	Stephanie Hanzel Cohen	37	<p>So, it is with a broken heart that I've recently learned about the airport expansion project and the subsequent impact on our region that this expansion will have on noise pollution, air and water pollution, increased traffic congestion, and the overall collateral damage this effort will have on our quality of life, not to mention a decrease in our home values over time. I am also a high school teacher at The Pennington School and as a concerned and passionate educator, I am worried about what this project will mean for young people and their health. I am writing to express my deep worry that expanding the airport, as is currently planned, will result in health consequences for the region that NO ONE (including developers who also care deeply for their family and neighbors) would ever welcome in their neighborhood. Please consider whether you would want to have this expansion happen in your backyard? Humans live in this area and love it. Please don't destroy our habitat. Please consider what it would be like if someone told you that this type of project was happening where you live. Surely, you want your children and grandchildren to have a healthy life with ample opportunities to be outdoors with clear air, water, and free from noise that has multiple adverse effects on sleep and mental health. Small regional airports should be updated, but we do not need to increase the air traffic in our beautiful area. My uncle who worked for 30 years for United Airlines in Pittsburgh died of bladder cancer at a premature age. His oncology team speculated that working at the airport around the exhaust of all those planes was a likely contributor to his particular aggressive form of cancer. My family and others in our neighborhood will be devastated if our tiny, yet useful neighborhood airport, is expanded to accommodate a higher traffic load. PLEASE hear our calls to reject the expansion plan. Thank you for your time and care for our community. Sincerely, Stephanie Hanzel Cohen resident of Mountainview Rd, Ewing NJ (Phone number redacted)</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Section 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Water Pollution:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11 for a discussion of flight paths and air traffic.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessment</p>
5.28.21	PC	Tom Wilkinson	39	<p>I live in Ewing and can hear the planes take off occasionally. It's not too bad though since there aren't that many flights, take off patterns vary, and planes are a lot quieter than they used to be. I fully support the proposed terminal expansion. It would be great to have a modern facility that county residents can be proud of as an alternative to the hour drives to Newark or Philly. All the hundreds of thousands of travelers who use that facility for convenience are voting 'yes' as well. Please let me know what I can do to support the expansion.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Joseph Radice	40	<p>there is too much noise and air pollution right now. Please do not, do not expand the airport. waste of money</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See section 5.8 and Section 6.2.2 Item 6 for a discussion of Noise. Air Pollution is described in Section 5.1 of the EA. See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2, Items 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Waste of Money:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item for a discussion of Mercer County Fiscal Responsibility, Accounting, and Taxes.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.28.21	PC	Gino Pasqualone	41	Support improvements to secure and increase safety at terminal	Comment noted.
5.28.21	PC	Damon Grandbouche	42	There needs to be a full study done on the environmental and financial impact an expansion at TTN would bring to our area. Property values would likely plummet with the increase in noise pollution and traffic. It's already a great nuisance and gets worse by the day.	<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3. The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F.</p> <p><b>Financial Impact:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for a discussion of fiscal considerations.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9 – 11.</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 and the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Don Krevetski	43	It is imperative that these projects at the airport move forward with the new terminal as it will provide Meaningful construction and maintenance jobs to the local workforce and stimulate the economy of Mercer County	Comment noted.
5.28.21	PC	Todd Flannery	44	Please decrease the expansion of the Trenton-Mercer Airport. The airplanes flying overhead our towns are causing noise, air, and water pollution. It is important to decrease jet noise and preserve our protected land and waterways. The airplane noise must decrease.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-112 for discussion of flight patterns</p> <p><b>Jet Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Protected Land and Waterways:</b> Except for temporary increases during construction, the project effects are limited to airport property. Section 5.12 of the EA describes water quality, water pollution and water resources. .</p>
5.28.21	PC	Todd Flannery	45	To whom it may concern, The amount of airplane traffic flying over my town, Pennington/Hopewell, NJ, has been very disturbing and distracting. My family and I have been awakened early in the morning by airplanes flying near or over our home. The planes have been so close that our home has actually shook. This has impacted our sleep and may impact our health and religious services. We ask for your immediate attention in decreasing the amount of airplane noise and traffic flying over Pennington and Hopewell, NJ. Thank you	<p><b>Air Traffic and Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E). Request to decrease existing noise is outside the scope of the EA. The Proposed Action is intended to address the purpose and need described in Section 2 of the EA.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Maureen Troiano	46	Voting against expansion due to negative impact on real estate values and quiet living. Traffic has already increased, disturbing the peace, flight paths are lower, much too close to homes, a disaster waiting to happen.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Traffic Congestion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 and the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p>
5.28.21	PC	Yvonne Daniel	47	We need an environmental impact study. The proximity of flight paths to preserved land where short eared owls nest should be considered.	<p><b>Environmental Impact Study:</b> It is assumed the commentor is referring to Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p><b>Flight Path:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 –11. For a discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Short eared owls nest:</b> According to the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Division of Fish and Wildlife (<a href="https://www.nj.gov/dep/fgw/ensp/pdf/end-thrtened/shrtearedowl.pdf">https://www.nj.gov/dep/fgw/ensp/pdf/end-thrtened/shrtearedowl.pdf</a>) Short eared owls have historically bred along the Atlantic and Delaware Bay coasts of New Jersey. The Delaware Bay begins at approximately Wilmington, Delaware, approximately 55 miles southwest of TTN. Further, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Division of Fish and Wildlife reports that the last confirmed nesting by short eared owls in New Jersey was in 1979. Based on these factors, impacts to nesting Short-eared owls are not a concern for this project. Coordination with the wildlife agencies was performed. See Chapter 5 and Appendix C for further discussion.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Phillip Brackin	48	Please stop expansion at Trenton Mercer airport. It would be bad for the quality of life in central New Jersey. There are two large airports with adequate capacity within a short drive.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Mary	49	There are too many planes flying overhead as it is. Planes should not be able to fly directly over homes on the way to the airport. They have to be redirected and expansion would make it much worse. Please stop the expansion.	<p>See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Marge Stanford	50	I live near the airport and am against the mega expansion of a little local airport. This airport was not meant to be a huge facility but only as a local airport (company jets, private jets and 1 small commercial airliner. The proposed expansion would cause many bad issues arising. Yes add on some extra terminal space but it is proposed to add space, 3x the size of the original structure. That is an overkill and would cost the residents in taxes plus the air pollution, noise pollution, destruction of the woods near the airport, the environmental impact on the wildlife, the grounds near or around the facility. Being a resident, I see this action as totally ignoring the people that live in the area. The transparency is very sparse and we the people have little to say contra to what the county/township desires. All of these expansion, are being stuffed down our throats and we are not being heard to the inherent problems to such a huge expansion of the airport. We don't want this expansion (safety yes,) but not building a huge airport. The airport is sandwiched between two roads (limiting space) , the traffic would be horrible( noise, air pollution, ground pollution ) and draining funds that could be used to better the	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Destruction of woods:</b> Tree removal for this project is 3.5 acres 1.68 acres would be revegetated. See Section 5.2 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>community. Plus, we are in difficult times as a community ( as well as our country)and it wouldn't be prudent to build a "big white elephant" that will not be used to its fullest. I find this attitude reckless and destructive. Our community would be changed considerably and the payback for this expansion would be minimal. There are more negatives: reduced property value ( they even want to tear down residential homes and other structures). We have construction on Parkway (housing) they will also impact travel congestion and then airport expansion would make more traffic congestion. The quality of life would be altered too by a bigger facility for the worst. There should be an environmental impact study to fully justify the mega expansion of this little airport. We don't want an airport akin to Newark. Why is the FAA and Mercer County officials hiding their true plans for this airport from the people? Where is the transparency? We want to protect our homes, health and visual appearance of the community. Plus we don't need a huge facility for the planes that do fly here (1 airline only). Plus, we don't want any more. There's more to be said, against this expansion but the room is not available to do so. We do not want a 400% increase of Trenton-Mercer Airport capacity, leave the monies for other important projects ( fix roads, bridges, for example). Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p> <p><b>Ground pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18. Contamination is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of ground pollution or contamination is governed by an established NJDEP procedure. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN. As described, remediation under the NJ Site Remediation Program regulations will proceed regardless of whether the Proposed Action proceeds.</p> <p><b>Transparency:</b> See Section 6.2 for Public Involvement and summary of public participation.</p> <p><b>Traffic Congestions:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4 for a discussion of traffic.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for a discussion of fiscal issues.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Tearing Down Homes:</b> No home demolition is proposed as part of this Proposed Action</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts (Nearby Housing Construction):</b> As described in Section 5.13 of the EA, no notable cumulative impacts were identified.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Bryan Johnston	52	<p>There is already enough noise pollution with the current landing patterns. Trenton is not a city that needs to be served by an airport. Spend your money on cleaning up the city.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Funding: See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for a discussion of fiscal considerations.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Angel Louis Valentin	53	<p>I am very appalled and disappointed that there is consideration in expanding mercer airport as this could have a profound negative impact on my family and community. The pollution, traffic, and noise would have a negative impact on my home, health, and happiness. I pay near \$12,000 in property taxes to live in my home in mountain view and I would likely be forced to relocate if this expansion occurs. Please have consideration for Ewing township residents, the community and environment and please DO NOT EXPAND THE AIRPORT AND RUIN EEWING TWP.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 132 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessment</p> <p><b>Happiness (Quality of Life):</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Flight Path:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.29.21	PC	Denise Hamilton	54	I live at 2398 Pennington Road close to Mercer/Trenton airport. The planes fly so low over my house all hours of the day. The noise due to the planes very low altitude is unbearable. I am no exaggerating when I say that the lights on the plane shone direct into my bedroom Windows. This is a nuisance and it is driving down the value of my home. Please do not expand the service and please develop a flight path over the highway instead of through our neighborhood. Sincerely Mrs.Hamilton	<p>Commenter is describing an existing condition related to flight paths. As described below, the Proposed Action will have no effect on flight paths.</p> <p><b>Flight Path:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Lindsay	55	I strongly oppose the expansion of the Trenton-Mercer Airport. I have young children and am very concerned with the environmental impact, including increased air, water, and noise pollution. There is already a decreased quality of life with the increase in the number of flights into and out of the airport. If the airport is expanded, we may be forced to move and pull our children from the excellent schools in Hopewell Valley. I am very concerned about the impact of the airport and oppose any and all expansion.	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality.</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p>
5.29.21	PC	Michael Jodoin	56	I am strongly against the expansion of the Trenton airport. Given our impending climate disaster and the enormous negative contribution the airline industry makes to this existential global environmental catastrophe, and numerous other airport choices within the region in is absolutely irresponsible to expand this airport.	<p>The commentor cites broader (global) concerns that are beyond the scope of the EA.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p>Climate effects are broadly described in Section 5.4 of the EA. As described in Section 5.4 the Proposed Action would not induce additional aircraft operations or change in the aircraft fleet using TTN, therefore operational emissions would be essentially the same under the Action and No Action alternatives.</p> <p>Greenhouse Gas emissions during construction are disclosed in Section 5.4.3. As noted, the FAA has not established a significance threshold.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Angela Ratliff	57	I’ve lived near the airport, in Pennington, since moving to New Jersey. While convenient, we constantly heard flights arriving and leaving. Expansion means more noise! Please do not expand the airport.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>
5.30.21	PC	Donald Layton	58	no comment attached	No comment attached.
5.30.21	PC	Tom Leary	59	Just say NO! Increased air traffic, increased vehicle traffic nothing good for Ewing twsp!	<p>Commentor’s opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4, the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
5.30.21	PC	Dr Sharon Whitfield	60	As someone who lives off of River Rd, I am worried about the lack of environmental research regarding this expansion. I demand: Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property 2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA) 3. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p><b>Contaminants:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 18 for a description of the PFAS remediation procedures and requirements. The recommendations in the Phase II report will be followed. The SWPPP will ensure there is no net increase in stormwater runoff.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment</b> – See Section 6.2.2, Item 175 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments. .</p> <p><b>Independent Accounting</b> - See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for a discussion of fiscal considerations.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Arlene Abrams	61	how much more flights are planned? Will the actual site be enlarged?	<p><b>Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11.</p> <p><b>Site:</b> No change to airport property boundaries is proposed. As described in Section 1 of the EA, the replacement terminal is larger than the existing terminal, but will remain entirely on existing airport property.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Kathryn Trenner	62 and 63	I don't want MORE NOISY planes flying low over my house. ENVIRONMENTALLY DESTRUCTIVE AN ANNOYING; Noise	<p>Commenter submitted two comments in sequence (62 and 63)</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Noise See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and as described in Section 5.8 of the EA.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Helen Marie Dolton	64	I oppose the Expansion of the Trenton Mercer Airport capacity for environmental reasons	<p>Opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation of Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p>Commenter did not cite a specific environmental reason. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, no significant environmental, social, or economic consequences were identified.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Maria Herwig	65	As a Trenton resident that never used the airport, I implore you to very carefully consider all environmental factors that a possible expansion will affect. Please, don't turn Trenton into an air pit stop. We already have so many unresolved problems. The implications can severely degrade quality of life. Thank you for your attention.	<p>Commenter cites unspecified unresolved problems, presumably unrelated to the airport. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, no significant environmental, social, or economic consequences were identified.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p>
5.30.21	PC	Melissa	66	As lifelong residents of Ewing, who recently moved to a different area of town, we are still and will always be, opposed to the expansion of the airport. There is already condos and townhomes being developed and this has created additional traffic in the town. The police department hasn't expanded and has no plans to and this means reduced services for the entire town. We can't afford another expansion that will bring more traffic into this area. Adding a Wawa gas station alone brought in more traffic to the town. With traffic comes increased pollution, not to mention pollution from additional planes. This is unacceptable and unfair to jeopardize residents' health. I want to feel safe in my town and	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation of Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 4 and the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Health</b> – See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				I want my children to feel safe in our town. I am tired of constantly having to fight for my health and the health of my children in this town. We do not need more traffic or more pollution in this town. It comes at a significant cost to the residents and the township and is frankly unacceptable.	analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.  <b>Law Enforcement:</b> Size of the police department is an issue outside of the scope of the EA.  <b>Cumulative Impacts (Nearby Housing Construction):</b> As described in Section 5.13 of the EA, no notable cumulative impacts were identified.  <b>Cost</b> - See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for a discussion of fiscal considerations.
5.30.21	PC	Donna Ahmed	67	Love that airport needs to expand for more airlines and business.	Comment noted.
5.30.21	PC	Judy	68	Please stop this airport expansion. I live nearby and have a well and a garden. This expansion will cause much more air, water and noise pollution. An EIS and EA must be done. But even so they will show this is outrageous and life threatening to all life surrounding the airport for many miles. And not conducting public hearings is sneaky and deceptive. PLEASE STOP THIS expansion now!	Opinion noted.  <b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.  <b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 6.2.2, Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).  <b>Water:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.  <b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.  <b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.  <b>Safety:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 5.  <b>Public Hearing:</b> A virtual public hearing was held on June 2, 2021 from 7pm to approximately 1015 pm when no further comments were offered. The hearing was conducted virtually to ensure the health and safety of all participants due to the ongoing global pandemic. Multiple Notices of Hearing were published in the Times of Trenton and Bucks County Courier Times. See Section 6.2 for details.
5.30.21	PC	Thomas DeShields	69	Go for it. It is needed.	Comment noted.
5.30.21	PC	Judy	70	I have lived very near the airport most of my life. Hearing and seeing planes and now jets occasionally during the day is normal. I understand that a new terminal is imminent, but to increase capacity 400% is downright invasive of my life as well as everyone in the area. If planes take off and land every 7.5 minutes is not acceptable and must be stopped. Even 100% increase is too much! Please do not do this to an area that is mostly homes. Thank you.	Comment noted.  <b>Airport Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.  <b>Aircraft Operations:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11 describe flight paths.  <b>Land Use Compatibility:</b> Section 5.6 of the EA describes Land Use Compatibility (e.g., residences). The EA determined that no significant impacts on land use compatibility would occur.
5.31.21	PC	Sherri	71	I am opposed to any expansion Message: I do remember the noise that was generated 30 years ago between 6-9am and 4-7pm Mon to Friday. I wouldn't want the flight schedule increased again.	<b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.  <b>Aircraft Operations:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					Flight schedules are at the discretion of the aircraft operators and beyond the purview of this EA. See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a description of TTN's noise abatement policy and procedures for addressing noise complaints.
5.31.21	PC	B. Zakharieva	72	The so called expansion of the airport in a densely populated area will destroy the fabric of two communities and two counties. Do you want to cause a mass exit of homeowners who contribute with their taxes and leave behind scorched earth? There won't be enough passengers to justify this large airport...Stop the madness!	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Commentor does not specify which two communities and counties will be affected.</p> <p>Population migration occurs for a multitude of reasons that are well beyond the scope of this EA. These include weather, education or economic opportunities, family or personal reasons, cost of living, and many others.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Barry Hantman	73	I live a 1/2 mile down the street from the airport. I fully support the expansion of the airport for numerous reasons. I have lived in West Trenton since 1987 and have seen the expansion of West Trenton. Rte.95 Bridge, GM site. ouse is the problem, traffic is.	Comment noted.
5.31.21	PC	Bob	74	Airport is for everyone not just rich. It was therefore big houses	Comment noted.
6.1.21	PC	Brian McGrath	75	Nobody want to live next to an airport so why diminish the lives of thousands of people for what cannot be undone. I live miles from the airport yet aircraft come over my home at less than 2000 feet. I appears the tower does not monitor and enforces approach heights. This ill-conceived expansion plan benefits few but punishes many. It is a reason to move away. People elected to improve life in the County are doing the exact opposite.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> Commenter is describing existing conditions for flight paths. See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11 for further discussion.</p> <p><b>Ill Conceived Expansion Plan:</b> Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Caroline Hoedemaker	76	I am opposed to increasing the size of the airport to facilitate a major airlines, particularly since there is already a large increase of <50 distance flights. The noise and disturbance of flights over the Pennington/Hopewell area is a great concern. I fly frequently and find access to Philadelphia and Newark both is more than ample.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Facilitating Major Airlines:</b> Frontier Airlines has served TTN continuously since 2012. The Proposed Action will result in replacement of the undersized existing terminal building to accommodate existing and forecast passenger growth at TTN.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>&lt;50 distance flights:</b> It is unclear what the commenter is referring to "large increase of &lt;50 distance flights". See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 for a discussion of noise.</p> <p><b>Newark and Philadelphia:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Caryl Chambers	77	I am strongly opposed to any plans to expand the Trenton Mercer Airport in any way. The proximity of the Philadelphia Airport is sufficient for this area. The environmental impact, noise, air and water pollution, reduced property values and increased traffic	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Philadelphia Airport:</b> Philadelphia International Airport (PHL) is an existing airport with its own challenges. The need for the Proposed Action at TTN is described in Chapter 2.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				congestion are NOT ACCEPTABLE. I want the plan for expansion defeated.	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6 for a discussion of noise.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 for a discussion of Traffic.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Dawn and Matt Riello	78	By expanding the airport, the airplane noise, pollution ... very close our homes will result in many long term residents leaving the area.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2, Item 6, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Population Flight:</b> Population migration occurs for a multitude of reasons that are well beyond the scope of this EA. These include weather, education or economic opportunities, family or personal reasons, cost of living, and many others.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Dorothy David	79	I am opposed to the increased noise, traffic, pollution that this expansion would cause. Keep Mercer County low key.	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 and the Traffic Engineering Report contained in the EA, which is highlighted in Chapter 5, Paragraph 5.10 and Appendix G, the Project is not expected to affect intersection performance (congestion and delays).</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Douglas Weigle	80	I've lived in Mercer county for 20 years and I do not want to see our air quality get any worse or hear more noise. It's already bad enough with all the highways and trains and small airport nearby. I oppose the increase of the airport capacity. If there was a lot more airport noise than there already is, I would not have moved here	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.
5.31.21	PC	Grace Sinden	81	Though I live in Princeton, less close than people in the immediate airport area, I am concerned about increased regional air and water pollution as well as increased noise locally and generally. From my house skylight at night, I can often see one-a-minutes planes above. I do not know where they are from or going to and we do not hear the noise of those planes at ground level. However, we do have Princeton Airport as a close neighbor and sometimes hear loud helicopter or airplane noise. There must be a thorough EIS (Env. Impact Statement performed airport expansion.	<p>Commenter notes observing frequent aircraft operations, but due to distance from TTN, acknowledges uncertainty as to their origin/destination.</p> <p><b>Air:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Ilene Blanton	82	<p>I cannot attend the meeting tonight but would like my comments to be included in the public record regarding TTN expansion plans.</p> <p>I am vehemently opposed to moving further with any construction or expansion activities on TTN until the further actions can be taken and reviewed by all stakeholders (including residents and taxpayers) involved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A comprehensive evaluation of toxic contaminants which have been previously identified on the airport property, and the creation of a containment/remediation plan to eliminate risk of their spread given the current and future expansion activities being proposed.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> </ol>	<p>Comment is included in the public record and opinions are noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Health</b> – See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. <b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p><b>Cost</b> – See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for discussion of fiscal considerations.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Janine Kane	84	I am all for business expanding however, the expansion of this airport is unwelcomed. Part of the beauty of Bucks County is the peacefulness along with the abundant beauty. When I chose to live in Yardley 10 years ago, I chose it because I did not have planes flying over continuously and at times very low. With Philadelphia and Newark airports within a reasonable drive there is no need for yet another large airport that will create pollution and increased noise ultimately affecting quality of life for those who live here. Please do not approve the plan to expand	<p>Opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> Commenter is describing existing conditions for flight paths. See Section 6.2.2, items 9 – 11 for further discussion.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's Design AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Jean Marsilli	85	I am very tired of planes flying directly over my home. If the expansion goes on, the value of my home will plummet. I endure the air traffic now, but larger and more aircraft will make it unbearable for me. Does anyone care?	<p>Commenter describes existing conditions regarding overflights.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values. Property values are influenced by a variety of factors such as land use, zoning, school districts, transportation access, employment opportunities, and many other factors that are outside of the scope of this EA.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Aircraft Operations:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through– 11 for discussion of aircraft operations. All comments are being carefully considered.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Jue	86	no comment attached	No comment attached.
5.31.21	PC	Karen Zamparelli	87	I live in Yardley in a quiet little neighborhood until the planes land. I am in the direct landing path for most landings and arrivals. At the present pace it is a tolerable nuisance. Expansion will make it unbearable I fear. If a plane suffers a mechanical event my husband and I would be a casualty of said event. Please, please do not expand. It would make living in our home unbearable!	<p>Commenter describes existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 19 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Aircraft Operations (Landings and Departures):</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9through -11 for further discussion.</p> <p><b>Safety:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 5.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Marcia Weigle	88	I OPPOSE to the Trenton Mercer Terminal Expansion. I'd like to protect my homes property value and the environment, which impacts my health and well- being.	<p>Opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Health –</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>Environment –</b> Commenter refers to the environment in general. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, no significant impacts resulting from the Proposed Action were identified.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Margaret Bucci	89	I'm a 30 year resident of the Indian Village in Hopewell Township and Frontier planes fly low directly over my house/backyard. I'm not happy about it for many reasons such as reduces value of my home, causes soot and air pollution, and general noise. Increasing the flights will be devastating to quality of life and house value. I can't afford either. Please do not expand!	<p>Commenter refers to existing conditions regarding flight paths. See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Nadia	90	Expanding Trenton airport will worsen our NJ environment, even now we're suffering from noise with one terminal, planes are flying just about 300 yards right above our house, late nights (around 12 at night) awakens kids in the middle of night. We don't want to expand the airport any further. Thank you	<p>Opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 for discussion of flight paths.</p> <p><b>Environment</b> – Commenter refers to the environment in general. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, no significant impacts resulting from the Proposed Action were identified.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> Commenter describes noise issues under existing conditions. As described in Section 6.2.2 Item 6 and Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>
6.1.21	PC	Noemi de La Puente	91	Your report on noise (Master Plan Noise Technical Report) clearly states that people notice noise more so when it is quiet. That is exactly what is happening in my neighborhood. It is quiet at night, and almost every night between 10 PM – 11 PM we have a loud plane fly overhead (Carter Road area). Lawrence Twp. Has a noise ordinance for construction projects that specifically states no loud noise after 9 PM. Can you please observe that too? Your planes are that loud. Thank you.	<p><b>Noise:</b> Commenter describes existing conditions. As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E). The referenced noise ordinance applies to construction activities in Lawrence Township only.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Pam Evans	92	Totally for it, and for those that live over 3 miles away and are complaining about the noise and disruption- forget it. We live less than a mile away and noise is never a problem. How about the disruption of the Scudders Falls bridge	<p>Comment noted. Scudders Falls Bridge carries I-95 over the Delaware River, approximately 2 miles southwest of the TTN terminal. According to the project website <a href="https://www.scudderfallsbridge.com/construction/">https://www.scudderfallsbridge.com/construction/</a>, the project is intended to alleviate traffic congestion and upgrade safety and operational conditions on the Scudder Falls Bridge and adjoining highway segments. As of Fall 2021, construction is expected to be complete in early 2022. The project is being completed in a separate action, unrelated to the Proposed Action.</p>
5.31.21	PC	Pam Evans	93	Continuing on – and how about all the nasty chemicals being transported through the area by rail? Very environmentally unsafe. On the plus side, more jobs being brought to the area.	<p>This is a continuation from the previous comment.</p> <p>Chemical transport by rail through the area is unrelated to the Proposed Action, which is intended to address passenger terminal deficiencies at TTN. Commenter notes potential for the project to bring jobs to the area.</p>
6.1.21	PC	Rene John	94	I agree Airport should be expanded	<p>Comment noted.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Timothy Case	95	The jet fuel fumes are giving us headaches. We don't do a garden anymore. Help!	<p>Commenter describes existing conditions. Comment noted. No response required.</p>
6.3.21	PC	Dr. John Bojarski	96	We absolutely do NOT need an airport of this size in the Trenton area !!!! both Philadelphia International Airport and Newark International Airport are not only about an hour away from Trenton. Folks who need to travel can very well choose one of these two airports in order to accommodate their needs. We do not want the extra noise pollution here in this area not to mention all of the additional environmental issues. STOP THE MADNESS	<p><b>Need:</b> The need for the project is described in detail in Chapter 2 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				!!!!!!!. Modernize the terminal but for God's sake please bag this 400% increase nonsense	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The referenced noise ordinance applies to construction activities in Lawrence Township only. TTN is not located in Lawrence Township.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion (400% increase):</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Environment in General:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. No significant impacts were identified.</p>
6.3.21	PC	Dr. John Bojarski	97	No comment attached	No comment attached
6.3.21	PHT	Robin Karpf	98 – 99 and 199 (pages separated during compilation)	<p><b>Commenter Stated:</b> Please find attached a copy of my public statement at the June 2, 2021 Public Hearing: Trenton-Mercer Airport NEPA Draft Environmental Assessment. Thank you, Robin Karpf MD</p> <p><b>Attached Statement:</b></p> <p>We are concerned about the unintended consequences that the proposed, new Trenton Mercer Airport Terminal and ARFF will have on our health, homes, quality of life and environment. This Draft Terminal EA presents a false picture of the environmental impacts by grossly underestimating the number of operations that these changes will have on the airport. In 2019, before any of these projects were underway, the number of flight operations exceeded the projections for 2035 and the number of enplanements grew to greater than 462,000 passengers. These false projections have been used to gain FAA approval without proper Environmental Assessments. Mercer County officials, Airport management and their consulting engineers, continue to claim that there will be no changes to the number of operations and therefore no impact on our air or environment. They also falsely present the existing terminal as having 4 gates. Anyone who has flown out of Trenton clearly knows that the existing terminal has two functioning gates. The apron outside the gates where passengers board by portable ramps can functionally accommodate two, perhaps three passenger jets. It is blatantly dishonest to present the newly proposed terminal as having no change in the number of gates and to underestimate the number of enplanements and jet operations in this environmental assessment. How is this protecting the health and welfare of Mercer and Bucks County residents? The associated noise, air pollution, financial burden to local and national taxpayers, quality of life, property values and public health impacts of the inevitable increased operations on surrounding communities is being skillfully ignored. The growth of operations of low flying passenger jets over my home in the last few years disrupts our sleep, our</p>	<p><b>EA Underestimates the Number of Operations:</b> The EA is based upon the FAA approved forecasts contained in the most recent TTN Airport Master Plan Update. See Section 6.2.2 Item 11. Chapter 1 of the EA compares 2019, 2020, and 2021 operations to 2020 forecasts. Commercial service operations are less than 2020 forecast levels. General Aviation operations are above forecast levels.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size and Gates:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 16 and 19 describe the terminal size, existing and proposed aircraft parking positions, and passenger boarding/de-boarding positions.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, describes terminal and airfield capacity s.</p> <p><b>Health –</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Finances -</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2.</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>2006 EA Conclusions:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 14 describes the comparison between the 2006 FAA Finding and this EA.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Emerging Health Data Regarding Aviation Noise and Emissions (ultra-fine particles):</b> All analyses conducted in this EA were conducted in accordance with CEQ and FAA requirements. Regarding Ultra Fine Particles (UFP), the project doesn't result in changes to aviation source emissions. While AEDT has the capability to model ultra-fine emissions, there are currently no standards in place for these emissions. Furthermore, research is still being undertaken to identify source attribution for UFP and their relative contribution as a source.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>walks and conversation. These jets are 900-1000 feet over my 200 years old home and shake the foundation and windows. In choosing to accept these falsehoods and the segmentation of airport projects, the FAA ignores its own conclusion from a 2006 analysis. In that analysis the FAA stated that the air traffic growth associated with a new terminal of only 64,000 sq ft would have a significant noise impact would likely require an EIS. The newly proposed terminal will be 4 times the size of the existing terminal and twice the size of the terminal that the FAA stated may require an EIS. On page 146 of this EA, it states “ ...the Proposed Action would not induce aircraft operations ....Therefore, operational emissions associated with airfield emissions sources, parking, and traffic were not inventoried or evaluated as part of this EA.” Again, by assuming no change in operations and using artificially low projections, you have not studied how an inevitable increase in operations will affect our air quality and noise. Once these airport expansion projects are completed, it will be too late. Emerging health data links aviation emissions and noise to numerous health conditions. A growing body of science has identified health risks associated with ultra-fine particulates associated with airplane exhaust that impacts residents’ miles away from the airport. Similarly, there is substantial evidence of health risks associated with airport noise from low flying planes. We have also learned that the airport is not monitoring or testing stormwater runoff and are using deicing compounds without adequate containment. In fact, I was on a passenger jet at TTN that was deiced last winter and watched the deicing chemicals applied to the jet in an area which clearly did not have any containment systems. How is this possible? And Despite the presence of documented water contamination on and near Airport property, the airport plans to remove acres of trees within 100 feet of known contaminated groundwater. We also find out that PFOS is also contaminating the proposed new terminal and ARFF sites. There are serious health hazards associated with these forever pollutants that if disturbed can make their way into our drinking water and the Delaware River. Our local Commissioners, Airport management and the FAA are ignoring the potential impact of these actions. Due to the segmentation of projects, the NJDEP will never see the full scope of the airport expansion and the potential damage to the local environment will not be fully evaluated. The Airport and nearby NAWC are both heavily contaminated with PFOS/PFAS, heavy metals and other toxic chemicals, yet the projects as stated in this Terminal EA, will be “remediated” as they go along. What are the unintended consequences of not doing a full Environmental Impact Statement for the entire airport development plan and what will be the effects of not remediating these toxins before any development begins? We demand:</p>	<p><b>De-icing Operations:</b> Aircraft are currently de-iced at the Signature Flight Support ramp at TTN. After the boarding process is completed, airline aircraft taxi to the ramp where de-icing and anti-icing chemicals are applied as needed. After the aircraft departs the ramp, spent de-icing fluid is captured using a vacuum truck. No change to de-icing operations is anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>PFOS/Forever Chemicals:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFOS (PFAS)contamination will be addressed and controlled. All remediation activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p> <p><b>Cost —</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for discussion of fiscal considerations.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs</li> </ol>	
6.15.21	PC	Alan Kearns	100	<p>Due to the extensive changes to TTN and the noise and pollution impacts on the two states in the flight path an extensive EIS is warranted.</p> <p>Meaningful noise and pollution sampling and analysis have not been conducted in the affected communities.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of EA vs. EIS.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 5.8 and Section 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA for description of the detailed noise analysis conducted for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Keith Pyontek	101 and 102	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for discussion of cost considerations.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Greg	103	<p>I am strongly opposed to the proposed expansion of the Trenton-Mercer airport. As a resident of Yardley, PA, additional flights would have a negative impact on our quality of life and property values.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1,, and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations. As described in those sections, aircraft operations are not expected to change and are constrained by physical features around the airfield.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life</p>
6.15.21	PC	Lisa Jakubek	104	<p>I am extremely concerned about ANY Trenton - Mercer airport expansion! I live directly under the landing and takeoff path on the PA side in Buck County. The aircraft are so low here that they tip their wings when i wave at them. Passenger jets, business jets, and military jets and planes and helicopters... propeller planes and small aircraft, with a pilot training, all fly directly over my family home. Horizon jets and obnoxiously loud and dirty and slow. They stop our conversations as well as the business jets. They are fast and loud and startling. They both vibrate dishes in my house. The helicopters, also! I would imagine there is much jet fuel in the air and earth and water when these huge jets take off and land. I hope not as I have a pool and the canal and river are nearby. I would like this area checked for pollutants like metals in a mandated environmental impact investigation. If more jets and aircraft are added to this airport, it will definitely ruin our neighborhoods quality of life, as well as damage the earth, and air and water and flora and fauna! Thank you, Lisa Jakubek</p>	<p>Commenter describes existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Pollution in general:</b> Air Quality and Water Quality are described in Sections 5.1 and Section 5.12 respectively of the EA. As described, aside from temporary impacts during construction, no significant effect on air quality and noise is expected. Implementation of BMPs would mitigate the effects of the project on Water Quality. Hazardous Materials and Contamination are discussed in Section 6.2.2 Item 18 and Section 5.5 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1, and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations. As described in those sections, aircraft operations are not expected to change and are constrained by physical features around the airfield.</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>Helicopters:</b> The project would have no effect on helicopter operations at TTN</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> <b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. All remediation</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>activities will be conducted in accordance with NDEP regulations and requirements. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>Horizon Jets:</b> Presumably refers to a General Aviation jet operator. General Aviation operations would be unaffected by the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Flora and Fauna:</b> As described in Section 5.2 of the EA, no significant impact to Biological Resources from the Proposed Action was identified.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Christopher Smylie	105	<p>To the Trenton Mercer Airport and Affiliated Groups,</p> <p>I live in the vicinity of the Trenton Mercer Airport and I am concerned the proposed airport expansion is being advanced without adequate consideration for the health and well-being of the surrounding communities.</p> <p>Stakeholders in this project are acting in a willfully deceitful and negligent manner with respect to their responsibility for area residents and the environment. This negligence is evident on slide 40 displayed during the Public Hearing on June 2, "The only change in aircraft operations noise is expected to be associated with the aircraft ground movements around the terminal gates." Will there not be additional, more frequent noise levels affecting surrounding communities from additional flights?</p> <p>Specifically, I would like to see the following actions taken - at a minimum - before any construction at the Trenton-Mercer Airport proceeds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The level of soil toxicity in the area surrounding the airport needs to be adequately evaluated and remediated to levels that are safe in accordance with Federal Law and best practices.</li> <li>2) Comprehensive studies need to be conducted on the impact to the environment and public health. Specifically, I am asking for an Environmental Impact Statement and a Health Impact Assessment.</li> <li>3) There needs to be an independent accounting and full disclosure to stakeholders regarding actual project costs, the impact to surrounding property values, public health costs, and the suitability of planned future work at Trenton Airport.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for recording my requests and replying that you have received this letter. This is very important to everyone living around the airport, our children, future generations, the environment and the rich history of our area.</p>	<p>Opinion noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items, 16 and 20 discuss the rationale for the proposed terminal size.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations. As described in those sections, aircraft operations are not expected to change and are constrained by physical features around the airfield.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18 for discussion of how contamination will be addressed.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the proposed action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. Therefore, and EIS is not required or warranted.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2 for discussion of cost considerations.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p>
6.15.21	GO	Uri Feiner	106	I serve as a Yardley Borough councilman. I hear from many of my constituents, serious concerns over airport expansion without	<b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>sufficient review of environmental impact. Many of our residents are concerned with flight paths that cause undo noise and other impacts to their neighborhoods, and they are further concerned about the potential worsening of this situation. To be clear, it is not an objection to the airport in general; rather, it is impact from insufficient impact mitigation efforts that is the problem.</p> <p>On behalf of my constituents, I request that a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis be done for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. This is imperative.</p> <p>Also, and especially with regard to recent national and regional attention to PFAS, the airport must identify a plan for remediation of this cancer-causing chemical which is found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. It is environmentally dangerous to the health of nearby residents to begin any construction on the expanded terminal, parking garage or ARFF building until a viable, near-term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of both states.</p>	<p>found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E)</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>Impact Mitigation:</b> Mitigation measures are described under the pertinent resource categories in Chapter 5 of the EA. The identified mitigation measures are related to regulatory requirements (e.g., stormwater, wetlands) imposed by the relevant permitting agencies.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Noise mitigation procedures:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a discussion of how Mercer County addresses noise complaints and voluntary noise abatement procedures in place at TTN. The Proposed Action would not change any flight paths or aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Karen Zamparelli	107	<p>When we purchased our home in Yardley it was not disclosed that it was in the direct landing and takeoff path of the airport. That was in 2006 and although we have some issues with noise, it has been tolerable. That would not be the case if the proposed expansion results in an increase of volume. Our lovely home would become a virtual sound chamber for constant take offs and landings. Our windows vibrate and conversation has to stop till the plane passes. At night when the planes land the headlight lights up our back windows of our family room. Peaceful it is not. We are not unreasonable people, but we draw the line at making our home unsalable. No one will purchase it.</p>	<p>Commentor is describing existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1-11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations. As described in those sections, aircraft operations are not expected to change and are constrained by physical features around the airfield.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Property Values/Salable Home:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Jeffry Stockman	108	<p>I am a Trenton resident and I fully support this expansion. Mercer Airport has much potential and the facility upgrades will provide a welcome boost to local region economics. The upgrades vs. cost make this a no brainer. Thank You for your consideration.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Eric Rudolf	109	<p>I am very against this because of noise pollution over my house and town in Yardley. And also, the ground safety regarding toxic materials needs much deeper study before anything can go forward</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and 6.2.2 Item 6 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Contamination/Toxic Materials:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18 for discussion of contamination.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Heather Nally	110	<p>I am concerned about the lack of environmental study for the expansion of TTN and feel additional studies need to occur prior to approval.</p>	<p>This EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. No significant impacts were identified.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.15.21	PC	Richard Kurisko	111-115	<p><b>Expansion;</b> The county is looking to shoehorn a commercial airport like Philadelphia Airport, into a residential area that is zoned for Residential Use and has always been zoned for residential use.</p> <p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use</li> </ol>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Land Use Compatibility:</b> See Section 5.6 for Land Use Compatibility. No change to the airport property boundary is proposed. The airport property is Zoned IP-1 (Industrial Park) and operation of the airport within that zone is a permitted use. Additional zoning is included in Section 1-8-2, Figure 1-9 of the AMPU. No change of zoning is proposed. The EA determined that no significant impacts on land use compatibility would occur.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Law Enforcement:</b> Sizes and operations of the police department is an issue outside of the scope of the EA.</p> <p><b>Environmental Justice:</b> Section 5.9.3 of the EA considered whether the Proposed Action would have disproportionately high and adverse effects on environmental justice populations.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.	
6.15.21	PC	Anne Chmielewski	116-118	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs. There has been a complete lack of transparency around process, costs, RECOOPING costs and timing.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> </ol> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.	
6.15.21	LO	Richard Dodds	119-120	<p><b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Background:</b> While Ewing Township is not in the Wild and Scenic River designated corridor, the proposed airport terminal expansion is approximately one and a half miles east of the River and less than a mile from the airport boundary. Flight paths and increased development, particularly takeoff and approaches to runways 06 and 24, will have an impact on the river system overall.</p> <p>Commenter provided a multi-page letter with pre-amble and background information. The specific issues of concern identified in the letter are shown below:</p> <p>While Ewing Township is not in the Wild and Scenic River designated corridor, the proposed airport terminal expansion is approximately one and a half miles east of the River and less than a mile from the 119 Lower Delaware Wild &amp; Scenic River Lower Delaware Scenic &amp; Recreational River airport boundary. Flight paths and increased development, particularly takeoff and approaches to runways 06 and 24, will have an impact on the river system overall.</p> <p><b>Stormwater and Wastewater Planning:</b> The airport expansion was planned with current and future growth in mind. Increased flight patterns, greater fuel loads, and the removal of trees will have a combined impact of additional impervious coverage and greater pollution from stormwater runoff. In addition, increased contamination from jet fuel and firefighting foam into the River, and possible spread of PFOA chemicals from existing contaminated sites further into groundwater resources are possible. The Council has the following questions: o Will groundwater and surface water resources be monitored for a period of time? What protections will be in place? o Can permeable and green stormwater infrastructure be used to show a net improvement to the region in the face of climate change?</p> <p><b>Scenic and Noise Impact:</b> While the environmental assessment addressed soundscapes and viewsheds directly around the terminal construction site, it did not provide an analysis of increases in noise or increase in traffic of flight paths over the River and further from the terminal. The Wild and Scenic River would count as a "noise sensitive location." The Council requests that there be no impact to the visual resources of the River, nor any net increase in sound. The Council has the following questions: 1. Will flight paths increase over the Wild and Scenic River? Or are there options to pursue increasing flight paths over already developed areas or existing flight patterns that are not over the River? 2. How would soundscapes be impacted two to three miles away? 3. Will an increase in traffic and flight patterns change any dark skies over the River?</p>	<p>The Proposed Action consists of terminal improvements and not the expansion of the airport. Specifically, the existing terminal has four (4) aircraft parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft. The proposed terminal would have four (4) parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft. The size of the aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the operational limitations imposed by the runways at TTN. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p> <p>Land use surrounding the Airport would remain unchanged and the Proposed Action does not include any changes to runway lengths, runway alignments, instrument procedures, navigational equipment, or other factors that increase airfield capacity. As detailed in Draft EA, the existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor level of service. Additionally, this situation is exacerbated when departures and arrivals are delayed due to weather conditions. The terminal improvements will address immediate and short-term needs of the airport, providing a functional terminal that meets current standards, code, safety and security requirements, spacing and adequate level of service to all users and tenants.</p> <p><b>Wild and Scenic River:</b> The Delaware River Wild and Scenic River designation ends approximately 0.4 miles south of the Washington Crossing bridge, or approximately 2.7 miles straight line distance from the TTN terminal. According to FAA Order 1050.1F, no Significance Threshold has been established for Wild and Scenic Rivers; however, the Order identifies these factors to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destroying or altering a river's free flowing nature; The project will have no direct impact on the river therefore it will not destroy or alter the river's free flowing nature.</li> <li>• A direct and adverse effect on the values for which a river was designated (or under study for designation); According to <a href="#">Designation Origin Stories   Lower Delaware Wild and Scenic River, NJ/PA (U.S. National Park Service) (nps.gov)</a>, the Outstanding Resources offered by the Lower Delaware River include water quality, natural resources, historic resources, recreation, and open space. Based on the findings of the analyses described in Chapter 5 of the EA, and given the distance of the designated portion of the River from the project site, it is reasonable to conclude that the project would not directly and adversely affect these values.</li> <li>• Introducing a visual, audible, or other type of intrusion that is out of character with the river or would alter outstanding features of the river's setting; The designated Wild and Scenic river corridor is 2.7 miles from the project site and is not visible from the project site. The project would not alter flight paths or operations; therefore, no audible intrusion will occur.</li> <li>• Causing the river's water quality to deteriorate; As described in Section 5.12 of the EA, no significant impact to water quality is anticipated. All water quality permits will be obtained and Best Management Practices will be implemented.</li> <li>• Allowing the transfer or sale of property interests without restrictions needed to protect the river or the river corridor (which cannot exceed an average of 320 acres per mile which, if applied uniformly along the entire designated segment, is one-quarter of a mile on each side of the river); No transfer or sale of property is proposed</li> <li>• Any of the above impacts preventing a river on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) or a Section 5(d) river that is not included in the NRI from being included in the Wild and Scenic River System or causing a downgrade in its classification (e.g., from wild to recreational). None of the above impacts to the Delaware River are anticipated therefore the project will cause a downgrade.</li> </ul> <p><b>Stormwater and Wastewater Planning:</b> The project will comply with all required stormwater management requirements and all required permits will be secured prior to construction. Sampling and monitoring will be conducted as required by the relevant permits. Best Management Practices, including implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention plan are included in the project plans. Project planning and design has not progressed to a point where site specific practices have been developed. Implementation of green infrastructure, such as permeable pavement will be considered as the project design progresses, subsequent to completion of the NEPA process. The proposed project will not change airfield capacity or other operational characteristics. Air carrier aircraft operating at TTN are expected to be similar in terms of size and other pertinent characteristics to those operating at TTN today, for the foreseeable future. No change in the number of aircraft operations is anticipated as a result of the proposed project therefore no change in the use of jet fuel or firefighting foam is expected as a result of the Proposed Action. It is uncertain why the commentor believes there is increased risk of fuel contamination. The issues of PFAS/PFOA contamination is a legacy issue largely attributable to previous practices and land uses on airport property. The airport will manage</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p><b>Environmental Analysis:</b> We understand that the expansion of the Trenton-Mercer Airport project has been long in the planning to meet the demands of a heavily travelled corridor and to support the economic growth of Mercer County. With that said, the airport is pursuing a series of separate projects which may have a cumulative effect. NPS and the Lower Delaware Wild and Scenic River Management Council request careful oversight as it pertains to water resources. We believe a comprehensive environmental and public health analysis should be conducted to examine the collective impact of the expansion projects. This includes the terminal expansion itself, the runway protective zone, and the anticipated increase of traffic. We feel a full environmental impact statement, in addition to the assessment, should be completed.</p>	<p>and monitor the contamination in accordance with applicable regulations. Further it is expected that the risks associated with discharge of firefighting foam will decrease over time as airports are better managing discharges to those that only necessary in the event of an accident. Additionally, PFAS-free firefighting foam is expected to become available in the coming years.</p> <p><b>Aircraft Operations:</b> See Section 6.2.2 items 9 through 11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Regarding air traffic and noise over the Delaware River, Flight paths are generally dictated by weather (wind), air traffic, safety, and aircraft performance characteristics. As noted in the EA, the project is not expected to change aircraft operations, nor will it affect flight paths. As such, no change in current conditions over the designated portion of the Delaware River are anticipated.</p> <p><b>Aircraft Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Terminal and Airfield Capacity and Operations:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 for descriptions of terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Environmental Analysis:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments. The EA addressed the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the CEQ and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained in the EA, it was concluded that the proposed federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. Therefore, an EIS is not required or warranted. See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA. The analysis was conducted in accordance with CFR Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA and FAA Order 1050.1F, and evaluated projects completed within the past 3 years (at the time of the analysis) and projects expected in the next 5 years.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Proposed Action would not induce aircraft operations or passengers or change the aircraft fleet using TTN compared to the No Action. Appendix E includes the Air Emission Analysis to assess the potential for air quality and climate impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The analysis details the potential impacts to air quality with the implementation of the Proposed Action would be less than significant when compared to the No Action. During the years of construction and after construction, operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action. Construction of the Proposed Action would result in short-term local changes in air emissions at TTN from sources such as exhaust emissions from nonroad construction equipment such as haul trucks, site clearing, and grading. On-road vehicles include those associated with transport and delivery of supplies, materials, and equipment to and from the site, and construction worker trips. Additionally, fugitive dust emissions include site preparation, land clearing, material handling, equipment movement on unpaved roads and evaporative emissions from the application of asphalt paving. To ensure construction impacts remain at or below less-than-significant adverse levels, emissions would be minimized and controlled through the implementation of BMPs and reasonably available control measures.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Patricia Fletcher	121-122	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document (the subject of this public hearing) and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a FULL Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> : See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7 regarding noise reporting at TTN.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. To help illustrate the impact of this expansion project on my home investment and quality of life, I myself have submitted tons of FlightRadar24 data (an app showing flight paths, altitudes, aircraft &amp; owner specifics in real time) and related questions on numerous occasions in recent years to both the Mercer County Commissioners Board (Freeholders, as was) and Trenton-Mercer Airport leadership. The majority of my data and essential questions have been actively blown off during meetings, or passively ignored by email, so far by both organizations. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport</p>	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. No significant impacts were identified.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Annette Loveless	123-124	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussions of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Glenn Reitmeier	125-129	<p>Below and attached please see my public comment on the Trenton-Mercer airport terminal Draft Environmental Assessment. Please acknowledge receipt of my comments and include them in the records of the proceeding Thank you, Glenn Reitmeier ----- The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners, New Jersey State officials, the Federal Aviation</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled</p> <p><b>Document should be rejected:</b> Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Document is misleading/contradictory/proposed terminal is larger than the existing facility.</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 16 and 19 discuss the size of the proposed terminal,</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts/Connected Actions/Segmentation:</b> A new air traffic control tower, runway obstruction "clearance" projects have independent utility from the Proposed Action. See Section 5.12 and Table 5.13 for further discussion of cumulative impacts and independent utility.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>Administration and any other government agencies with authority over the associated projects.</p> <p>The document is full of deliberately misleading and contradictory information. It casts a thin veil over the real truth by asserting that the Airport Terminal Plan is a “Replacement” project that will have little or no Environmental impact. This is a blatant lie. During the public comment meeting on June 2, 2021, Mercer County Executive Brian Hughes and other New Jersey elected officials repeatedly heralded a new commercial terminal and more commercial airline flights to TTN airport as “an engine of growth for Mercer County.” Such comments from government officials clearly demonstrate that the Draft Environmental Assessment document that asserts a simple terminal replacement is both inaccurate and inadequate. A full Environmental Impact Statement must be performed and subjected to a fair and transparent public review.</p> <p>The comments of elected officials are revealing, but it is quite clear from the document itself that the Airport Terminal Plan, together with the taxiway expansion, Expanded Runway Obstruction Clearances and a New Air Traffic Control Tower constitutes a major expansion of airport capacity that will clearly have a substantial impact on air, water and noise pollution, which will diminish health and well-being, quality of life and property values in surrounding communities.</p> <p>The true nature of the airport’s substantial air traffic expansion plan is evident from the plans for the so-called “Replacement Terminal”. The new Terminal is planned to be 125,000 sq ft - 5 times the area of the current building! How can this possibly be called a replacement rather than the significant expansion that it is?</p> <p>Not only is the total area of the building a dramatic increase, but virtually every detail of the terminal building plan[1] illustrates a dramatic increase in passenger throughput capacity. A few examples are:</p> <p>Checkin/queueing area goes from 700 to 2450 sq ft. (3.5x the area)</p> <p>Concessions area increases from 2,950 to 9,090 sq ft (3x the area)</p> <p>Rental Car agencies increase from 1 to 5 (a 5x increase)</p> <p>Ticket Counter positions increase from 6 to 14</p> <p>TSA Screening Lanes increase from 2 to 4 (2x the current capacity)</p> <p>Baggage Screening area increases from 600 to 8525 sq ft (14.20x the current area)</p> <p>Public Restrooms space increases from 1300 to 3645 sq ft (2.8x the current capacity)</p> <p>Parking spaces increase from 1,303 to 2,900 [plus 800 in Scotch Road garage] (2.84x current capacity)</p> <p>Play area increases from none to 805 sq ft</p> <p>The Draft EA document states that multiple simultaneous operations are not typical at TTN:</p>	<p><b>Gates/Boarding Positions:</b> Section 6.6.2 item19 describes the number of gates for the proposed terminal.</p> <p><b>Terminal and Airfield Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Economic Impact:</b> The EA cites a study prepared by the New Jersey Department of Transportation. The economic impact information was provided for background information and was one of many factors in Mercer County’s decision making regarding the Proposed Action. The Commentor’s opinion of the significance of the impact is noted. The full report can be found at <a href="https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/freight/aviation/documents/NewJerseyEconomicImpact.pdf">https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/freight/aviation/documents/NewJerseyEconomicImpact.pdf</a></p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Water Pollution:</b> Section 5.12 of the EA discusses water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Noise Complaints:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 7 discusses how Mercer County addresses noise complaints.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> Section 6.2.2 items 9 and 10 discuss flight paths and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>Home Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Good Neighbor/Noise Abatement Procedures:</b> As described previously, the Proposed Action would not result in changes to flight paths or aircraft operations. Implementation of curfews, changes to flight paths, and similar measures are beyond the authority of Mercer County to implement unilaterally. Implementation of mandatory curfews would be a violation of Mercer County’s grant assurances (Grant Assurance 19a). Grant assurances are conditions Mercer County must agree to in order to accept FAA AIP program funds. Voluntary noise abatement procedures have been published at TTN and can be viewed at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport-for-pilots">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport-for-pilots</a>.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>“The proposed terminal design is based on the approved forecast that could include simultaneous operations requiring multiple aircraft to enplane or deplane during peak hours. It is not common for more than two aircraft to simultaneously load/unload in the existing condition. While scheduling of aircraft arrivals/departures is subject to the individual airlines ability to process the passengers on those aircraft, the number of air carrier operations in the approved forecast does not increase by a level where the anticipated usage differs significantly from the existing. Multiple simultaneous operations are not typically scheduled at this Airport. They periodically occur due to circumstances beyond the control of the Airport, such as weather delays, and when that happens, there will be the ability for the facility to safely process the passengers using the four proposed parking positions on the apron that correspond with four hold rooms in the terminal building.”ii[2]</p> <p>Since multiple simultaneous flight operations are not typically scheduled, it seems clear that the airport could operate using two gates and two holding areas and simply renovate the existing building. Anything more represents a significant expansion of current operational capability. But such an option is readily dismissed as an alternative, simply by stating that four gates are required to match current capabilities. The actual current configuration of the terminal should be counted as two gates; TTN airport disingenuously claims that it has four gates, because one full-sized gate is subdivided into three small boarding areas. Going from today’s configuration to four full-sized gates is not a replacement – it is a doubling of capacity. This is a simple example of how the truth is obfuscated and twisted to avoid proper review and scrutiny of the impacts of airport expansion.</p> <p>Another example is that in order to disingenuously deny that that the new Terminal is an expansion and claim that it will not have any environmental impact on surrounding communities, the FAA Approved Forecast is cited – 396,358 enplanements in 2025 and 476,507 enplanements in 2035. And yet the report states that the airport had a total of 404,349 enplanements in 2018 – exceeding the 2025 approved forecast seven years beforehand – and prior to planned airfield and terminal changes that increase capacity! This “doubletalk” of using lowball forecast data that is lower than actual operations makes it clear that the current environmental impact of the airport is being deliberately understated in an attempt to deceive the public of the true impact of the airport and its massive expansion plans.</p> <p>With the construction of the proposed new Terminal, the airport will go from a situation where “multiple simultaneous operations are not typically scheduled” to having the capacity for eight simultaneous aircraft – 4 gates and four hold</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>rooms, each with capacity to have a large A320 aircraft. The airport has a decades-long history of segmenting projects to avoid a comprehensive Environmental Impact Study. It is clear that this new Terminal construction is an Expansion Plan and that it demands a long overdue full Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>Now let's turn to the economic deceptions of the plan. The Draft EA document trumpets the general aviation and corporate economic impact aspects of the airport:  "Based on the New Jersey Statewide Airport Economic Impact Study dated September 2016 (see Appendix B), total employment at the Airport was estimated at 1,258 and the third largest employer within the New Jersey airport system. Both general aviation direct and secondary on airport businesses (e.g. Fixed Based Operator, corporate/charter aviation, flight schools, aircraft sales and maintenance) and visitor employment (e.g. visitors who spend money to support jobs in the area such as at restaurants, hotels, retail, entertainment) account for total employment numbers. For those 1,258 jobs created by TTN, total payroll was estimated at \$83,386,500. GA output was estimated at \$266,416,700, which represents total annual sales and capital improvements for airport tenants."iii[3]</p> <p>But these economics are completely separate and unrelated to a new terminal for commercial flights and they cannot be used to justify a new commercial terminal. With respect to commercial aviation, the Draft EA states that:</p> <p>"Total commercial employment was estimated at 311, commercial service payroll total was estimated at \$24,226,500, and total output was estimated at \$80,348,200. In summary, TTN is a critical part of not only the local economy by providing jobs and bringing revenue into the area, but also part of New Jersey's overall economy."iv[4]</p> <p>This economic impact assessment methodology should be highly suspect as an inflated claim, since it imputes that the average wage of the 311 jobs is \$77,000 and that there is a magic 3.3x multiplier on wages that generate economic value. But according to U.S. Census data, the median household income in Mercer County is \$81,057. So the jobs associated with commercial service to TTN airport are clearly not top-tier jobs compared to other employers in the County. Nor will they ever be, since the profile of low-margin leisure travel on low-cost carriers that characterizes TTN travelers cannot possibly bear the cost of highly-paid staff. Moreover, the claim that TTN is a significant contributor to New Jersey's overall economy is ludicrous. The very same report cites EWR (Newark) employment as 47,450, payroll \$3.7B and total economic output of \$12.2B.v[5] That means</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>that TTN has less than 1% of the economic impact of EWR (0.65%, to be precise). And note that New Jersey has invested heavily in NJ Transit, which offers excellent train service from Trenton, Hamilton and Princeton Junction train stations directly to EWR airport. Expanding commercial service at TTN will not grow the overall demand for air travel; it will simply siphon flights, travelers and revenue away from EWR airport and NJ Transit, where the infrastructure has a well-established economy of scale that serves business and leisure travelers as well as commuters.</p> <p>Despite the claims of Mercer County officials, the Draft EA document makes it clear that TTN airport is NOT a significant contributor to Mercer County's economy. According to U.S. Census data [6], 199,859 people are employed in Mercer County. The U.S. census reports 129,936 households in Mercer County, at a median household income of \$81,057, so the annual contribution of residential households alone is \$10.47B. U.S. census data reports a total annual payroll of Mercer County businesses as \$14.12B. So the claimed economic output of \$80.3M represents a mere 0.56% of Mercer County's economy. Even if the number of jobs associated with commercial service at TTN were to double, it would not be a significant contributor to Mercer County's economy. Frontier airlines and other Low Cost Carriers that might fly to TTN are not a source of high-wage jobs, but rather a few mediocre jobs that are effectively being subsidized through massive taxpayer investment in TTN airport.</p> <p>But even if a new Terminal isn't a good investment, how can it hurt? Listen to the concerns of the residents who are objecting to this expansion project – increased air, water and noise pollution that will harm the well-being of nearby residents – AND substantially decrease their home values – literally their life savings. Mercer County's Tax Ratables breakdown [7] shows \$30.26B in residential property values, with \$2.1B in Ewing Twp., \$2.7B in Lawrence Twp. and \$2.7B in Hopewell Twp. Referring again to the claims that the economic output of commercial airline service to TTN is \$80M, consider that \$7.5B of residential property value in those communities is being put at risk of significant devaluation by expanding an airport from which noise and pollution will chase away residents who value the quality of life of their once-serene communities.</p> <p>And that's just in New Jersey – the communities in Pennsylvania's Lower Makefield Twp. and Yardley borough stand to suffer as much or more, given that both arrivals and departures fly directly overhead at extremely low altitudes and that there are no noise abatement procedures used in TTN flights. The TTN airport is a bad neighbor that has deliberately ignored and illegally discarded noise complaints for years. Both phone calls and emails to the noise complaint contacts</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>were simply deleted. At the public comment meeting on June 2, 2021, elected officials from Pennsylvania eloquently stated the concerns of their constituents. It is clear that TTN airport and Mercer County officials are quite happy to have flight paths low and loud over their Pennsylvania neighbors, while touting the benefits to Mercer County. Particularly because of the jurisdictional issues associated with the airport and the impact of its operations, a full federal review and Environmental Impact Statement is needed.</p> <p>In stark contrast, the Port Authority of New York &amp; New Jersey (Port Authority) Noise Management Office website<sup>viii</sup>[8] reports that Teterboro airport</p> <p>“...has a comprehensive noise program that aims to reduce the impact of aircraft noise on surrounding communities. The program includes mandatory noise limits for aircraft departures:</p> <p>80 dB(A) departure limit on Runway 24 from 2200 to 0700 local  90 dB(A) departure limit on Runway 24 from 0700 to 2200 local  95 dB(A) departure limit on Runways 01, 19 and 06 at all times  95 dB(A) departure limit for helicopters at all times</p> <p>If an aircraft exceeds an applicable decibel limit by more than 1.0 dB(A) of the limit, a noise violation is issued. A noise violation stays on the record for two years. An aircraft will be banned from the airport if it receives three noise violations within a two-year period.</p> <p>The Teterboro Airport noise program also includes a voluntary restraint of all non-essential aircraft operations between the hours of 11 p.m. and 6 a.m.</p> <p>The Teterboro Aircraft Noise Abatement Advisory Committee (TANAAC) is comprised of the locally elected officials or their duly appointed alternates, and members of the aviation community. The primary goal of the committee is to work collaboratively with the airport management and Federal Aviation Administration in an effort to enhance the quality of life of the residents of local communities while ensuring the continued efficient operation of the airport.”<sup>ix</sup>[9]</p> <p>It is reprehensible that TNN has not voluntarily instituted a similar program to be a good neighbor to its surrounding communities in both New Jersey and Pennsylvania. Mercer County Commissioners, New Jersey elected officials and the FAA can and must direct the airport to follow the good example set by Teterboro and institute similar procedures and limitations at TTN. Failing to do so and continued airport expansion will chase away high earners who simply want peaceful, clean and quiet communities to live in as a respite from their long commutes and stressful jobs. The allure of an occasional cheap vacation flight from TTN for a few citizens is no match for the repulsion from an endless stream of Airbus A/320s roaring over your home every 5 minutes, from early morning hours until well after midnight.</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>To summarize, the draft EA Report is completely unacceptable:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is an egregious lie to call the construction of a new Terminal a “Replacement” project. It is a significant expansion of capacity that requires a full EIS.</li> <li>2. It is ludicrous to claim that commercial service to TTN airport significantly benefits the economy of Mercer County, when its claimed total economic output is about 0.5% of the business payroll in Mercer County.</li> <li>3. It is irresponsible and unacceptable for government leaders to accept the segmentation of projects to avoid a comprehensive EIS. Taken together with Major Taxiway changes, Expanded Runway Obstruction Clearances and a New Air Traffic Control Tower, the resultant airport growth will negatively impact the health, well-being and economic value of the surrounding communities with no proper assessment and opportunity for checks and balances to uncontrolled expansion.</li> <li>4. It is foolhardy for government leaders to ignore the negative impact that an expanded airport will have on the desirability of homes in the surrounding communities and their property values; putting \$7.5B of residential property value at risk in Ewing, Lawrence and Hopewell townships alone.</li> <li>5. It is reprehensible that TTN has no proper Noise Management Office and has not taken steps to institute aggressive noise abatement procedures and limitations, such as those set by the Teterboro airport.</li> </ol> <p>It makes perfect sense for TTN to continue to serve general aviation and corporate needs. But the plan to massively expand the commercial terminal and commercial airline service by low-cost carriers is a costly and dangerous delusion that has far more downside consequences to our health, environment, and communities than any upside benefits that a few jobs from low-cost carriers can possibly create.</p> <p>Despite the airport “doubletalk”, you simply can’t have it both ways. If the new terminal is truly a replacement, then spending \$125M on a new building and a new parking garage makes no sense; the existing building can be renovated. And if spending \$125M on a new terminal is a good investment because it expands capacity and actually has an economic impact, then a complete EIS and a rigorous and transparent public review of the airport’s environmental impact is necessary and long overdue in order to provide the appropriate checks and balances to decades of TTN airport expansion that has been segmented to avoid a rigorous and proper EIS review.</p> <p>In conclusion, myself and many fellow citizens respectfully demand that the Draft EA document be rejected by Mercer</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>County Commissioners and that no further airport construction should approved or conducted unless and until:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA) is performed and subjected to fair and transparent public review.</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Noise abatement procedures are established and implemented that demonstrably reduce the impact of the current level of flight operations.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you.</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Richard Adams	130	<p>My residence of 70 years in Lower Makefield Township, Pa is directly under the flight path. The amount of noise is extremely disturbing. There is no need to increase the capacity of the airport for there are two airports Philadelphia and Newark that have frequent public transportation and highways to handle the ability of the airport customers both private and commercial.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9 through 11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft. <b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Newark and Philadelphia:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Dionne Polk	131-133	<p>To Whom it May Concern: I wish to make comments regarding the proposed expansion of the TTN facility. MY concerns start with the lack of visibility and proper notification to the general public. A project of this size would require the developer to make it as visible as possible, not some tiny notice in a paper that perhaps people don't read. It was put up on the Mercer County Website (three levels deep) and apparently at another website you'd have to know about to get to. That does not qualify as real, intentional "public notice." Perhaps in a barely legal way the rules were followed but it's clear that this "notice" was designed to "fly under the radar." IT should have been noticed on a county-wide wide basis as well to people across the river who are also impacted. I receive notices of various meetings and projects e-mailed directly to me from Mercer County. In most cases, these e-mails regard matters of health, clinics, outreach to minorities, and needs of residents. Yet this disruptive, massive multi-year project that will affect tens of thousands of people never made it to the level of "we're reaching out to seniors for information." How</p>	<p><b>Public Outreach:</b> See Chapter 6 for a discussion of Public Outreach conducted for the EA.</p> <p><b>Economic Benefits:</b> The commenter is discussing comments offered by a separate commenter during the hearing. The justification for the project is described in Chapter 1. Section 6.2.2, Item 2 describes the fiscal responsibility of Mercer County.</p> <p><b>Travel Recovery:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18 and Chapter 5 and Appendix F of the EA for discussion on PFAS and Hazardous Materials.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p><b>Table 5-1:</b> The purpose of Table 5-1 is to summarize the findings which are discussed in greater detail within Chapter 5. Natural Resources and Energy Supply is improved because the proposed Terminal will be more energy efficient and consume fewer natural resources for terminal operations. Although the Proposed Action would not affect aircraft operations (departures and arrivals), noise is improved because the Proposed Action includes Passenger Boarding Bridges with provisions to power the aircraft while at the gate and pre-conditioned air to the aircraft. These provisions reduce the duration of aircraft idling and use of Auxiliary Power Units while parked at the gate. Hazardous Materials improves existing conditions because the Proposed Action includes remediation of legacy contamination from prior activities on airport property. Traffic and surface transportation is improved by the Proposed Action by providing safer and more efficient surface transportation access to the terminal, by improving the access and circulation roadways. Light emissions and Visual Impacts are improved by</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>could this be? I certainly have a problem with these different levels of notifications. The process was referred to as being “transparent” but in fact that was a misstatement. A number of people (myself included) made a point of this misstatement. I received The Public Notice of Availability/Notice of Public Hearing from Mercer County on May 28th . The notice indicated that starting on May 3, the EA would be available at libraries. That information didn’t do us any good by May 28. To be told on that date that we could participate in a public meeting 6 days hence regarding a very dense, technical 200-page document that a large number of affected people were unaware of was disturbing and smacks of bad faith. FURTHER, we were granted until June 16th to submit additional comments. (I don’t know whether that meant “including June 16th or by June 16th indicating that the comments had to be received by end-of-day June 15. This question was submitted to Commissioner Frisbe and has received no response.) I also object to the very short comment period provided for us. 30 days is hardly enough to review something of this magnitude and impact. I don’t know who suggested this, the sponsor, the FAA, County officials, but it’s wildly inadequate for full comment. In a prior request for construction at the 131 28 airport, the FAA issued a withdrawal on February 23, 2006 after a 60-day comment period that was then extended by 10 days. Why did that project deserve a meaningful comment period and this current project is given only 30 days? That’s indefensible. I request that the comment period be extended to 60 days, with an extension if necessary. This project is clearly being rushed through by the sponsor with the assistance of the Mercer County officials, and the FAA should be aware of this discrepancy. Further, the presentations by the officials ( who were given about 30-45 minutes to cheerlead out of a two-hour meeting) focused strictly on the “economic benefits” of the project without any discussion of the effects on quality of life, air, water, noise, etc. The economic benefits focused mainly on TTN being a destination for travelers to this area. This doesn’t seem to be realistic. What are they flying in to see? Despite the testimony of a man who employs 30 people, I’m not seeing a huge jump in growth as a result of the expansion. I don’t see a cost/benefit ratio anywhere, and I’m sure that the cost will end up in my taxes. It is estimated that business travel is and will be depressed for 18-24 months. That’s the segment of the airline business that pays the most and subsidizes the cheaper flights. The alternatives to face-to-face meetings are growing rapidly, so it’s wishful thinking to state that segment will grow. I contend that the segmentation of the project is done strictly to avoid having to produce an EIS. That directly contravenes NEPA, which calls for an ENTIRE project to be assessed. Further, it positions the airport to grow to a size and use that’s well beyond what is described here. Have other airlines been approached to use it as well? Moving on to the substance of the EA, I’m missing some information and have questions relating to the contents. How is it possible that the construction will not</p>	<p>providing energy efficient, downcast lighting that reduces fugitive light emissions compared to existing conditions. Solid Waste Management is improved by consolidating airport operations and management in the Terminal, resulting in more efficient and consolidate waste disposal operations. Additionally, the new terminal will allow for more efficient waste management operations within the terminal building by providing modern waste handling infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Stormwater Management</b> - Stormwater Management is described in 5.12. As described in that section, all relevant stormwater management permits will be obtained prior to construction, all water quality regulations will be carefully adhered to. No significant impact is expected.</p> <p><b>Public Comment and Questions:</b> See Chapter 6 for Public Outreach for the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>disturb the adjacent Superfund site containing poisonous materials? My reading of the EA indicates, basically, that they'll get to that when they get to that. That's what I call Seat-of-Pants planning, and it never ends well. Table 5-1 has some information that makes me wonder about the concept about an "EA." In this table the results of an assessment done to compare No Build to Full Build-out. It is unconvincing. The various impacts on the following state (for full build-out) Natural Resources/ Energy Supply "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Air Quality: "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Noise: "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Hazardous Material "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Traffic and Surface Effects "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Light Emissions and Visual Effects "IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Solid Waste Management IMPROVED EXISTING CONDITIONS Only the last one sounds plausible but could not possibly include the Superfund site. I didn't see anything in the report about storm water management. Either I missed it or it's just not there. This needs to be clarified. 132 29 So, where and when can I get my questions answered? When did we have and/or when will we have the opportunity for that critical interaction? If there was or will be no opportunity to do so, the entire process is fatally flawed. I heard the presenter say, in a weary tone, something to the effect that "This has been talked about for years. It's time to move forward." Who has been talking about it? Even if you knew about where you could read the EA, was there any opportunity to question or clarify available? I believe that all my points above direct attention to material flaws regarding the development of this project from notification to the current time. I wish them to be considered fully, and the process paused until we have answers to all the most pressing questions. Then we can begin our 60-day comment period, having had interactions essential for clarity, assuming that is the aim of the sponsor and the Mercer County officials. Please provide me with a confirmation that you have received this e-mail. Thank you for your time and consideration. Dionne Polk dionne27law@comcast.net</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Dorinda Reliford- Sutton	134	<p>If 3,000 aircraft of all types fly out of Trenton airport per year, the length of time it takes to clear the flight path is between eight and 10 seconds. I live within two miles of the existing airport, and time the noise levels of the various departing planes. The loudest in their class are the Boing 737's, currently the largest aircraft flown at Trenton, but Boing 737 max are louder, and airport expansion would allow for these noisier planes to fly. Cessnas and other private aircraft should not be overlooked when measuring the impact of noise pollution from the airport. Not quite a roar, but a loud, long, droning sound that continues for 14 seconds in near range. These 3,000 aircraft, flown currently between the hours of 5:30 am and later than 9:30 pm, are in our immediate airspace, over our homes, for a period of roughly 42 STRAIGHT DAYS A</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Flight paths/Low Flying Aircraft:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9 through 11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity and Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>3,000 aircraft:</b> This comment and math as described are difficult to follow. 3,000 departures per year equates to approximately 8 departures per day, or one every three hours.</p> <p><b>Tree clearing:</b> Approximately 3.5 acres of tree clearing is proposed. Approximately 1.68 acres would be revegetated. See Section 5.2.1 for additional detail.</p> <p><b>Natural Resources:</b> Section 5.7 of the EA describes Natural Resources and Energy Supply is expected.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>YEAR, or 20% of our life. The math can be done on the number of aircraft, in total, the airport intends to accommodate when the expansion is complete. The future noise and air pollution will rise exponentially. Old-growth trees will be felled, service road access will be built to carry heavy machinery, building materials, hazardous materials, creating more impervious serious and depriving the region of yet more natural resources (the immediate area was denuded of trees and impervious service created for two massive new apartment complexes within two miles of the airport). Developers have not planned for the expansion of passenger needs that will impact the area. There is only one motel in Ewing, where the airport is located. There is a paucity of eateries, no rest stops or picnic areas, no public spaces, the parking lot (to be four levels) is located on a local two-lane road. Vehicle noise, traffic jams, accidents, etc., are to occur. Covid is still a pandemic, yet the airport expansion is a priority over the health and safety of NJ citizens. It is undemocratic for our elected leaders to disregard legal regulations, manipulate data for the purpose of passing the expansion, and fail to represent their constituents. It is all a matter of whose ox is being gored. Send a copy to my email address</p>	<p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> See Section 5.13 of the EA for Cumulative Impacts.  <b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Passenger Needs:</b> Development proposals for ancillary services such as hotels and restaurants are private investment decisions beyond the scope of this EA.</p> <p><b>Safety:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 5 for discussion on safety.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 4 for Roadway Traffic Congestion and Section 5.10 and Appendix G for discussion of current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p> <p><b>Elected leaders role:</b> Mercer County made the decision to proceed with planning for the terminal project based on analysis and findings of the Master Plan update.</p>
6.15.21	GO	Brian Fitzpatrick Congress of the U.S. - District 1	135-139	<p><b>Expansion:</b> At the forefront of issues, regardless of the new names of the proposed project, this project is nothing more than an expansion project. Moreover, there are multiple independent variables that have the potential to adversely affect human health and our environment.</p> <p>The project must be classified for what it is and not classified incorrectly in an effort to evade environmental regulation/safeguards and extinguish liability/extra hurdles.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> Addressing the environmental impact of this expansion project, regardless of what is stated in the clearly biased draft EA, this project will cause significant adverse impacts to the environment and health of our residents. Clearing trees and the excavation of wetlands to construct a new terminal building contributes to many new and longstanding issues such as air and water quality, elimination of habitats, harmful effects to endangered species and the prolonged postponement of remediation of hazardous PFAS compounds. These issues are further exacerbated by the increase of greenhouse gases and noise pollution caused by the influx of flights.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> The land within and around TTN has been subjected to decades long exposure of PFAS through prior military use and TTN's use of the fire foams for the purposes of training drills and to extinguish fire outbreaks. Again, the draft EA presents misleading information under REC No. 3 – Historic Firefighting Drills stating, “There are currently no NJDEP or federal standards or screening levels for PFAS in soil.” This is</p>	<p><b>Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 items, 11, and 16 for discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity, Operations, and the size of the Terminal. The Proposed Action consists of terminal improvements and not the expansion of the airport. Specifically, the existing terminal has four (4) aircraft parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft. The proposed terminal would have four (4) parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft. The size of the aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the operational limitations imposed by the runways at TTN. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p> <p>Land use surrounding the Airport would remain unchanged and the Proposed Action does not include any changes to runway lengths, runway alignments, instrument procedures, navigational equipment, or other factors that increase airfield capacity. As detailed in the EA, the existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor level of service. Additionally, this situation is exacerbated when departures and arrivals are delayed due to weather conditions. The terminal improvements will address immediate and short-term needs of the airport, providing a functional terminal that meets current standards, code, safety and security requirements, spacing and adequate level of service to all users and tenants.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements. The EA addressed the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the CEQ and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. After careful and thorough consideration of the facts contained in the EA, it was concluded that the proposed federal action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. Therefore, and EIS is not required or warranted.</p> <p>The EA addressed all required impact categories as required by FAA Order 1050.1, including items such as wetlands, biological resources, threatened and endangered species, PFAS, and many others. The conclusion of the analysis was that no that the project would not result in significant effects or significant effects could be mitigated to less than significance. Temporary construction impacts such as construction traffic, and construction related air quality effects are addressed within each impact category in Chapter 5. In summary, no significant effect is anticipated.</p> <p><b>Contamination/PFAS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of PFAS and Hazardous Materials. Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA describe the site characterization results. As described in the EA, PFAS contamination has been identified on airport property. The EA considered the potential for encountering PFAS or other contamination during construction and operation of the Proposed Action. The EA specified that appropriate engineering controls would be employed to address contamination as appropriate, and all remediation will be performed in accordance with NJDEP regulatory requirements. As noted, the PFAS remediation will progress in accordance with NJDEP Site Remediation Program requirements regardless of whether the Proposed Action</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>misleading information due to the pending litigation regarding the federal government’s violation of the New Jersey State environmental standards for PFAS. The suit heavily incorporates the Trenton-Mercer Airport as an example of a hotspot. See State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection v. United States of America. No: 2:18-mn-2873. The State knows of the devastating health concerns resulting from PFAS exposure and has an aggressive sense of urgency for remediation.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> In addition to the direct health implications this expansion would cause to the community, this proposed project also has the potential of causing both long and short term noise pollution. Citing the earlier argument that the draft EA fails to properly account for the growth of emplacements, the increase of flights will cause a significant increase in noise pollution that is not properly accounted for. To highlight this point, the draft EA cites noise studies conducted in 2020 where enplanements were significantly less prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2020 noise studies were then used to project 2022 noise pollution. Using these numbers and failing to account for the actual increase of flights this expansion project will cause is disingenuous. Also, in the short term, it should be noted that the construction of the proposed project would result in temporary elevated noise levels related to heavy vehicles hauling materials and debris to and from the work site and on-site construction activities.</p>	<p>proceeds.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA further describes the analysis of noise to assess the potential for impacts associated with the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action would have no effect on the capacity of the airfield and land use surrounding the Airport would remain unchanged. Based on the Proposed Action, no significant impacts are anticipated. Although the noise study was dated November 2020, the noise study was prepared using 2019 operations and forecast operations for the years 2022 and 2027. The forecast operations are based upon the FAA approved forecasts for TTN. The Proposed Action does not include any changes to runway lengths, runway alignments, instrument procedures, navigational equipment, or other factors that affect airfield capacity. No changes to flight operations are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action. The only change in aircraft operations noise is expected to be associated with aircraft ground movements around the terminal gates, not resulting in an increase of current background noise. The Noise Analysis conducted in Chapter 5, Section 5.8 and Appendix E, evaluated noise in accordance with the FAA requirements published in FAA Order 1050.1F. Comparison of the no action and action alternatives found that the only change to the noise contours were related to the changed aircraft parking positions at the new terminal. The changes do not exceed the FAA’s threshold of significance for noise. No new noise sensitive land uses would be added to the 65 DNL (Yearly Day Night Average Sound Level) contour because of the Proposed Action. Furthermore, No additional noise sensitive land uses would be included in the 65-DNL contour when comparing the no action to the action alternative. The analysis notes that approximately 25 residences are present within the 65 DNL contour under both the no action and action alternatives. Given their proximity to Runway 6-24, it is unlikely that procedural changes would significantly benefit those residences. Voluntary noise abatement procedures are in effect however safe operation of the aircraft are largely at pilot’s discretion. However, pilots choose their flight paths based upon a variety of factors including wind direction, runway length, performance characteristics of their aircraft, other air traffic, and many others. Quarry Hill Elementary and Afton Elementary Schools as well as the Orchard Hill neighborhood are outside of the 65 DNL contour. The Draft EA, Chapter 5, Section 5.8, provides details regarding noise related to the Proposed Action. Noise and air emissions during the construction phase of the Proposed Action were also analyzed in Section 5.8 and Appendix E. Best Management Practices will be utilized to limit the effects of noise and air during construction.</p> <p><b>Tree clearing:</b> As described in Section 5.2, approximately 3.5 acres of tree clearing are proposed. Approximately 1.68 acres would be revegetated. The tree clearing would occur in habitats that are common in the vicinity. The EA concluded that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Section 5.12 of the EA describes water quality, water pollution, and water resources. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p> <p><b>Endangered Species:</b> As described in Section 5.2, US Fish and Wildlife Service determined that the project is not likely to adversely affect federally listed or proposed listed species.</p> <p>See Chapter 6.2.2 Items 1, 16, and 19 and Chapter 2 for terminal sizing and numbers of aircraft boarding positions.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Brian Miller	140	<p>To the Trenton Mercer Airport and Affiliated Groups, I live in the immediate vicinity of the Trenton Mercer Airport. I am concerned the proposed airport expansion plans are being undertaken and advanced without adequate consideration for the health and wellbeing of the surrounding communities. Stakeholders in this project are acting in a willfully negligent manner with respect to their responsibility for area residents and the environment. Specifically, I would like to see the following actions taken - at a minimum - before any construction at the Trenton Airport proceeds:</p>	<p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. Based on the findings of the EA, a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Contamination/PFAS:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of PFAS and Hazardous Materials. Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA describe the Hazardous Materials and remediation.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Assessments and Environmental Impact Statements.</p> <p><b>Cost/Independent Accounting:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>1) The level of soil toxicity in the area surrounding the airport needs to be adequately evaluated and remediated to levels that are safe in accordance with Federal Law and best practices.</p> <p>2) Comprehensive studies need to be conducted on the impact to the environment and public health. Specifically, I am asking for an Environmental Impact Statement and a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>3) There needs to be an independent accounting and full disclosure to stakeholders regarding actual project costs, the impact to surrounding property values, public health costs, and the suitability of planned future work at Trenton Airport. Thank you for recording my requests. This is very important to everyone living around the airport, our children, future generations, and the environment. You need to do the right thing now and act prudently instead of rashly!</p> <p>Sincerely, Brian Miller</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Katie McVan	141-145	<p>The Lower Makefield Township Board of Supervisors (BOS) is submitting this letter to be included in the public record for the Trenton-Mercer Airport Terminal Area Improvements Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA). The DEA was prepared by McFarland Johnson, Inc. on behalf of Mercer County and dated April 2021. The BOS understands that the open public comment period for this DEA runs until June 16, 2021. Many of our constituents in Lower Makefield Township, are concerned about the dramatic increase in the number of airport construction projects being approved by the Mercer-County Freeholders aimed at increasing the air traffic and passenger handling capabilities of the Trenton-Mercer Airport (TTN) facility and the process for approving same.</p> <p>A review of all the plans filed for the terminal expansion indicate the construction will increase the size of the terminal 4-fold. In 2006, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) concluded that if the airport were to increase the terminal size from 25,000 sq. ft. to 64,000 sq. ft., it would have a significant noise impact because of the increased air traffic growth. However, Mercer County is now arguing that increasing the terminal to 125,000 sq. ft. will have no significant impact. The 125,000 sq. ft. terminal will have a very significant impact on our area, and it will be made worse because of the complementary projects, such as parallel taxiways. The increase in terminal size will lead to a drastic increase in airport usage and impacts to the surrounding community. According to the FAA approved forecasts provided in the DEA, annual passenger enplanements are expected to grow from 314,665 in 2016 to 476,507 in 2035. This represents an approximately 51% increase in enplanements.</p>	<p><b>Independent Utility:</b> All constructed projects under FAA jurisdiction have gone under NEPA review in accordance with the applicable type of action. Previous projects that had independent utility are not considered a connected action to the proposed action presented in the Draft EA. According to the FAA, a project has independent utility when the project has logical starting and end points and would have a useful purpose without relying on other transportation improvements. The EA considered the effects of the proposed actions and connected actions in accordance with CEQ regulations at Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (CEQ Regulations). See Section 5.13 for Cumulative Impacts. Table 5.12 provides additional information regarding the independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p> <p><b>Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2. item 1 for the discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity and items 11 and 16 regarding the operations of the airport and size of the terminal. <b>2006 EA:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 14 for a description of the differences between the 2006 EA and this EA.</p> <p><b>Enplanements:</b> The Proposed Action is intended to improve Level of Service for passengers utilizing the TTN Terminal. The growth in enplanements, is expected, whether or not the terminal project is completed. The Proposed Action is not expected to stimulate or induce additional flights.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the Cumulative Impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA further describes the analysis of noise. <b>Air Pollution and Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Water Pollution and Water Quality:</b> Section 5.12 of the EA describes water quality, water pollution, and water resources</p> <p><b>Runway Protection Zone:</b> The Runway Protection Zone project is a separate project with independent utility from the Proposed Action. That project is intended to enhance the safety of the airport, while the Proposed Action is intended to enhance passenger LOS.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes PFAS and Hazardous Materials. Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA describes Hazardous Materials and remediation.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion on Property Values. .</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>The noise, air and water pollution impact of these multiple projects and the associated significant increase in air traffic appears not to be addressed by the FAA environmental assessments. Projects are being reviewed individually, instead of looking at the cumulative impact.</p> <p>This piecemeal review contradicts FAA Order 1050 which states a proposed action cannot be segmented by breaking it down into small components to reduce impacts (see 40 CFR 1508.27(B)(7), CEQ Regulations). We believe the FAA should take into account these combined projects for what they will become in aggregate when reviewing permits.</p> <p>Chapter 23 of the FAA's <i>Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions</i> (October 2007), requires the consideration of cumulative impacts when reviewing airport actions. Per this document, cumulative impacts are "impacts the proposed action would have on a particular resource when added to impacts on that resource due to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions within a defined time and geographical area." The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) further defines cumulative impacts as follows:</p> <p>...impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over time.</p> <p>Based on the above, the BOS is concerned that the cumulative impacts associated with multiple projects over time, including indirect emissions from airplanes associated with the increased taxiing and flight levels of the runway protection zone and other related proposed projects, are not being considered as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Because of the cumulative impact of these projects, the BOS believes that it is incorrect to conclude in the runway protection zone EA that a Conformity Determination is unnecessary. By only considering the runway protection zone project and not its impact (along with new taxiways and a massive terminal expansion) on expected air traffic, the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) analysis carried out misrepresents the true impact on air quality. We ask that you consider these indirect emissions as they will impact the air quality for the entire area, and they will not be reversible once the airport growth has occurred.</p> <p>Furthermore, this DEA only considers direct impacts by the physical expansion of the terminal and does not consider the cumulative impacts of other associated projects considered in the Airport Master Plan. Based on our review of the Airport Master Plan and the several projects that directly result from the Airport Master Plan, it appears as though Mercer County is undertaking segmentation in direct contradiction to FAA and NEPA guidance</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>and regulations to avoid further NEPA review. The collection of projects should be analyzed collectively because of the significant potential environmental impact they will have on the area, including impacts to air quality, water quality, habitat and other resources due to the amount of pervious surface that will disappear as the result of parking lots, taxiways, hangars and the expanded terminal and increased air traffic.</p> <p>The State of New Jersey is suing the federal government over its contamination of groundwater and drinking water resources on and around the Naval Air Warfare Center Trenton. <a href="https://www.nj.gov/oag/newsreleases21/COMPLAINT(AFFF).pdf">https://www.nj.gov/oag/newsreleases21/COMPLAINT(AFFF).pdf</a> Despite the presence of documented water contamination and the State of New Jersey's lawsuit, the FAA has approved with a finding of no significant impact the Mercer County's plans to remove trees on an area that comes within 100 feet of contaminated groundwater. We are concerned about the health hazards associated with these pollutants making their way into the drinking water supply because of the disturbances caused by airport projects, and Mercer County and the FAA are ignoring the potential impact of these actions. Additionally, the impact of aircraft operations on water quality degradation should also be considered. We encourage you to find a way to account for the impact on water pollution (drinking and local wildlife) due to increased air traffic effluent and pollutants associated with airport operations and vehicular traffic.</p> <p>Time is of the essence in these matters because of the rapid pace the airport projects are taking and how many of the projects are being approved as routine maintenance (parallel taxiways) despite their significant impact on air operations and traffic capacity. We ask that you consider them collectively and evaluate their effect because of on-going air operations and not just based on the project specifics themselves. The need for these projects to be collectively evaluated is vital to protecting citizens on both sides of the Delaware River. TTN/Mercer County is not presenting a full, complete, and transparent picture of what they are building. If successful, the impacts on our health, property values, and financial status of the communities impacted will be irreversible.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact us with any questions. We can be reached through our Township Manager, Kurt Ferguson at Phone Number redacted or <a href="mailto:kurtf@lmt.org">kurtf@lmt.org</a> and I can be reached at Phone Number redacted or <a href="mailto:sblundi@lmt.org">sblundi@lmt.org</a>. Sincerely, Suzanne SrBlundi Chair, Board of Supervisors, Lower Makefield Township</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Roger and Susan Crook	146-147	The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents	PFAS: Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes PFAS and Hazardous Materials. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p>of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 13 for a discussion on Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Donna Nardoza	148	Learn from the lessons of the past of how many airlines have pulled out. Keep it small and manageable and avoid further air,	<p>Commenter discusses history of airlines leaving TTN. Frontier Airlines has served TTN continuously since 2013.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				noise and other pollutions. Let' not get left holding the bag when the next pandemic or consolidation occurs and it will.	<b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.
6.15.21	PC	Donna Nardoza	149	I am not in favor of expansion. Not necessary to have a bigger hub in our rural area when we are situated between NY, Newark and Philly. Noise, air and other Pollutions will increase and everything about this cares will become more congested . Learn from the many tries at it in the past that airlines go through cycles and consolidations, add a pandemic or economic crisis and we are left holding the bag. How about shuttles to	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2. item 1 for the discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity and items 11 and 16 regarding the operations of the airport and size of the terminal.</p> <p><b>Newark and Philadelphia:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports, the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Darlene Yaplee	150-151	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	
6.15.21	PC	John Jusiewicz	152-153	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <p>1. An EIS must consider the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA.</p> <p>2. The FAA must be accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>3. Sign on as co-sponsor of US Senate Bill 2506: Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act of 2019-2020 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution.</p> <p>4. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Senate Bill 2506:</b> The airport cannot co-sponsor legislation.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Air and Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.15.21	PC	Robert Lucia	154	I live in Yardley and the planes take off and approach landing flying directly above my neighborhood. Noise is really bad. Please do not expand.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 16 for discussion of terminal sizing.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Flight patterns / Flight Increases:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe Terminal and Airfield Capacity and Aircraft Operations.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Thayer Moorcroft	155	I am a resident of Lower Makefield, Sandy Run development to be exact. I am very disturbed that they are planning to expand the airport. On Saturday morning at 10:48 a plane flew so low over my house that I really thought that this was it, it was going to crash into my house. This is not the first time that this has happened. My windows rattle and my pictures on the wall go askew all the time when planes fly over. This is not right. You can't even carry on a conversation with a neighbor outside. Please don't allow expansion. People have worked hard for their homes and this would devalue them just because of corporate greed. Our houses are the single most valuable investment we make.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2 items 9 and 10 for discussion on aircraft flight patterns and approaches. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for Property Values.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Dawn Singer	156	No way. It's especially bad when they come in and go out so damn low. House rattles	See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through –11 for discussions of approach pats, flight patterns, and operations at the airport.
6.15.21	PC	Steve Nayowith	157-159	<p><b>Air Traffic:</b> The airport's increase in air traffic and low-altitude flyovers will have a negative impact on housing prices in Pennsylvania, in addition to having a deleterious effect on our quality of life.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> a full Environmental Impact Statement is necessary.</p> <p><b>Incomplete EA:</b> Draft EA represents an incomplete evaluation of the proposed project's impacts, and the process has been executed poorly, at the expense of accurately reflecting realistic data and public input. Perhaps the most egregious example is the unrealistically low and outdated forecast of enplanements and aircraft operations at the airport. Without using realistic numbers, any evaluation of impacts will be fallacious and will underrepresent or fail to consider what the actual scope and magnitude of the impacts will be based on the proposed terminal expansion and the associated airfield modifications.</p> <p><b>Public Involvement:</b> Another example of the incompleteness of the Draft EA is in the table of contents for Appendix I, Public Participation, Public &amp; Agency Comments, "Item 6. TTN Terminal EA Public Meeting Comments- 1/23/2019": Numerous public comments were provided at or following that meeting; however, the Draft EA does not include any of those comments.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Complete EA:</b> The EA was prepared according to the CEQ regulation , which establish procedures for complying with the NEPA. In accordance with 40 CFR § 1507.3 of the CEQ Regulations, FAA Order 1050.1F provides the FAA's policies and procedures to ensure agency compliance with NEPA. The EA took into consideration the approved 20-year planning forecast.</p> <p><b>Public Involvement:</b> See Chapter 6 for a description of Public Outreach. Section 6.2.2 Item8 discusses the disposition of comments from meeting held prior to the public hearing.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of emissions and air pollution.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Cumulative Impacts are discussed in Section 5.13 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 13 for discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 19 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>Air Traffic:</b> : Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for discussion of Property Values.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>Most of the public and community group comments are generally related to noise; air quality; concerns about cumulative impacts of airport development; requesting an EIS rather than an EA; and frustration with lack of meetings with key officials. Their comments are representative and similar to comments received from others and do not stand out as unusual, other than the number of comments which includes references to various articles and press reports. Substantive comments will be addressed in an appropriate manner in the appendices of the Final EA.” Bottom line, from the public’s perspective: The Airport will decide what, or if, it will respond to any of those numerous concerns, despite the acknowledged large number of comments from concerned citizens. That is clearly not an inclusive or objective process.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> In particular, on the Pennsylvania side, aircraft noise is a major issue. Even the U.S. Congress has identified airport noise as an issue, as reflected in the formation of the bipartisan Congressional Quiet Skies Caucus, of which Brian Fitzpatrick (PA-01) is a member. In a March 10, 2021, letter to the FAA2, the caucus stated: “As members of the Quiet Skies Caucus, we have deep concerns regarding the results of the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA’s) nationwide survey about aircraft noise annoyance. The results show clearly that the Day-Night Sound Level (DNL) and corresponding Schultz Curve created in the 1970s have outlived their usefulness—people are far more annoyed by aircraft noise than the Schultz Curve predicts. This validates the reports about aircraft noise we have been hearing from our constituents for years and requires the FAA to take aircraft noise more seriously than it has thus far.</p> <p>After years of delay, the FAA has finally released the results of its Neighborhood Environmental Survey and issued a Federal Register Notice to seek comments on the survey results from the public. Fundamentally, the survey results demonstrate that the method the FAA uses to measure aircraft noise is deeply flawed. Even the FAA acknowledges that, “Compared with the existing Schultz Curve, the new National Curve shows a substantial increase in the percentage of people who are highly annoyed by aircraft noise over the entire range of aircraft noise levels considered, including at lower noise levels.</p> <p>The airport impacts are extremely detrimental to our quality of life; they negatively affect our property values and dissuade others from wanting to make our town their home; and they have known, negative effects on human health, including noise, air emissions, and PFOS/PFAS contamination. Therefore, the full impacts of the planned project and the associated increase in air traffic must also be</p>	<p><b>Segmentation:</b> See Section 5.13 for cumulative impacts and independent utility of recent and proposed projects.</p> <p><b>Project area:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 17 for discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Forecasts:</b> Chapters 1 and 2 of the EA described the approved forecasts, actual vs forecast enplanements and operations for the years 2019, 2020, and 2021.</p>
6.15.21	PC	David Penick	160-162	The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject	<b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.15.21	PC	David Moore	163	I have lived around the airport for 56 years. Trenton- Mercer has always been a small corporate jet airport. I will never forget the	<b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				noise pollution from Eastwind airlines in the mid-90s. The airport should remain as it is because we are close to major international airports. I am very concerned with the increased amount of pollution that the expansion will create.	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Maureen Nayowith	176-177	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project. The environmental pollution, specifically the noise generated today by the airport, impacts the community I live in and my general wellbeing almost 20 hours a day, 7 days a week. Being evasive on your answers about conducting proper, thorough noise studies requested repeatedly by the surrounding communities, as well as addressing other environmental impacts is shocking and disappointing. Therefore, I am asking that you address three things regarding this airport EIS and report back to the affected communities openly and honestly before proceeding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>2. Sign on as co-sponsor of US Senate Bill 2506: Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act of 2019-2020 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution.</li> <li>3. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> </ol>	<p><b>EIS:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2 item 7 for information regarding noise complaint reporting. See Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Air and Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p>TTN is not eligible to co-sponsor federal legislation.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.15.21	PC	Theresa Masters	178	<p>Living under the landing flight path to the airport is already bordering on the unbearable. Life in our beautiful rural community surrounded by farms, MCPark Northwest and Rosedale Park has become a nightmare. These preserved lands were designated as a nature preserve for both wildlife to thrive and provide an opportunity for the passive enjoyment of open space. Both objectives are already threatened by the current level of noise from airport traffic. Expansion will continue to diminish the quality of life for both humans and wildlife and also greatly increase traffic congestion on both local streets and the highway. There is absolutely no improvement to the community that will be achieved by expanding the airport.</p>	<p>Commentor describes existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p>Comment noted. Socioeconomic impacts and benefits are discussed in Chapter 5.9. Economic impact of the airport is discussed in Chapter 1.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Joanne Guiniven	179	<p>The "Terminal Area Improvement Draft Environmental Assessment" dated April 2021 is based on illogical forecasts that also directly contradict the numerous pronouncements of Mercer County executives and officials.</p> <p>☒ In many public discussions and press releases that Mercer County officials have had about this project; they consistently insist that this terminal is necessary because it is the "economic engine" of future growth for the county and region. For examples, look no further than the 20+ comments from such officials at the public hearing for this Draft EA held on June 2, 2021.</p> <p>☒ On pages 1-4 and 1-5 of the same EA, modest forecasts are shown that certainly do not support growth such as it would be an "economic engine" for anything. Furthermore, they are completely illogical.</p> <p>o The chart on p1-4 shows 314,665 enplanements in 2016 and a forecast of 476,507 enplanements forecast for 2035 - a fairly modest annual growth rate of 2.2%.</p> <p>o In the text on page 1-5, it is detailed that the enplanements for 2018 were 404,349, a 16.7% annual increase per year for the 2 years 2016-2018.</p> <p>o 2019 enplanements are not given, but they are likely to be higher still.</p> <p>o 2020 brought us covid and a covid induced slowdown from March on. However, if you take the first 2 months of 2020 on page 1-5 (pre-covid slowdown) and use it as the run rate, 2020 would have been more than 428,850 enplanements.</p> <p>o Given the 2018 number provided in the document, you only forecast 0.97% annual growth through 2035, after experiencing 16.7% annual growth in the years 2017 and 2018.</p>	<p><b>Economic Engine:</b> As stated in Chapter 1, The New Jersey Statewide Airport Economic Impact Study, prepared by the New Jersey Department of Transportation states "The contribution of all airports, from small general aviation to large international commercial service, is crucial to the economy." <a href="https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/freight/aviation/documents/EIS_Summary.pdf">https://www.state.nj.us/transportation/freight/aviation/documents/EIS_Summary.pdf</a>. The commenters were stating their opinion regarding the economic benefits of the Proposed Action. Chapter 2, the Purpose and Need for this project is to improve the Level of Service for passengers using the TTN terminal. Economic benefits of the project are ancillary to the Purpose and Need.</p> <p><b>Enplanements:</b> Updated enplanement information is included in Chapter 1 for 2019, 2020, and 2021.</p> <p>The commenter implies that the airport cannot be an economic engine because the annual growth rates assumed in the FAA approved forecast are not large enough to support that claim. However, based on the findings of the New Jersey Department of Transportation Airport Economic Impact Study cited previously, Trenton Mercer Airport's economic output was approximately \$346 million annually. It is reasonable to say that the airport is currently accruing economic benefits to the community and will continue to do so. However, as noted previously, the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action is to improve Level of Service for airport passengers.</p> <p><b>Forecasts:</b> The approved forecasts were established based upon the best information available at that time. Forecasts are based upon local and regional demographics and economic information, industry trends, historical data, and data from similar airports in the region. The Master Plan Update, including the forecast chapter is available for review on the project website <a href="http://www.tnterminal.com">www.tnterminal.com</a>. As noted in the Forecast Chapter of the Master Plan Update, forecasting at TTN was challenging because of the inconsistent history of air service at TTN. 4 forecast scenarios were considered, with the approved forecast being an average of the 4. As noted in the Master Plan forecast, enplanements growth and declines can be volatile because of TTN's proximity to two large hub airports (EWR and PHL). In other words, enplanement growth is expected to be irregular due to a variety of factors outside of Mercer County control. Therefore, it is unreasonable to assume that the recent enplanement growth will continue unabated, indefinitely.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>o Given the 2020 early run rate of 428,850, the implied annual growth rate from pre-covid to 2035 forecast would be a paltry 0.7% annually.</p> <p>Forecasting growth from this time until 2035 of LESS THAN 1%, and simultaneously claiming that this airport will be the economic engine or the region is completely illogical. The claims of the officials give their real intent. The extremely low forecasts are given to get them through this EA without proper scrutiny on the impact on health, air, water, noise, wildlife, property values, etc. on the entire region including Pennsylvania. This EA (and I dare say an EIS) must be re-done with realistic numbers and numbers that these officials really have in mind if they were to be truthful. Growth rates of less than 1% from this point on do not even make this an economically viable project.</p>	
6.15.21	PC	Carmen Marranco	180-181	<p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA. Outside of that I am good!</p>	<p><b>Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS and other contaminants will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Kyle Preston	182-183	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Michelle and Lee Schachter	184-185	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and control Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> A See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> <u>The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</u></p>
6.15.21	PC	Jeffrey Mark Nansteel	186-187	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> <u>The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</u></p>
6.15.21	PC	Jane L Lee	188	<p>I request that a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport and surrounding 10-mile community radius, not just the terminal and other immediate aspects of this project.</p> <p>This area is too environmentally sensitive for such a large expansion without knowledge of the results of a full environmental impact study.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for terminal and airfield capacity.</p>
6.15.21	PC	Maryanne Smith	189-190	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment,</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. <b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> <u>The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</u></p>
6.15.21	PC	Elizabeth O'Brien	191-192	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. <b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> <u>The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</u></p>
6.15.21	PC	Jim Shannon	193-194	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. <b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> <u>The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</u></p>
6.15.21	PC	Richard Preston	195-197	<p>Summary of key points since my comments were cut-off during the public meeting:</p> <p>1) I ask the FAA to carry out an environmental impact study for the projected capacity of the Trenton Mercer County airport and not issue a finding of no significant impact based on the unrealistic low growth percentages put forth by the airport and approved by the FAA.</p> <p>2) I ask the FAA to include in the study a wider area than the airport property since the noise and pollution impact are very significant in our Pennsylvania property in Yardley. Why there isn't a more holistic approach that looks at flight paths approaches where impact is substantial and within 5-10 mile radius that is often sited in noise studies and outlined FAA Land Use Document and the PART 150 Noise Study from 2017; Small Airport Applicability chapter 5 page 46 .</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Noise Mitigation:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a discussion of how Mercer County addresses noise complaints and voluntary noise abatement procedures in place at TTN.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				3) I ask the airport to consider implementing voluntary noise mitigation procedures for the surrounding areas. Some small airports may not have incompatible land uses, but still may have a noise problem if local residents protest noise originating at the airport. An airport may choose to incorporate some aspects of a Part 150 noise study to address the community's concern. Public outreach and voluntary aircraft operational mitigation strategies could be implemented without conducting a formal Part 150 Program.	
6.15.21	PC	Belinda Silver	198	I disagree with the expansion. I live about ten minutes from the airport and my house is in the flight path of the planes leaving and arriving. The noise is very loud, especially if I am sitting outside.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity and item 16 for sizing of the terminal.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths / Flyovers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through -11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6/3/21	PC	Robin Karpf, MD	See Comment 98-99. This page is a continuation of that comment. Page became separated during compilation	<p>We demand:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment .</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.</p>
6.3.21	PC	Marc Vecchiolla	200	in favor of expansion	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>As described in Chapter 1 the Project consists in the replacement of the existing terminal building with a proposed new terminal building at the Trenton-Mercer Airport.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Jennifer Hirsh, MD	201-202	I oppose the expansion of Trenton Mercer Airport. It is costly. The \$4 million can be better spent in other areas that would benefit the residents and small businesses of Mercer County. Expansion of the airport terminal and increased air traffic is detrimental to residents' health. NOISE: Increased air traffic will produce increased noise. A recent study from the Massachusetts General Hospital (Harvard affiliate) finds a link between noise exposure and major cardiovascular events, such as heart attacks and strokes. A 2015 study out of London showed that aircraft noise is associated with children having poorer reading and memory skills. AIR POLLUTION: Increased air traffic will produce increased air	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through -11 for aircraft operations and, flight path.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Ultra Fine Particles (UFP):</b> The project doesn't result in changes to aviation source emissions. While AEDT has the capability to model ultra-fine emissions, there are currently no standards in place for these emissions. Furthermore, research is still being undertaken to identify source attribution for UFP and their relative contribution as a source.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>pollution, including Ultra Fine Particles or UFPs. A 2020 study in Germany showed that exposure to UFPs may trigger heart attacks. A 2020 study in Canada showed an increase in UFPs was associated with an increased incidence of brain tumors. A 2019 study in Korea shows that exposure to air pollution is associated with an increased risk of SIDS/Sudden Infant Death Syndrome. A 2017 study from Montreal showed that ambient UFPs were associated with an increased risk of prostate cancer. Construction must be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from the 65 contaminated sites that are currently on airport property. Downstream spread must not be allowed to occur. Both an Environmental Impact Statement and Public Health impact Assessment must be completed to determine the effects of the massive expansion. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including the cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues, and increased public health costs, must be performed. This project must be evaluated in its entirety, instead of being segmented into multiple smaller projects, thereby circumventing the NJ Department of Environmental Protection jurisdiction. We must protect the quality of life and health of residents in Mercer County.</p>	<p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Project Funding:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 regarding Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> See Section 5.13 for Cumulative Impacts. Table 5.12 describes independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p>
A	PC	Sam Hunt	203	<p>I am one of the many local citizens concerned about the county and airport's lack of transparency and concern for the safety and well-being of Mercer county residents most impacted by this proposed expansion. I demand that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment .</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 112 for . Property Values..</p>
6.2.21	PC	Candice Jackson Long	204	<p>I am a homeowner that lives 10 minutes from this airport. I disagree with the expansion of the airport. The noise of airplanes flying overhead are already difficult to contend with an increase in air traffic will adversely affect our family's quality of life. I work from home and it's very difficult to manage with the overhead noise. In addition, the environmental impact study must be conducted to assess the risk of water, noise, and air pollution. Air travel has not fully rebounded and it's not a wise investment of taxpayer dollars to fund an airport expansion at this time.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through –11 for aircraft operations and, flight paths. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<b>EIS and Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments. Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.
6.2.21	PC	James Burd	205-206	<p>In 1957, I lived 1/4 mile from the Naval Jet Propulsion Center on Parkway Avenue. Our farmhouse would shake every time they would test the jet engine. During WW II, Fisher Body Company changed over to manufacture airplanes to bomb Germany. After WW II, Fisher Body Company (General Motors) continued to make auto parts. When Fisher Body Company was closed, the property soil was evaluated and condemned due to the hazardous soil. Fisher Body had to excavate the soil and it took years until a developer decided to build there. The major problem was that, because of the contaminated soil, there would be no basement and the ground floor on all buildings will be offices or stores. The next floors above will be apartments and condominiums, avoiding the contaminated soils. This is a primary concern of mine. I live on Nursery Road in Hopewell Twp.. I am concerned about the impact on the Trenton-Mercer Airport and the environmental impact that it will have on the local communities. Hopewell Twp. is impacted because we do not own a sewer plant and the drinking water comes from the earth.</p> <p>These two major factors will negatively impact everyone in this section of Hopewell Twp.. I request the FAA to do a thorough evaluation on what this massive airport increase will have on the health of everyone in this area. Please keep in mind what Fisher Body Company did to the soil that it stood on. Make sure that you do not let the same thing happen to the Trenton-Mercer Airport and the people that live in this area. I would appreciate a response from you.</p>	<b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and control Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.
6.2.21	PC	David and Deborah Sokol	207	We are strongly opposed to any airport change that will allow an expansion with increased number of flights.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Increase Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.</p>
6.2.21	PC	David and Deborah Sokol	208	We are residents of Lower Makefield Township Bucks County. All departing and arriving flights pass over our neighborhood. Any significant increase in the number of daily flights will cause a significant increase in noise pollution, air pollution and will drastically affect the health of those living in our neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods. These negative effects will clearly decrease the property values in our neighborhood . We are strongly	<p><b>Flyovers and Increase Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2 item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Victoria	209	I have major concerns regarding the environmental impact that the expansion of the Trenton Mercer airport will have on Ewing residence. I would like to see environmental studies completed for public access. The scope of these studies should include but not be limited to: the impact of consistent jetliner takeoff and	The EA was circulated for public review and comment. See Chapter 6 for a description of the public accessibility of the EA See Section 6.2.2, item 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations.. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				landings, noise and light pollution to surrounding neighborhoods, runoff from fuel/gasoline, displacement of wildlife, potential flight schedules	
6.2.21	PC	Kristen	210-211	<p>As it stands now, large commercial planes have been flying over our neighborhood lower than 1300 ft from the ground for over two years now. I have confirmed this on multiple occasions using FlightRadar24 and sent in complaints and notifications every time it happened. Finally, I requested a representative from the airport, Keith H., who came out to do a spot check in June 2019. He confirmed that the plane was lower than permitted; however, nothing was done to remedy the situation, and it continues even now as I type this.</p> <p>With this in mind my questions are...</p> <p>1) If the current commercial aircraft are approaching over our neighborhood under 1200-1300 ft, as the airport representative stated, why has this flight path not been corrected?</p> <p>2) Why are commercial aircraft allowed to complete their approach so low over other neighborhoods such as south of Lawrenceville-Pennington Road, the Stony Book Elementary School, the Princeton Community Church, and the hospital under 1000ft?</p> <p>1) As population and congestion increase in the area, at what point does the safety and health of people and families on the ground become more important? How large does the neighboring population have to prove the airport is a hazard by allowing commercial flights?</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight and elevations above ground are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at: <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-fags">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-fags</a>.</p> <p>Section 6.2.2 Item 4 discusses traffic congestion.</p> <p>Section 5.9 discusses Socioeconomic, Environmental Justices and Children’s Health and Safety.</p> <p>Section 6.2.2 Item15 discusses Health Impact Assessments</p>
6.2.21	PC	Glenn Reitmeier	212-216	<p>EA: full of misleading and contradictory information, numerous citations as to what is incorrect; Replacement Terminal is significant expansion; Economic deceptions: cites specific examples through the EA; Air, Water, and Noise Pollution: harm well-being of nearby residents, is not a good neighbor and does not have a Noise Management Office and has not taken steps for noise abatement procedures; House Values: decrease; EIS: segmentation of project to avoid.</p> <p>1. Toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA) is performed and subjected to fair and transparent public review.</p>	<p><b>Contradictory Project Description:</b> Chapter 1 of the EA provides a detailed description of the Proposed Action being considered in the EA.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> See Section 5.13 of the EA for Cumulative Impacts.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of property values.</p> <p><b>Noise Abatement Procedures:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a description of TTN’s noise abatement policy and procedures for addressing noise complaints.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Noise abatement procedures are established and implemented that demonstrably reduce the impact of the current level of flight operations.</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Linda Robbins	217	<p>I am writing to voice my serious concerns about the expansion of the Trenton/Mercer Airport. I want a finished study on the airport's impact on our environment in Ewing and surrounding towns. I am calling for an environmental Impact Statement and a Public Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>I want an accounting of actual costs to taxpayers and homeowners, including increased public health costs.</p> <p>I want construction to be delayed until toxic contaminants have been evaluated and cleaned from airport property.</p> <p>Please read my comments and add them to the record.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p>As described in the EA, the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action were carefully considered. The environmental consequences are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Cost / Taxpayers Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 regarding Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Pamela Ammidon	218	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be provided, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>We are told the flight path does not go over our house, yet the planes are flying right over us extremely low and LOUD ... rattling the widows etc.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p>As described in the EA, the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action were carefully considered. The environmental consequences are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Cost / Taxpayers Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 regarding Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Olga Troyanskaya	219	<p>I am concerned about the major expansion proposed. Prior to construction, it is necessary to provide a full evaluation of the toxic contaminants and their clearing from airport property, to reduce the risk of downstream spread of these chemicals. Perhaps even more critically, we need a comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment and public health, as this is a major expansion of operations for the airport. An accounting review of the cost of the expansion and its impact on taxes should also be provided.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 for a discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>As described in the EA, the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action were carefully considered. The environmental consequences are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Cost / Taxpayers Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 regarding Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p>
6.2.21	LA	Hal English	220-221	I am writing as President/CEO of both the Princeton Mercer Regional Chamber of Commerce and the Princeton Mercer Regional Convention and Visitors Bureau. Based on the New Jersey Statewide Airport Impact Study we are in support of the proposed new replacement Terminal.	Comment noted.
6.2.21	PC	Dr. Bogdanovic	222	The airport expansion project will not only endanger wildlife and the environment in this area (!) it would also additionally impact and disrupt already challenging living in the vicinity of this airport! This is absolutely unacceptable as well as the fact that the FAA and the Mercer County official are not communicating this project and it's potentially disastrous consequences with the concerned public and taxpayers!	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Project Communication:</b> Chapter 6 describes the public outreach process for this project.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USWFS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p>
6.2.21	PC	Brian McGrath	223	Nobody want to live next to an airport so why diminish the lives of thousands of people for what cannot be undone. I live miles from the airport yet aircraft come over my home at less than 2000 feet. I appears the tower does not monitor and enforces approach heights. This ill-conceived expansion plan benefits few but punishes many. It is a reason to move away. People elected to improve life in the County are doing the exact opposite.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>. See Section 6.2.2, item #78, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p>
6.6.21	PC	Mary Ann Wilson	224	I recently moved to this beautiful part of NJ with my family. It would be a shame for my property value to drop. The risk to our family's health is too great. The airports in Newark and Philadelphia should suffice. Please do not destroy the quality of life in this great part of NJ.	<p>The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F.</p> <p>Quality of Life: See Section 6.2.2, Item 13 for a discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion on Property Values <b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.6.21	PC	Pat Elliott	225	I am not against expansion in general. I do, however, have some concerns. 1) Ensure that flights take off and land throughout the area—the residents who formed BRAAM should not be granted any favors. Other neighborhoods have not complained or taken	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Flight Patterns:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>action. That does not mean we won't if we see flight patterns favor one area over another. 2) can expansion be done in stages? Work out flight schedules, etc. And to fix any problems with remediation issues. 3) I'm assuming more airlines will fly out of Trenton to provide some competition to Frontier</p>	<p><a href="#">mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs.</a></p> <p><b>Noise Complaints:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a discussion of how Mercer County addresses noise complaints and voluntary noise abatement procedures in place at TTN. The Proposed Action would not change any flight paths or aircraft operations.</p> <p>As described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity / Flight Schedules:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Section 6.2.2, Item 1 describes terminal and airfield capacity .</p> <p>At this time there are no plans for a new air carrier to begin operations at TTN. Flight schedules are at the discretion of the aircraft operators and beyond the purview of this EA. See Section 6.2.2, Item 7 for a description of TTN's noise abatement policy and procedures for addressing noise complaints.</p> <p><b>Remediation:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18. Contamination is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of ground pollution or contamination is governed by an established NJDEP procedures. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN.</p>
6.5.21	PC	David Penick	226-227	<p>Everyone on this call should understand that the Trenton Mercer planned airport expansion is massive – a new much larger terminal in a new location, a new 1000 car parking garage, a new control tower, major runway work and destruction of many acres of trees. Total budget for the airport expansion is over \$177Million of taxpayer's money. We disagree with the need for this significant expansion of the airport. There is no economic analysis that justifies the expense and we really don't see the demand. The tradeoff of convenience for the few days a year one may need jet travel is far, far outweighed by the negative consequences of a larger airport here in Mercer County. According to the FAA, the average American traveled by plane just 3 times in 2019. We do not need a major airport here for three trips a year. There just isn't the demand and the tradeoff in air, water and noise pollution just doesn't make sense. I for one am perfectly happy going to Newark or Philly for my air travel needs and keeping Mercer county clean and green for the next generation. A big lesson learned in the pandemic has been the ability for business to be conducted well over zoom calls, just like this meeting. As a result, many experts believe business air travel will continue to decline. Business air travel is the lifeblood of the airlines. Airlines are not profitable solely with cheap tickets to Florida. It does not make sense to be making a huge capital investment in Trenton Mercer airport when we are on the brink of new ways of living and doing business, which will reduce the need for air travel. There is also increasing public awareness of the major contribution jet air travel makes to global warming. Every car manufacturer around the world is trying to accelerate the production of electric vehicles and get out of the fossil fueled energy business. But it will be decades if ever for similar technology to impact the airline industry And then there is the long term environmental impact. Just take a look at the land around Newark and Philadelphia airports. It is largely unoccupied industrial and vacant land. No homes are impacted. And no homes will be impacted because no one would dream of building a new</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 16 for discussion of terminal sizing.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p> <p><b>Travel Demand:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Home Purchases:</b> No home purchases are proposed as part of the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a description of Property Values</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18. Contamination is addressed in Section 5.5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of ground pollution or contamination is governed by an established NJDEP procedure. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 and Appendix E of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Water Pollution and Water Quality:</b> Section 5.12 of the EA describes water quality, water pollution, and water resources</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Fiscal Responsibility /Economic Analysis:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for Mercer County fiscal responsibility.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>home close to those airports. But here in Mercer and Bucks Counties there are private homes being impacted everywhere. In fact, the airport is actually forced to buy homes to make these plans viable. Trying to force a new larger airport into our community is unwanted and will significantly diminish the peaceful enjoyment of our lives in Mercer and Bucks counties while driving home values down. We also have to consider that the existing airport, due to its past history as a military and industrial complex is heavily contaminated with toxic materials and the way this project is being managed, those contaminants are not being properly remediated because they can't afford to do it. So, they are trying to sweep it under the rug by not doing a proper EIS. This will likely lead to increased water and air pollution which will be another bad legacy. I urge every concerned citizen to speak out against this inequity and for all elected officials to vote no on the expansion of Trenton Mercer Airport.</p>	
6.5.21	PC	Kathleen Barringer	228	<p>Prior environmental assessments shot down this proposed expansion because of the airport's proximity to a National Historic Park (Washington's Crossing) and the Delaware River. What's changed since then? In the meantime, we've had a pair of bald eagles move in, directly beneath the flight path of incoming and outgoing air traffic. Aren't bald eagles protected? Shame on you Mercer County, for trying to ruin such an historic and environmentally important area</p>	<p><b>EA:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Historic Resources:</b> See Section 5.3 of the EA for a discussion of Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resources.</p> <p><b>Bald eagles</b> were not raised as a concern for this project. According the USFWS Bald and Golden Eagle Fact Sheet , (<a href="https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering">https://www.fws.gov/midwest/eagle/Nhistory/biologue.html#:~:text=Bald%20eagles%20require%20a%20good,and%20night%20roosts%20for%20sheltering</a>), bald eagles require a good food base, perching areas, and nesting sites. Their habitat includes estuaries, large lakes, reservoirs, rivers, and some seacoasts. In winter, the birds congregate near open water in tall trees for spotting prey and night roosts for sheltering. Large open water features such as those described are not present in the project area.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport-airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport-airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USWFS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p>
6.5.21	PC	Dorinda Reliford	229	<p>Once tiny MC airport, surrounded by highly-populated residential regions in Bucks and Mercer counties (350,000 residents in MC and growing). In a radius of three miles of the airport, four massive rental developments have been built since 2019, adding to the population.</p> <p>The airport was expanded against overwhelming opposition, and Boeing 737's (loudest aircraft in their class) now depart from 5:30 am until 9:00 pm daily. The noise level prevents outdoor conversation, concentration, causes anxiety disorders in children and older adults, and frightens and stresses pets. My cat won't even join me on my screened porches, and I have to wear lawnmower earmuffs when reading.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2 item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Land use:</b> See Section 5.6 for Land Use Compatibility. No change in land use or zoning outside of the airport property as a result of the proposed project</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 13 for discussion of Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Rezoning:</b> No rezoning is planned for the Proposed Action.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>Cessnas, other private aircraft, helicopters and cargo planes add to the noise levels. A noise calibrator I'm using measures the 737's at 64 while overhead. The calibrator reads 95 if the area is of average noise levels.</p> <p>Hearing loss is common when older people are exposed to a sustained high noise level.</p> <p>Property values coincide with quality of life. Homeowners buy houses with amenities, and recreation purposes After all, property taxes are based on location, as well as factors pertaining to quality of life issues.</p> <p>The further expansion of MC airport into an international airport, such as JFK, Newark, and Philadelphia, is unlawful in its current location, and Daniel H. Hutton, urban planning developer hired to effect the massive expansion of MC airport is completely aware of this. The conglomerate of attorneys, politicians, construction companies, materials suppliers, management corporations, building corporations, stockholders, executives, buyers, bidders, every single detail has already been planned, and is underway for the expansion. A parking lot on Scotch Road has been built for the purpose of passenger parking. If the airport weren't expanding, no funds would have been spent on this project. The expanded airport will turn the area into an industrial zone. Since my home is less than two miles from the airport, my property will also be industrial and urbanized. Massive rezoning should take place in Ewing Township as a result.</p> <p>Taxpayers have no legal recourse to curtail the expansion of the airport. The last expansion was completed without a public referendum or due process of the law. This expansion is the same. The public is invited to comment on what will change the region forever, but a comment isn't legally binding, and can't effect any change. Inviting comments on a monumental regional shift, is ineffectual and worthless.</p>	<p>Commentor raises concerns regarding existing conditions. The noted conditions will not change as a result of the Proposed Action.</p>
6.5.21	PC	Erin O'Neill	230	<p>I already have had to change my habits because of the noise pollution from Frontier...closing windows on beautiful nights, halt conversation until planes pass, etc. More traffic will further destroy our lifestyle. Stop expanding!!</p>	<p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2 item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through-11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>
6.4.21	PC	Teresa Majewski	231	<p>STOP EXPANSION. HISTORIC Revolutionary site all around. Neighborhoods, many multimillion dollar properties. HISTORIC rich environment. Wildlife including forest animals &amp; fish will be KILLED from pollution, . STOP ALL EXPANSION.....YOU WILL KILL ANIMAL &amp; FISH &amp; WILDLIFE.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p>Historic Resources: See Section 5.3 of the EA for a discussion of Historic, Architectural, and Cultural Resources.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within and immediately adjacent to the footprint of the Project consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the Airport and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. As described in Chapter 5 of the EA, the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources. A USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. Furthermore, as discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is no work proposed in this area.</p>
6.4.21	PC	Heuring	232	I live near Trenton Airport. I've read the Environment Impact Statement. Any expansion will further disrupt the residents in the area. Traffic, noise and pollution are already bad. I hear planes taking off and landing, helicopter noise etc. all day and night. I was here before the airport and Frontier Airlines. Please do not expand.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 items 9 through 11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Vehicle Traffic:</b> See Section 5.10 and Appendix G for discussion of traffic conditions and impacts.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> As described in the EA, the environmental consequences of the Proposed Action were carefully considered. The environmental consequences are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p>
6.4.21	PC	Barbara	233	I, and my friends and neighbors hope you have addressed the lack of cover when we leave the airport from baggage. It needs to be at the very least, covered with an awning, etc. Thank you. (We live in Bucks Co. PA)	Comment noted. Baggage Claim area will be integral with the Terminal.
6.4.21	PC	Barbara Portnoff	234	no comment attached	No comment attached.
6.3.21	PC	Richard Westhouse	235-236	I am writing to express concern about the borrowing of \$142M for the expansion of the Brian M. Hughes Airport.....sorry, I mean Trenton/Mercer Airport. I am requesting the business proposal for the repayment of said funds. As I understand it, the repayment will be by fees collected by travelers. I assume that you are collecting these fees only from commercial airlines, so you are expecting commercial airlines (Frontier is the only commercial airline operating out of Brian M. Hughes Airport). I find this June 16, 2019 Brian M. Hughes reporting quite amusing: "Frontier Airlines' added service to Sarasota-Bradenton will help satisfy the Mercer County region's growing desire for warmer seasonal climates, along with increased frequency to other Southern cities," said Mercer County Executive Brian M. Hughes. "We also look forward to hosting travelers looking for convenient ways to discover the history-rich Trenton and Princeton region, centrally located between the New York City and Philadelphia metropolitan areas." Mr. Hughes is so visionary. I certainly do see people from Sarasota coming to Trenton to spend their money to go to Washington Crossing to appreciate that history! ...but if they want	<p>Commentor's opinions are noted.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County will be requesting use of PFC's in combination with other funding sources for the construction of the Proposed Action (see Chapter 2 for more details).</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>to go to NYC or Philadelphia, they certainly will not fly into Brian M. Hughes Airport! Oh, by the way, Frontier discontinued that market. Currently, Frontier flights in/out of “that” airport are as follows in the last 2 days 6/2 and 6/3: 5/6 from the south and 3/4 coming from the south. I would speculate that these are not travelers from the South coming to Trenton to explore the rich history here, but returning Jerseyans vacationing from the South. If anyone flies from the South to Brian M. Hughes Airport, they are more than likely going to spend their money in NYC or Philadelphia. Mr. Hughes, there is no one to host here. You should spend millions of dollars advertising in Sarasota demonstrating the benefits and reasons to explore Mercer County. What would it take to repay \$142M (not even including the interest)? Every passenger is charged a \$4.50 airport fee that would pay off the bond (but not all of it because you have maintenance and repair fees coming out of that). So, you would need 31, 555,555 passengers to travel to pay that principal (not including interest). Frontier flies A320 packed with 168 passengers; I mean packed! That would be 187,830 flights to pay off just the principal. Let’s just assume 10 flight/day. You could say that you expect Frontier to increase flights because of some new high tech terminal, but well, Frontier is still trying to figure out what markets will even work flying into Brian M. Hughes Airport. Based on 10 flights/day would be .....51 years! ...just to pay off the principal. Another great reason why government should NOT get involved in private commerce. This is NOT a “build it and they will come” scenario! I hate to put it this way, but it’s still just Trenton. People from the South do not come here to spend their money. This airport will be for local folks to leave and spend their money somewhere else. It won’t even be a transit point for non-locals to get to NYC/Philadelphia, ..... how do you get from TTN to NYC? Uber to Hamilton, NJT to Penn Station; wow that’s efficient and not even cheap. ....how do you get to Philadelphia? Uber to West Trenton, SEPTA to downtown, same conclusion as going to NYC. I are requesting a real business proposal on how and when this bond will be paid off. Mr. Hughes: build a school. It makes more sense and the math works out.</p>	
6.2.21	PC	Dee Long	237	<p>What are the plans for noise abatement? Right now, the quality of life in the flight path has been dramatically reduced due to the volume, noise and the timing of the planes. Frontier has several flights that take off before 7 am EVERY DAY – this is not why I moved to Bucks County. Trenton Airport is ruining the entire area by their mismanagement of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Flight Path:</b> See Section 6.2.2 items 9 through 11 for flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. : See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p>
6.3.21	LO	William Healey	238-241	<p>Support of EA, authored by the Alliance for Action President, Jerry Keenan</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.3.21	PC	Gareth Middleton	242-243	Will recording be posted to website for those unable to attend at the scheduled time?	Refer to project website <a href="http://www.tnterminal.com">www.tnterminal.com</a> to access a recording of the public hearing. (please open in google chrome).
6/2/21	PC	Linda Robbins	244	<p>I am writing to voice my serious concerns about the expansion of the Trenton/Mercer Airport. I want a finished study on the airport's impact on our environment in Ewing and surrounding towns. I am calling for an environmental Impact Statement and a Public Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>I want an accounting of actual costs to taxpayers and homeowners, including increased public health costs.</p> <p>I want construction to be delayed until toxic contaminants have been evaluated and cleaned from airport property.</p> <p>Please read my comments and add them to the record.</p>	See Comment Response #217.
6/2/21	PC	Pamela Ammidon	245	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be provided, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. We are told the flight path does not go over our house, yet the planes are flying right over us extremely low and LOUD ... rattling the widows etc.</li> </ol>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6/2/21	PC	Olga Troyanskaya	246	I am concerned about the major expansion proposed. Prior to construction, it is necessary to provide a full evaluation of the toxic contaminants and their clearing from airport property, to reduce the risk of downstream spread of these chemicals. Perhaps even more critically, we need a comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment and	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				public health, as this is a major expansion of operations for the airport. An accounting review of the cost of the expansion and its impact on taxes should also be provided.	<p><b>Environmental Consequences / EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments. See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Cost / Taxpayers:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 Describes Mercer County’s fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County’s investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.</p>
6.7.21	PC	Robert Barish	247	My wife and I have lived at 41 Buckingham Dr., Pennington New Jersey for the past 17 years. Most of the time it's an ideal place to live for a retired couple who have been lifelong residents of Mercer county. We have so much enjoyed living at this location because it's centrally located and yet is free from a lot of the congestion that takes place on the Rt.1corridor. The most disturbing events take place when commercial aircraft are landing at Mercer county airport. ENLARGING THE AIRPORT FACILITIES ANYMORE THAN THE PRESENT WILL RESULT IN MORE RESPIRATORY ENVIRONMENT/NOISE POLLUTION, LOWERED PROPERTY VALUES AND DETERIORATED LIVING CONDITIONS. PLEASE KEEP NEW JERSEY CLEAN!	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 12 for a discussion on Mercer County fiscal responsibility and item 12 for a discussion on Property Values. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County’s investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.</p> <p><b>Deteriorating Living Conditions:</b> The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Mary Ellen Rizzotti	248	I demand a mandated environmental impact statement be done on the potential expansion of the Trenton - Mercer Airport	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Steven Nash	249	Please do not expand the Trenton Mercer airport. The noise is too much. Please do an environmental impact study.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Bindukumar Kansupada	250	Trenton Airport Mercer County ,Yardley Bucks county are originally rural county Towns. Population density has grown multifold in past 4 decades. Growth of air traffic has adversely affected pollution level because of increased car traffic and air traffic over past 2 decades. Increased aircraft noise at night has affected senior citizens health leading to insomnia, Increase stress level and deterioration of personal physical and behavioral health. Peaceful community of lower bucks county and mercer county has been disturbed because of financial greed of mercer county leaders. FAA must respect and ask for opinion of Pennsylvania residents as this is interstate issue. Expansion of terminal building will worsen existing problems by multifold because of needed construction work related activities including increased pollution because of fuel, increased air traffic , increased fuel consumption, electricity need, water consumption Peaceful neighborhood will be disturbed forever. No flights should be allowed to be operated between 10.00 pm and 7.00 am as this is not urban neighborhood. This airport was built in rural area. Lets respect citizens health. Shift flights and development to less populated area in NJ . Dr Bindukumar Kansupada.MD, MBA, FACC, FCCP, FASNCA Long time resident of Bucks county - 37+ years.	<p><b>Air Traffic and Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport.</p> <p><b>Increase Car Traffic:</b> Section 5.10 and Appendix G describes the current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. A See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.8.21	PC	Timothy Stauffer	251	The planes flying over our house drive us crazy!! And now you want increase that threat. The noise is unbelievable. Please don't expand and if you do then route the planes differently. Why do we in Yardley have to suffer when get nothing in return.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. A See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity / Flyovers / Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Stephen Roman	252	Information detailing expansion of the Trenton-Mercer Airport should be divulged in total description for the public to respond to. As a Ewing Township resident, I am opposed to any expansion that will increase air traffic over our community. International airports in both Newark, NJ and Philadelphia, PA provide major air transportation to regional, national and international destinations. Additional expansion of the T-M Airport is not necessary as the public can access the other major, local airports for greater flight selection. Both airports are within 40 miles; less than an hour by car.	<p><b>Project Information / Public Information:</b> See Chapter 6 for Public Outreach.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9-11 for a discussion of airport operations.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Katherine Ritenband	253	The sound and the fumes from the planes and all the machines that it takes to keep the airport running are polluting the area. The more growth means more noise and pollution which affects everyone in the area. This area holds so much wildlife and expanding is taking even more land that these animals who have minimal space as is. Please tell us how you are going to address these concerns?	<p><b>Noise:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, aircraft noise was evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the AEDT. The analysis found no change in noise levels outside of the airport property as a result of the Project. See Section 6.2.2, item #7, for information about noise complaint reporting (see Appendix E).</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Wildlife:</b> The areas within the Airport property consist of a variety of habitats that are common, of limited ecological function and value, and abundant in the vicinity of the project areas and within New Jersey. Substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species' habitats or their populations is not anticipated. Based on the above and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources nor does it have the potential to exceed the significant thresholds listed above for non-listed species. USFWS request for a project review was submitted on August 19, 2020. The project review for the Proposed Action was conducted to formalize the above guidance. As stated in the USFWS concurrence letter, dated November 12, 2020, a known occurrence or potential habitat for Indiana Bat and NLEB is located on or near the project's action area; however, the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect federally-listed or proposed-listed species. As discussed in Section 4.2.1, potential vernal pool habitat on Airport property is located north of the existing terminal building. The outer edge of the vernal pool habitat overlaps with employee parking lot, however, there is <u>no</u> work proposed in this area. Therefore, potential impacts to the vernal pool habitat are not anticipated.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Anna and Peter Merrett	254	Please don't increase the airport. Think of our environment, healthy air and hiking areas for the good of our residents.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>
6.8.21	PC	Henry Geller	255	I am opposed to the proposed expansion of Trenton-Mercer Airport. I live in Yardley and, if completed, the expansion would result in increased air traffic which would result in increased noise levels. This would decrease the value of homes in the area and also increase the stress levels of many residents. I strongly urge	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				that an environmental impact statement be developed and released to the public.	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of. Property Values.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>
6.9.21	PC	Kenneth and Amy Pepperman	256	After living in Queens, NY we know the sound of jets landing/taking off from LaGuardia and Kennedy Airports. A substantial increase in flights at the Trenton airport will cause noise and air pollution as well as an increased risk of accidents. As residents close to the airport we object to the increase in flights to and from the airport.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic and Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Accidents:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 65 for a discussion of Accidents. As described in Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 the Proposed Action would not affect flight paths, operations, or other factors that would increase the risk of aircraft accidents.</p>
6.9.21	PC	Donna VanBlunk	257	This expansion will lower my property value and dramatically increase noise in my neighborhood!	<p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of. Property Values.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.9.21	PC	John Radvany	258	My name is John Radvany I live across the river in Yardley, PA and Frontier currently flies over my house on a daily basis which is a constant disruption. Increasing these flights would have a significant negative impact on the quality of life my wife and I now enjoy. I am against an expansion of the existing terminal which very well may encourage an increase in the volume of flights at TTN. I request a formal impact study be executed to include neighboring homes in nearby Yardley. Our town is an affluent community and any increase in airport traffic will devalue our property values. It will also increase the noise and air pollution which will lead to a devalued quality of life. We have lived here for 35 years and hope to continue to reside here peacefully without an increase in the constant interruption of planes flying over our house.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic and Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for aircraft flight paths and operations at the airport. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercer-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of. Property Values.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p>
6.9.21	PC	Nancy Tustin	259	I'm concerned with the proposed 400% expansion of the airport. That large increase will adversely affect the local communities in the various flight paths. I have no problem with some expansion, maybe 50-100%, but opposed the 400% expansion.	<p><b>Airport Expansion (400% increase):</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 16 for discussion of terminal sizing.</p>
6.9.21	PC	Dennis Fretz	260	Property owner at 9 Houston Rd, Yardley, PA 19067 is opposed to the plan for an increase in TTN capacity	Section 6.2.2, Items 1 and 11 describe terminal and airfield capacity and aircraft operations.
6.9.21	PC	Gareth Middleton	261	To whom it may concern, The slides should be made available on the website as the engineers went through the details too quickly to comprehend. Please do so.	As part of the public involvement process, EA documents have been made available to the public on the Trenton Mercer Airport webpage as well as the project specific website ( <a href="http://www.ttnterminal.com">www.ttnterminal.com</a> ). The slides are embedded in the links on that page.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.9.21	PC	Charles Heise	262	If you are not certain that you are morally corrupt, let me disabuse you of that notion. It is apparent that if you are forgoing the environmental impact study that you care only about your own enrichment and that of your patrons. Be clear, your patrons are not those who voted you into office, they are those that are bribing you and providing kickbacks to your business contacts. Of this, the civil people of this country are aware! Shame on you.	<b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.
6.9.21	PC	Richard Lyons	263	We don't need nor want a larger airport in the Bucks Mercer county areas. We have 2 International airports within 45 minutes of both counties. Also construction MUST be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property – also we DEMAND a comprehensive study of the airport's impact on our community's environment (Johnsville's Warminster Air Base polluted local creeks and waters of the area - still causing cancer in area residents) We demand an Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.	<p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants: Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 15 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Funding / Taxpayer Dollars:</b> The cost of the Proposed Action is described in general terms in the Alternatives chapter, based on the preliminary design completed to date. Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Anthony LaGrutta	264	At present usage level each time a takeoff occurs houses in my neighborhood shake and the noise of the engines is deafening. I cannot imagine what life will be if this expansion is allowed. Please save us	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting. TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercercounty-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Steve Nayowith	265-267	<p>EIS and HIA is necessary- comprehensive and do not separate projects; Draft EA represents incomplete evaluation of impacts and does not include public comments, sites sections of the EA which disagree; must compile detailed and accurate data; Noise: PA side airport noise is a major issue; detailed noise analysis is requested; Sites U.S. Congress; Quality of Life: detrimental; negatively Property Values: negative effect; Human Health- negative effect;</p> <p>Incompleteness of the Draft EA is in the table of contents for Appendix I, Public Participation, Public &amp; Agency Comments, “Item 6. TTN Terminal EA Public Meeting Comments- 1/23/2019”: Numerous public comments were provided at or following that meeting; however, the Draft EA does not include any of those comments.</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to comment #157-159.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.10.21	PC	Joseph Sundeen	268	The current and future operations of the Trenton-Mercer airport needs to be in compliance with the results of a study on the environmental impact of the existing and projected future volume and nature of air traffic using the terminal and runways. This is a basic right of the people who are most affected by the airport traffic - both the current residents as well as any future residents. Home and business owners on both sides of the river have this right, which must not be ignored. Further resistance to obtaining this information reflects badly on the airlines pushing to expand, and on the Mercer County government officials who are supporting and pushing for this expansion. The time to assess the potential harm is now, before the County and the airlines make financial commitments which could be in jeopardy in the near and more distant future. Both entities must be responsible enough to look at the long term impact of this project, and not be satisfied with questionable short term gains. This is the basis for good government and for good business management. Ignoring this study indicates a practice of bad government and poor management.	<p>The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment, including risks to Children’s Health and Safety (Section 5.9.4) in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The analysis in the EA included traffic forecasts and utilized the current FAA approved aviation activity forecasts for TTN. The forecasts are based upon the best information available at the time they were prepared.</p> <p>Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. Based on this analysis, no significant impacts were identified from the Proposed Action. .</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9-11 for discussion of operations at the airport. See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Traffic (Vehicles):</b> Section 6.2.2 Item4, Section 5.10 and Appendix G describes the current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Ari Pinkus	269	I am a resident of Lower Bucks County and already hear more planes overhead today than ever before. We are concerned about the environmental impact to our community and the excessive noise with the increase in traffic. Thank you.	<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. Based on this analysis, no significant impacts were identified from the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 items 9 through 11 for flight paths and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Michele Cayemitte	270	I am extremely concerned about the Environmental impact of this expansion. Currently the flights that go and come from this airport fly right over my backyard. I am extremely concerned about health issues and the fact that due to the Airport trying to go "under the radar" in obtaining the proper Environmental protocols by disguising this expansion in the way of smaller projects, is a major liability. Legal action will take place if this is not stopped.	<p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Transparency:</b> See Section 6.2 for Public Involvement and summary of public participation.</p> <p>Refer to Section 5.13 for a discussion of cumulative impacts, where independent utility is discussed in Table 5.12</p>
6.10.21	PC	Werner Liebig	271	I am opposed to any capacity increase at TTN due to the impact that this will have to the people in the surrounding areas. There is plenty of capacity currently and no changes are needed. Use the other 4 major airports in the area designed for high volume.	<p><b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity and item 11 for airport operations.</p> <p><b>Other Airports:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Brigitte Bendriss	272	I demand that: 1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property 2. A comprehensive study of the finished,	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA) 3. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Funding / Taxpayer Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of Property Values.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Catherine Mahony	273	I am demanding a mandated environmental impact statement concerning the proposed expansion of the Trenton Mercer Airport. It is our duty and right to have this conducted to protect our area and the people who live here.	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p>
6.10.21	PC	Steve Krimstock	274	We do not need airport expansion. The air pollution would be excessive especially when the wind turns toward residential areas. Also the loud noise pollution would be unbearable. Environmental damage. I am strongly against it.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Erin O'Neill	275	<p>Living on the Delaware River is a privilege. The many parks, water activities, restaurants and festivities in Mercer and Bucks County are the reasons we chose to live here when we came east in 2005.</p> <p>After living in many states, I always check specific items before purchasing a home. For instance, I never live with 3 miles of a major highway. Nor do I live within 30 minutes of an International Airport. I knew the Mercer County airport existed when I purchased my home. I checked the flights and decided the small commuter airlines and private corporate jets would not adversely affect my family's quality of life.</p> <p>That changed as airplanes flew over our home early in the morning and after we went to bed - so no more breezes through open windows and we had to halt conversations when standing outside.</p> <p>Now we read that there are plans to expand the airport without regard to the families and businesses who will be directly impacted. The obvious complaint is the noise pollution that large airplanes create. But what about the environmental impact of the physical expansion? Has the FAA looked beyond the perimeter and studied the impact on the residents health, water and overall quality of life?</p> <p>When I fly into Newark and Philadelphia, the areas surrounding the airports are vacant of homes, green spaces, soccer fields and housing. Is this the shortsighted goal of Mercer County officials? Will the people be compensated for the future losses to their</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Environmental Evaluation:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of Property Values .</p> <p>The Proposed Action would create construction jobs and associated economic benefits. Additionally, all users of the terminal would benefit from the improved level of service that the proposed terminal would provide.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>home values? Does the expansion benefit locals or just people outside the immediate area?</p> <p>Please do not expand the airport. We have two sufficient airports in the area - three if you consider Atlantic City.</p> <p>I love this area and have planned to stay here after retirement, but those plans will be destroyed if I have to tolerate constant noise and elevated pollution from an unnecessary expansion.</p>	
6.11.21	PC	Deborah Sokol	276-277	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Toxic Contaminants/PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.11.21	PC	John	278	Don't make my neighborhood any more noiser than you have already with the present airplanes.	<b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.
6.11.21	PC	Steve Wentworth	279	No expansion needed or desired. Over the decades we have seen airline service expand and then decline, expand and then decline,... Continued expansion of this airport will result in a fabulous, unprofitable, physical facility and yet a boondoggle similar to the Pittsburgh International Airport. Stop the madness now.	See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.  As indicated in Chapter 2 of the EA, the terminal is designed to accommodate current as well as forecast levels of enplanements at an acceptable LOS.
6.11.21	PC	Anil Thomas	280	I am very concerned about the noise levels, traffic congestion and most of all the danger to our neighborhoods. I would strongly urge the responsible parties to stop any expansion!	<b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. <b>Traffic Congestion:</b> Section 5.10 and Appendix G describes the current and future roadway traffic conditions. <b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.
6.11.21	PC	Lauren Davis	281-283	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Toxic Contaminants/PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.	
6.11.21	PC	S. McGee	284-285	I am requesting: 1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property 2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA). 3. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues, and increased public health costs.	<b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. <b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment. <b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment. <b>Funding / taxpayer Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for a discussion of the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.
6.11.21	PC	Lynne Scymanski	286	Phila and Newark Airports are each less than 2 hours away. Why does this area need another larger airport? The money could be spent smarter in other ways. An airport with more capacity is not one of them. This region does not need a large airport. And what about the Environmental impacts??? An Environmental Impact Statement is a mandate - is this being done? This needs to be made public - EVERYONE should be informed of the negative environment impacts this will have to the area.	<b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action. <b>Project Needs:</b> Chapter 1, Introduction and Proposed Action, and Chapter 2, Purpose and Need describes the existing conditions and terminal planning for the Proposed Action. <b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity. <b>Environmental Impacts / EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.
6/11/21	PC	Suzanna McGee	287-288	I am requesting: 1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property 2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA). 3. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues, and increased public health costs.	<b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. <b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment <b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment . <b>Funding / taxpayer Dollars:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 2 for Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. Mercer County's investment in TTN is carefully considered based on the findings of the Master Plan Update and industry conditions. Questions and concerns regarding the financing of this project should be directed to Mercer County.
6.11.21	PC	Dolores Ramsey	289	I am concerned about the expansion of the airport and the impact it will have on the health of our citizens and the pollution that will result. I have yet to see any definitive report about the health of the citizens in the surrounding (10 mile) area.....especially our children. What are the long term effects? I am also concerned about the pollution that will result.....especially to the water which is essential to life. What are we getting ourselves into? The pollution and contaminants.....how far reaching will it be and for how long???? hundreds of	<b>Environmental Impacts:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. <b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established. <b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 165 for a discussion of Health Impact Assessments. <b>Water Pollution:</b> Water quality, water pollution, and water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. <b>Air Pollution:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				thousands of years? We are the custodians of this planet and need to protect our resources and citizens.	
6.11.21	PC	Drew Farrell	290	Dear Committee, As a Ewing resident I oppose the proposed airport expansion due a to quality of life concerns as relates to my home, my health, my happiness, my home value: the area already contends with multiple flights that constantly disturb and disrupt our lives. The adverse impact to our environment and climate MUST take precedent over the need for profit. Please allow this email as OPPOSED to increasing the airport.	<p>Opposition comment noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12 for a discussion of Property Values.</p>
6.11.21	PC	James Lear	291	No need for an airport expansion. The airport is enclosed and encircled by major roads, expansion is not required, with two major airports located north and south of mercer county, the additional noise, traffic and possible pollution does not warrant the risk	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> Section 5.10 and Appendix G describes the current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Gerald Arth	292	I demand that a full EIS be performed before increasing the capacity of Trenton-Mercer Airport. As a Lower Makefield Township resident already adversely affected by planes flying low over my property, I insist that the negative effects of further expansion be addressed by an EIS and that Mercer County officials not be allowed to ram through expansion without full consideration of the impacts.	<p><b>EIS:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Capacity:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity. Section 6.6.2 item19 describes the number of gates for the proposed terminal.</p> <p><b>Airplanes Flying Low:</b> Section 6.2.2, Items 9 through 11 discuss flight paths, aircraft operations, and low flying aircraft</p>
6.11.21	PC	Paul Pflaumer	293	Homes here will become difficult to sell I have lived here 54 years and was a pilot. Ttn is just right for the area as is. Don't mess up everything with massive expansion.	See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.
6.11.21	PC	Ian Chinnici	294	Experience has told me not to trust what we're being told regarding Trenton airport upgrades. We live in Yardley, right under the flight path from the Trenton Airport. After having moved into the area in 1981, a representative of the Trenton Airport Expansion came to talk to a neighborhood group about their subsequent plans to extend runways. We were told that flights into and out of the airport wouldn't change, that the runway expansion was only to accept larger planes. No additional noise, No additional flight traffic. What we were told was FALSE, a	<p><b>The airport project team cannot comment on the alleged prior conversation. The EA presents the facts related to the current Proposed Action. With regard to Frontier's actions, those decisions are made by the airlines and are beyond control of the airport.</b></p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Capacity / Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>misrepresented LIE. The airport representation was not actually able to guarantee that flights into and out of the airport wouldn't increase, but we were nevertheless told that so we wouldn't object to the increased noise attributable to increased frequency of much larger planes landing and taking off. Consequently, I feel that we've already been "snookered" once with LIES, and I therefore do not approve of further expansions at that airport. Further, I know people who have flown on Frontier into and out of that airport, with cancelled flights and no recourse for Frontier to get passengers to their ultimate destination. If rerouting passengers to Philadelphia instead of Trenton, and telling passengers that "that was the best they could do, and that it was the passenger's responsibility to find a way to get back to the Mercer airport where their car is parked" is deemed acceptable, then Frontier by its example is telling it's passengers that the Philadelphia Airport is directly comparable to Trenton. If that's the case, Frontier should abandon Trenton and move to Philadelphia, where ample facilities exist already. Yes, treating customers with little respect sets a negative tone. Don't lie to us about what is, or is not going to change. Your credibility is zero, based on the way you've previously handled this with me and my neighbors, and you diminish the value of my home by making our location less desirable than a comparable location without noise issues. How can I regain the diminished value of my home based on your actions? I've received no offer from the Airport or Frontier to offset the diminished value of my home. Finally, no human being, including the executives of Frontier or the Airport would want massively increased noise in their neighborhood, and that says it all.</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Elias Nyktas	295	<p>I am greatly concerned with the proposed expansions to the Trenton airport. Impacts to my property value, environmental ramifications as well as quality of life for myself and my two-year-old daughter. We live directly in the landing path Of the airport and I cannot imagine the noise and pollution that would come with an expansion, beyond what already exists. I am not in favor of this expansion and demand a mandated environmental impact statement be made available to the public.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impacts and Quality of Life:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments. Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Noise and Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Ravi	296	<p>Hi, Truly opposing plans to increase flight frequency over houses over lower makefiled / Yardley, PA area which already causing lots of issues of flights noise and noise pollution and health hazard. Please reduce flights and avoid any airport expansion plan.</p>	<p><b>Increase Flight Frequency:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Alan Chinnici	297	<p>After we moved into the area in 1981, The Mercer airport wanted to extend the runways. A representative of the expansion spoke to us in our neighborhood, right under the flight path in Yardley, and us that flights into and out of the airport wouldn't change -</p>	<p>See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for the definition of terminal and airfield capacity.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				we'd see no difference. We were told a LIE! I now don't trust the planners for the Mercer Airport and I object to being told a lie so we won't object to expansion plans.	
6.11.21	PC	Carl Ravitch	298-299	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA.</li> <li>2. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>3. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>4. 25+ projects intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts. The entire project is not looking at the whole IMPACT.</li> <li>5. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA.</li> </ol>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.:</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> See Section 5.12 and Table 5.13 for further discussion of cumulative impacts and independent utility.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Jeanne Moore	300	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the Trenton Mercer Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project. There are 25+ projects that have been intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts. The whole IMPACT of this enormous project is not being considered. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport. I live in Yardley and,</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Segmentation and Cumulative Impacts:</b> See Section 5.12 and Table 5.13 for further discussion of cumulative impacts and independent utility.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				prior to the slow-down caused by COVID-19, know how bad the air traffic over my house can be. The impact of an increase in air traffic, resulting from the Trenton Mercer Airport expansion, would be devastating to me, my neighbors and the Yardley/Lower Makefield/Mercer County communities as a whole. Our quality of life, health and happiness will be severely damaged by the increase in noise and pollution resulting from this expansion. To reveal the full impact properly, the ENTIRE project must be represented in the Environmental Assessment.	
6.11.21	PC	Barbara Bickel	301	I AM AGAINST THE EXPANSION! I live in Lower Makefield Township, PA (near Yardley). Already there are many low flying airplanes over my home every day. We don't want more. It's very scary with how loud and close to our houses they are. Bucks County is a nice area which is being destroyed by the airport. The expansion will also lower property values, increase traffic, and cause pollution.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercero-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p>
6.11.21	PC	Thomas Ziegler	302	I am against it because of the noise pollution and the fear of one of the planes crashing into homes.	<p><b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Accidents:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 65 for a discussion of Accidents. As described in Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 the Proposed Action would not affect flight paths, operations, or other factors that would increase the risk of aircraft accidents.</p>
6.12.21	PC	Emily Carmichael	303	Please delay airport expansion until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property. Please complete a comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA). Please share independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs. Thank you.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p> <p><b>Health Impacts Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Funding:</b> The cost of the Proposed Action is described in general terms in the Alternatives chapter, based on the preliminary design completed to date. The cost estimates will be updated after the NEPA process is concluded and design resumes. Funding mechanisms, impact on property taxes, etc. are Sponsor's decisions that are beyond the scope of the EA. Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.12.21	PC	Dorinda Reliford- Sutton	304	<p>The MC airport was expanded from its original size, without public approval. Runways were extended, Boing 737's were added (the noisiest aircraft in their class), and destinations were added. Noisy, droning, private aircraft increased, including Cessnas (which Robbinsville airport could accommodate), as well as military helicopters with deafening noise. As I speak, (my home is in the direct flight pattern), aircraft depart the airport from 5:30 am until at least 9:30 pm. Helicopters fly at all hours. My noise calibrator records the combined sounds of 1295 (my property also backs up to the sound wall, which is defunct after 30 years of neglect), and aircraft, at levels of 64, which is over the allowable noise limit permitted by the FAA. When I filed a noise complaint with the FAA, I received a "do not reply" email, stating that the FAA wasn't taking any noise complaints. After the reassessment of our property in 2020, our property value decreased, and our property taxes increased by \$900.00/yr. We attempted to file a lower tax rate, but we're told by the State that we would get a higher assessment, and higher taxes if we did so. We were told that PROPERTY ASSESSMENTS WERE NOT DEPENDENT UPON NOISE OR AIR POLLUTION FACTORS. In October, 2020, I spoke to Ewing Township officials in person and by text messaging. I was told that the airport COULD NOT expand due to lack of runway space. Currently, I have spoken to a local proponent of the airport expansion, who told me the following in a telephone conversation: The parking lot recently built on Scotch Road will expand to four levels. The tower will be made higher. There will be a service road, for the purpose of trekking heavy equipment, raw building materials, heavy supplies and other construction materials that are not road-worthy. In order to create this service road, a new, macadam (impervious service) road is to be constructed through virgin woods, felling old-growth trees. The source denies that the airport will add any discernible impervious service to the environment. This comment flies in the face of the governor's new law, which imposes a tax on all NJ residents who have roofs and driveways that don't shed water. He states that this impervious service is not environmentally acceptable. Also, Ewing mayor has created an ordinance where residents have to bag their leaves and bundle their sticks for pick up on the curb, not the street. The chaff from loose leaves and sticks is bad for the environment. And as the airport expands, and as Ewing has experienced build-out, clear-cutting every old-growth tree, putting down tarmac and macadam on every inch of available land, causing air pollution on a whole lot of levels, cramming as many apartments as are possible on a plot of land (look at the old GM site), ignoring noise levels beyond the legal limits for over 600,000 residents in Mercer and Bucks counties-and-still-the politicians, the developers, the attorneys, the stockholders, the contractors, the tax shelters, the manufacturers, the aircraft industries, the private airlines, the private aircraft owners, the sellers and buyers, the underbelly-all are colluding to make the expansion happen. They're in it for the money, not for the</p>	<p>Commenter provides a description of the noise environment from their perspective. For clarification, currently there are no air carriers operating Boeing 737's at TTN. Frontier Airlines operates Airbus A319 and A320 aircraft at TTN which are similar in size to 737 aircraft. Commentary provided on several regional topics that are beyond the scope of the EA or this project (condition of sound wall, taxes, local politics, etc.)</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Runway Extension:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. As this is not an airfield capacity enhancement project, the only effect on aircraft movements related to this project is a change in location of parking positions at the terminal.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting. TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a></p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p> <p><b>Stormwater/Water Quality:</b> Water quality, water pollution, and water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Tree clearing:</b> Section 5.2 Biological Resources identifies approximately 3.5 acres of tree clearing are proposed. The tree clearing would occur in habitats that are common in the vicinity. The EA concluded that the Proposed Action is not likely to adversely affect biological resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				purpose. And, ultimately, we taxpayers are going to pay the price for the exponential increase in apartment population(new schools), the new passengers coming from near and far (no adequate lodging, opening up the area to strangers while COVID is still infecting Americans, not enough eateries, no rest areas, the route to the proposed four-level parking lot a two-lane road. Planners have only planned for profit. The outcome will be an ecological and demographic disaster. But who cares, when you're the governor, and you live in tony, quaint, Red Bank, with neighbor Bruce Springsteen? And you don't know what a plane in flight sounds like, unless you are on it? History is just a matter of crimes and misfortunes. Elections are now. You can't vote on the airport. Your comments are meaningless. They carry no weight. Vote out the white collar criminals.	
6.12.21	PC	Eleanor Emhof	306	1. Why isn't there in-person meeting where people can voice their comments! 2. People have many complaints such as noise, fuel residue, and effects on home values and many more! 3. Also we all know this is a joke since we all know this is a done deal and the FAA doesn't really give a damn about the people in the communities of Trenton-Mercer and Lower Makefield counties. So, who are you kidding with asking for our input! All they care about is making money. These people don't have to live here and put up with the horrible noise this will create since none of them live here! This is a beautiful place to live and now will be ruined because of greed . Totally outrageous and disgusting!! 4. What are you afraid of by meeting us in person?	<p><b>Virtual Public Hearing and Public Involvement:</b> See Section 6.2.1 for Summary of Public participation. The meeting was held virtually due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p><b>Complaints:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p>
6.12.21	PC	Ahmed Soliman	307	I am writing to express my concern for the consequences of the Trenton-Mercer Airport. As a long-term resident of Lower Makefield township, the increased air traffic, vehicular traffic, and associated noise, pollution, vibration will significantly worsen our quality of life as well as property values, and overall happiness as a community. I firmly stand against the expansion.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Vehicular Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 4 for Roadway Traffic Congestion and Section 5.10 and Appendix G for discussion of current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise Pollution and Vibration:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p>
6.12.21	PC	Joseph Gordon	308	It's already beginning to sound like I'm living in the traffic pattern of Newark Airport around here. The last time I saw the underside of a jet aircraft flying so low above my head was in a combat zone. Knock it off with this bullshit plan to expand this perpetually low rent airport.	<p>Commenter describes observations of air traffic in Pennington NJ.</p> <p>See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-merc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.12.21	PC	Grace & Frank Sinden	309-310	<p>Following are our comments and recommendations for the Draft Environmental Assessment and the TTN Airport plan that it represents. The plan should be rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other piecemeal segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.12.21	PC	Molly Petrilla	311-313	<p>Following are our comments and recommendations for the Draft Environmental Assessment and the TTN Airport plan that it represents. The plan should be rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other piecemeal segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources</p>
6.12.21	PC	Hillary Armitage	314	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <p>Objections:</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>1. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p> <p>2. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA.</p>	
6.12.21	PC	Jim Carty	315	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of the public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners AND the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project. 25+ projects have been intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts. The entire project is not looking at the whole IMPACT. This tactic is deceptive and misleading as it is not being honest and transparent about the primary end objective of expanding the Trenton Airport.</p> <p>I cannot sit in my backyard in Yardley PA, and speak on the phone, listen to music or take a meeting without being drowned out by the deafening noise of airplanes that come in so low I can read the lettering on the airplanes. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p> <p>I ask you to seriously consider this request. Thank you for your time,</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> See Section 5.12 and Table 5.13 for further discussion of cumulative impacts and independent utility.</p> <p><b>Study Area: Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established. See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definitions and discussion of Terminal and Airfield Capacity. The Proposed Action will not affect airfield capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting. See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.12.21	PC	Dennis Hovanec	316	<p>As a Lower Makefield resident, I object to the expansion of flights from TTN airport. They are not responsible partners. I reported and was advised about a violations of self-imposed flight times limitations. Planes flew in at 3:30am waking everyone in the neighborhood. This proves the airport and airlines are not responsible parties and do not care about those living in the surrounding area.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 7, for information about noise complaint reporting. TTN has a Voluntary Nighttime Flight Curfew from 12AM to 6AM.</p>
6.12.21	PC	John Silver	317-318	<p>Following are our comments and recommendations for the Draft Environmental Assessment and the TTN Airport plan that it represents. The plan should be rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other piecemeal segments of this project.</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.</li> <li>9. Please provide me with a receipt once you have received and documented my objection notification.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 21 describes Alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources</p> <p>Comments received during the public comment period are address in the Final EA, which will be made available to the public. A Notice of Availability (NOA) will be issued when the Final EA became available.</p>
6.12.21	PC	John Dempsey	319	I do not want the expansion to happen, it's enough noise now.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation of Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>
6.12.21	PC	CJ Baldoni	320	i am concerned about the proposed expansion, and live within the flight path. an increase in air traffic will likely adversely impact the quality of life here, increasing noise and disrupting the tranquility of the area. an environmental study needs to be done to assess the cost/benefit of any expansion, encompassing all aspect of the proposal including the terminal expansion. as a taxpayer and resident, i hope officials fulfill their responsibility to folk like me and complete an environmental assessment prior to spending additional funds on what is	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Flight path / Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				likely unneeded and unwanted project. thanks.	<p><b>Environmental Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of requirements for applicable environmental studies. Commentor has provided comment on the Environmental Study/Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost Benefit:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Thomas Albetta	321	If air traffic, noise and pollution will increase dramatically, when the project is complete then I want no part of it because I live in a condominium complex that is literally right next to the airfield.	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9 through 11 for a discussion of flight paths and aircraft operations. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions. Operational emissions associated with aircraft, traffic, and parking emissions are not expected to exceed National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), with the implementation of the Proposed Action. Regarding water quality, water pollution, water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA. The Proposed Action does not result in significant impacts and will comply with regulations and standards governing water quality. The EA found that implementation of Best Management Practices, in accordance with NJ DEP regulations would address any concerns regarding water quality. A SWPPP will be prepared in accordance with NJDEP requirements, and all necessary federal, state, and local permits will be obtained prior to construction.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Scott Becker	322	As a Pennington resident who lives under Trenton Airport flight paths, I'm extremely concerned about the impact that an airport expansion will have on property values and quality of life due to noise, traffic, and pollution. The reason I moved to Pennington in the first place is to avoid those things. I demand: a comprehensive study of the expansion's impact on my community's environment (EIS) and public health (HIA); an independent review and full disclosure of real costs to taxpayers (e.g., the cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues, and increased public health costs); and that construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property. Sincerely, Scott Becker	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life and EIS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 4 for Roadway Traffic Congestion and Section 5.10, and Appendix G for discussion of current and future roadway traffic conditions.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> . Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost to taxpayers:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 12 for discussion on Property Values.</p> <p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Kim Fuller	323	have lived in Yardley for 21 years. The planes fly over my house and are loud and fly low. If more traffic comes from the airport, the quality of our neighborhood will go down tremendously. Thank you for your consideration	<p><b>Increase Air Traffic and Airplanes Flying Low::</b> Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-faqs</a>.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.13.21	PC	April Bennett	324	Stop the expansion	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Dominique Mitchell	325-326	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <p>I am concerned with the fact that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination.</li> <li>2. The examination of area schools, impact on learning, health, and noise, water(the Delaware is a major water source for the area) have not sufficiently been studied and there is a lack of consistency in the definitions which have been applied.</li> <li>3. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10- mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 18. Contamination is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of ground pollution or contamination is governed by an established NJDEP procedure. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Water quality, water pollution, and water resources are addressed in Section 5.12 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p>
6.13.21	PC	John	327	Keep My Neighborhood Quiet And Pollution Free	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA. Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Ray Rettino	328	<p>I would like to encourage more prudent management of the airport that takes into account all relevant impacts on residents, especially west of the airport.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA)</li> <li>3. Independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 18. Contamination is addressed in Chapter 5 of the EA and Appendix F. Mitigation of ground pollution or contamination is governed by an established NJDEP procedure. The NJDEP procedure is being implemented and carefully followed by TTN. However, soil or groundwater remediation is managed as an independent action and separated from the Terminal Area Improvements Project.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for a discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Deborah Caldwell	329	We live in Lower Makefield, PA and are seeing lumbering prop planes skimming over the tree lines and Frontier flights so low I can clearly read the logo. I've lived near Newark Airport in the	See Section 6.2.2 items 9, 10 and 11 which discuss airplane flight paths and operational elements at TTN related to this.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				past, and while I disliked the airplane noise, I was OK with it. It's a huge necessary airport. I understand the desire for more flights and convenience at Mercer -- but with climate change happening so clearly now the world has changed. I don't see how more airplanes is good for anyone, let alone our little neck of the woods. Please can we preserve just a little quiet and non-degradation of the environment?	
6.13.21	PC	Jeremy Jeffries	330	On behalf of another Yardley neighborhood, we object to the noise pollution and already significantly increased plane traffic, beginning at 6am in the morning from Frontier airlines, and the drone, throb and vibration from helicopters and the numerous corporate jets asting over our homes at low altitude until late at night. We object to any increase in air traffic and we object to the increase and larger building project proposed for your terminal. Please stop and make the current aircraft traffic quieter now or divert away from Yardley PA.	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6  <b>Increase Air Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9-11. Further discussion of aircraft flight paths are discussed within the Airport Noise Frequently Asked Questions that can be found at <a href="https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-fags">https://www.mercercounty.org/departments/transportation-and-infrastructure/trenton-mercerc-airport/airport-noise-fags</a>.</p> <p><b>Terminal Building:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 16.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Michael Drobac	331-333	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study should be done of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers should be performed, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. The FAA should be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. The airport should be forced to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. There have been specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures made by the citizen group, Trenton Threatened Skies.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 should be factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>7. The broader impact related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination have not been fully factored in for our area schools, learning, health, and water, e.g.: the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. The true REGIONAL impact of the airport proposed expansion must be studied. Airplanes impact more than just the land use of the airport.</p>	
6.13.21	PC	Michelle MocarSKI	334	<p>As a homeowner in Lower Makefield Township, my family and I selected this area to live in because of the numerous benefits on health and outdoor activity. We were surprised to learn though that our house appears to be in the direct flight path of TTN causing constant disruptions as it is to our enjoyment of our backyard and no doubt polluting the air that we breathe when we are outdoors. It is unfathomable to me that the TTN Airport would expand and bring more noise, pollution, and disruption to communities that are prioritized for their peace and tranquility. Such an expansion threatens what makes LMT and surrounding communities a draw to individuals seeking to escape the busy city life and replaces it with many more negatives than positives.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F.</p>
6.13.21	PC	Suzann Blundi	335	<p>The airports currently has multiple projects pending which have been broken down into smaller projects, resulting in less regulatory review. They should be evaluated for their cumulative impact.</p>	<p>As described in Section 5.13 of the EA, no notable cumulative impacts were identified. See Table 5.12 for discussion of independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects</p>
6.14.21	PC	Joanne Kakoyiannis	355-356	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. We must hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. Additionally, the Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	John Amendolari	357	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	
6.14.21	PC	Carolyn Peucker	358	Please stop the expansion of Trenton airport. Dense housing and natural resources will be effected. Two international airports are within an hour drive. This is unnecessary	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Michael Meehan	359	We are firmly against expansion of the terminal. Between Newark and Philadelphia, the community's needs for major airports are met. It should be noted that those airports are located in industrial areas where planes are not landing directly over residential areas. It is not only the commercial flights but the private jets that are already an issue. I will be outside in my yard or on my patio and have to pause a podcast or stop a conversation with someone, allow the plane to pass and then restart. Some noise is of course reasonable; however, the flight path seems to have changed over the last year or so, such that the planes are coming in directly over our neighborhood and coming in low. I shouldn't be able to read text on the airplane. All this - and they want to make it worse. In addition, what I have read about reclassifying the expansion as repairs and the lack of process around the development project indicate this is not being handled properly.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Frank & Marilyn Mongiello	360-361	The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> <li>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Kevin & Daria Long	362-363	We speak out to demand:	<b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>A. Until the federal EPA conducts and assessment that the construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA.</p> <p>B. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA). An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA. More than 35 projects have been intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts.</p> <p>C. All parties to abide by the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels. D. Complete CFRR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents.</p> <p>E. Expand the impact scope to 10 mile radius and involve PA state, county and local authorities in the process and give equal voice and weight as you would do for any good neighbor.</p> <p>F. Present all quantitative data</p> <p>G. Set up an environmental impact fund to protect anyone who may be negatively impacted should any further airport improvement proceed.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. Based on the findings of the EA, a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA. The EA found that cumulative impacts are not a concern due to the lack of environmental resources in the project area and impacts associated with Proposed Action are expected to be less than significant. The analysis was conducted in accordance with CFR Title 40, CFR, parts 1500-1508, Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA and FAA Order 1050.1F.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> The Project is a single and complete action with independent utility and not dependable of other actions or projects. All elements of the Proposed Action were considered in the EA without broken them down into small projects. The Proposed Action was evaluated in accordance and consistent with CEQ guidelines and the process of determining overall environmental consequences, direct and cumulative impacts. Past projects under FAA jurisdictions were subject to NEPA review as applicable.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Present All Quantitative Data:</b> Quantitative data relevant to the impact analyses for the Proposed Action are provided in Chapter 5 of the EA and in the referenced Technical Appendices.</p> <p><b>Environmental impact fund: Environmental Consequences:</b> Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences of the EA describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds and factors to consider. Based on this analysis, no significant impacts were identified from the Proposed Action. The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA. No significant environmental impacts are anticipated; therefore an “Environmental Impact Fund” is not warranted.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Victoria Lowe	364	As someone whose young family lives 5 mins away from the airport, we need clear and in-depth reporting of the environmental impact and property value impact of the expansion.	<p><b>Environmental Impact:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Peter Kakoyiannis	365-366	<p>We need:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</li> </ol>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Richard Kurisko	367-371	<p>I demand that::</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual</p>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>5. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>6. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>7. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>8. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>9. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	David Sokol	372-373	<p>For the health and safety of my family and community, I request that :</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. The FAA be held accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise</p>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Melanie Henry	374-375	<p>Demand:</p> <p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>7. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs</p>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>of the airport.</p> <p>8. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>9. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	
6.14.21	PC	Wendy Varney	376	I We live in Yardley Borough between the Delaware River and Canal. The increased noise from the planes surrounding the Trenton airport are especially excessive this spring season and disrupting our way of life on this side of the river in PA!	<b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.
6.14.21	PC	Kenneth Ward	377	We live right under the flight path. Please do not allow the Trenton-Mercer airport to expand. We do not need more noise more traffic and more pollution. We have two major airports to pick from already.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Gilbert Cheeseman	378-379	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <p>An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3. <b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6. <b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Section 5.12 of the EA describes Cumulative Impacts. Table 5.13 describes independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12. <b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>I am a licensed realtor in New Jersey and Pennsylvania and have seen the drop in property values caused by air traffic. The plains traveling over my home in Lower Makefield are so low that I can see the writing on the side of the plane. It is so loud that you cannot carry on a conversation until the plain passes.</p> <p>I have personally witnessed sales in my sub-division falter if a plain passes over while a potential buyer is at the property.</p> <p>Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>Please don't let the residents get bullied into unhealthy living conditions. There are things in life more important than money.</p>	
6.14.21	PC	Ruthanne Boylan	380-381	<p>I am extremely concerned about the Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of a recent public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents. It should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners &amp; the FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment on the ENTIRE PROJECT, not just the terminal and other individual pieces of this project. Please please please do the right &amp; legal next steps. Be transparent and have TTN/ Mercer expansion delayed until the impact on the environment and the surrounding areas is determined. Make them do an Environmental Impact Study.</p> <p>Objections:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA.</li> <li>2. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>3. Sign on as co-sponsor of US Senate Bill 2506: Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act of 2019-2020 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution.</li> <li>4. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 19.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3..</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts/Segmentation:</b> The cumulative analysis took into consideration past three (3) years and projects within the next five years, as presented in Draft EA, Section 5.13. , Table 5-12 discusses independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Co-Sponsor U.S. Senate Bill 2506:</b> Mercer County is not a member of the U.S. Senate, therefore cannot co-sponsor of the referenced bill.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Costs:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2</p> <p><b>Transparency regarding Process, and Timing:</b> Section 6 and Appendix I includes public presentation materials. These materials discuss process and timing. Additionally, updates were provided on the project website www.ttnterminal.com.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> Chapter 1 of the EA describes enplanements in 2019, 2020, and 2021..</p> <p><b>Contamination / PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p> <p><b>Water:</b> Section 5.12 describes the project effects on Water Resources, including the Delaware River.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>5. 25+ projects intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts. The entire project is not looking at the whole IMPACT.</p> <p>6. There has been a complete lack of transparency around process, costs, RECOOPING costs and timing.</p> <p>7. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>8. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination.</p> <p>9. Examination of area schools, impact on learning, health, and noise, water(the Delaware is a major water source for the area) have not sufficiently been studied and lack of consistency of definitions have been applied.</p> <p>10. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p> <p>11. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA.</p>	
6.14.21	PC	Elizabeth Eshleman	382	<p>We have heard that there is increased air traffic planned to the Trenton airport. Planes fly directly over our house approximately every 2-3 minutes, and the traffic has been getting louder, and the planes lower as they come and go from the airport. A plane came through last week and over this weekend, and each shook our house. We are located in Yardley, PA. We respectfully ask that you NOT increase the air traffic or find a different flight path, as the volume of air traffic overhead is already crazy. We are located in what seems to be a direct flight path for every plane.</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Jean and John Brennan	383-384	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document which was the subject of a June 3, 2021 Public Hearing and the TTN Airport Plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion</p>	<p><b>Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 19.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 16.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project. We have lived at this address for 37 years and for most of that period of time have enjoyed a quiet and largely pollution free life for ourselves and our children. However, in recent years the expanded use of TTN has created unwarranted and unhealthy noise and environmental pollution from the growing number of take offs and landings that take place directly over our house. Yesterday morning which was a Sunday we were taking our three year old granddaughters for a walk around our block. During a 30 minute period we counted 18 very loud planes taking off over our heads. During that same time period only TWO cars drove through our neighborhood. It is inconceivable that at a time when carbon and noise pollution is being reduced by government initiatives in the US and around the world that the FAA and local government agencies are considering the support of such egregious noise and carbon pollution directly over residential neighborhoods in Mercer and Bucks County. While the government is beginning to outlaw noisy and carbon polluting leaf blowers and subsidizing electric cars and solar panels( which we have installed on the roof of our home) you are considering the approval of an airport expansion which has the exact opposite impact on the environment. You should force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and the wellbeing of area residents. It would certainly help if takeoff and landing patterns followed the nearby Delaware River rather than the residential neighborhoods on each side of the River. We request that you give serious consideration to our requests and those of our neighbors in PA and NJ. Please confirm receipt of our comments.</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Air Emissions:</b> See Section 5.1 for a discussion of air emissions.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Brendan Monaghan	385-386	<p>FAA should require a full Environmental Assessment Statement be performed on the ENTIRE project, not just the terminal and other pieces of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since their last environmental analysis in 2006 by the FAA.</li> <li>2. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>3. Sign on as co-sponsor of US Senate Bill 2506: Air Traffic Noise and Pollution Expert Consensus Act of 2019-2020 to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution.</li> </ol>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> The cumulative analysis took into consideration past three (3) years and projects within the next five years, as presented in Draft EA, Section 5.13, Table 5-12).</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Co-Sponsor U.S. Senate Bill 2506:</b> Mercer County is not a member of the U.S. Senate, therefore cannot co-sponsor of the referenced bill.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Segmentation:</b> The Project is a single and complete action with independent utility and not dependable of other actions or projects. See Table 5.13.</p> <p><b>Costs:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2</p> <p><b>Transparency regarding Process, and Timing:</b> Appendix I includes public presentation materials. These materials discuss process and timing. Additionally, updates were provided on the project website www.tnterminal.com.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>4. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>5. 25+ projects intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts. The entire project is not looking at the whole IMPACT.</p> <p>6. There has been a complete lack of transparency around process, costs, RECOOPING costs and timing.</p> <p>7. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>8. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination</p> <p>9. Examination of area schools, impact on learning, health, and noise, water(the Delaware is a major water source for the area) have not sufficiently been studied and lack of consistency of definitions have been applied.</p> <p>10. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p> <p>11. The airport has failed to identify a plan for remediation of the cancer-causing chemical, PFAS, found on several sites at and adjacent to the airport. Do not begin construction on the expanded Terminal, Parking Garage or ARFF building until a viable, near term plan with broad visibility and accountability to the public in PA and NJ has been developed and approved by the residents of NJ and PA.</p>	<p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools/Children's Health and Safety:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> 2019, 2020, and 2021 enplanements are discussed in Chapter 1 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Contamination / PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Rich Wayne	387-389	<p>EA should be rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full EIS be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p>Construction should be delayed until toxic contaminants have been evaluated, such as PFAS; Comprehensive EIS and HIA; independent accounting and full disclosure; shifts in travel patterns from Covid; Delaware River water quality; Elementary Schools due to flight noise; broader area to be studied.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA. The cumulative analysis took into consideration past three (3) years and projects within the next five years, as presented in Draft EA, Section 5.13, Table 5-12).</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs must be completed. There has been a complete lack of transparency around process, costs, ROI and timing.</p> <p>EIS and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA) must be performed in a comprehensive manner. An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since the last environmental analysis was done in 2006 by the FAA. More than 35 projects have been intentionally broken up to avoid a comprehensive environmental and community assessment to understand the cumulative and comprehensive health, economic and environmental impacts.</p> <p>The FAA must consider the Congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels. The airport should perform a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. Many residents have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport. The long term impact should be included.</p> <p>Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied. Quarry Hill Elementary and Afton Elementary Schools as well as the Orchard Hill neighborhood in Lower Makefield, PA have a terrible problem with flight noise. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Segmentation:</b> Table 5.12 describes the independent utility of recent and reasonably foreseeable projects. The Proposed Action is a single and complete action with independent utility and not dependent on other actions or projects.</p> <p><b>Costs :</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2.</p> <p><b>Transparency regarding Process, and Timing:</b> Section 6 and Appendix I described public outreach and include public presentation materials. Additionally, updates were provided on the project website www.tnterminal.com.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for a discussion of enplanements in 2019, 2020, and 2021.</p> <p><b>Contamination / PFAS: Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The Delaware River will not be directly affected by the project. As described in Section 5.12, implementation of Best Management Practices and full compliance with all water quality regulations minimizes the risk of water quality impacts.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Gary Fodor	390	<p>Increased Air Traffic over the Yardley/Lower Makefield area  Message: The current level of low flying, large aircraft over my house and neighborhood is already unacceptable. With things opening up we have already seen an increase. More? Really? How about if everyone who in favor of this has the air routes changed to fly low over their house? I suspect they would have a different outlook. Please Vote NO!</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Jim Fling	391	<p>Only with the more recent commercial flights by Frontier Airlines are there aircraft flying over my house. This is a new</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				phenomenon since 1988 when we bought our house in Mercerville. I've very concerned about more flights.	
6.14.21	PC	Elizabeth Thomas	392-393	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</li> </ol> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.	
6.14.21	PC	Marina Kudryashova	394-395	<p>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</p> <p>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</p> <p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Katherine Mittnacht	396	I am a longtime resident of Hopewell Township. I live just north of the Ewing border on Route 29. As a former member of Hopewell Township's Mayor's Task Force for Traffic and Trucking and the Head of The Coalition to Save Route 29 - a political action group that successfully worked with the State to stop the interstate long haul trucking traffic on Route	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. See also Section 6.2.2 Section 16 and 19 which address the proposed Terminal size and function.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> See Section 5.1 of the EA for a discussion of air quality.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>29, I am well aware of the importance of protecting this area from the threat of interstate transportation projects that are billed as “important for our economic future.” The noise and pollution that would come from a significant expansion of this airport would significantly affect the health, welfare and property values of the residents of this area. The airport is close to schools and hospitals, towns, a major city and residential neighborhoods. I am sure that the County is hailing the project as a great “jobs creator” - but at what cost? Jobs for whom? Would the project employ only local residents? Who is doing the construction? Why do we need a major airport when we live close to Philadelphia, Newark and Atlantic City? Why would you build a larger airport in an area that is so densely populated when just South of this area you have miles of open farmland? Who benefits from this expansion? Certainly not the residents who will undoubtedly pay for this project with our taxes. When New Jersey makes these decisions, they lose residents (who already shoulder some of the highest tax burdens in the country ) to Pennsylvania. This tax flight is particularly acute in this part of the state as the greener pastures of lower taxes are right across the river. Moreover, residents must be made aware of the dangers posed by an airport that would accommodate larger airplanes. If you notice, there are more and more residential housing units being built in Ewing, within 500 feet of this project. It IS IN OUR BEST INTEREST to have Ewing build these units as residential buildings and stores and community centers actually bring economic vitality to the community.</p> <p>The idea of expanding an airport in an area filled with people makes absolutely no sense to me. Sincerely, Katherine Mittnacht 1236 River Road Titusville, NJ 08560</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. Based on the findings of the EA, a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p> <p><b>Jobs Creator:</b> The Purpose and Need for this project is to improve the Level of Service for travelers using the TTN terminal.</p> <p><b>Nearby airports:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Green field Airport:</b> Construction of a new airport in a less densely populated area presents many environmental, social, and economic consequences. A new airport would likely entail significantly more environmental impacts compared to the Proposed Action, and is not considered a practicable alternative.</p> <p><b>Taxes/Finances:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item 2.</p> <p><b>Larger Airplanes:</b> The Proposed Action does not involve modifications to the runway system. The size of aircraft utilizing TTN is constrained by the runway configuration and length. Physical constraints at each Runway end make it impractical to extend the runways to accommodate larger aircraft.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Andrew Dellacorte	397	I Oppose airport increase	<p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11.</p>
6.14.21		Jean and John Brennan	398	<p><b>EIS:</b> The Draft Environment Assessment document which was the subject of a June 3, 2021 Public Hearing and the TTN Airport Plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> We have lived at this address for 37 years and for most of that period of time have enjoyed a quiet and largely pollution free life for ourselves and our children. However, in recent years the expanded use of TTN has created unwarranted and unhealthy noise and environmental pollution from the growing number of take offs and landings that take place directly over our house. Yesterday morning which was a Sunday we were taking our three</p>	<p><b>Expansion:</b> The Proposed Action consists of terminal improvements and not the expansion of the airport. See Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 19.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 9-11.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>year old granddaughters for a walk around our block. During a 30 minute period we counted EIGHT very loud planes taking off over our heads. During that same time period only TWO cars drove through our neighborhood.</p> <p>It is inconceivable that at a time when carbon and noise pollution is being reduced by government initiatives in the US and around the world that the FAA and local government agencies are considering the support of such egregious noise and carbon pollution directly over residential neighborhoods in Mercer and Bucks County. While the government is beginning to outlaw noisy and carbon polluting leaf blowers and subsidizing electric cars and solar panels( which we have installed on the roof of our home) you are considering the approval of an airport expansion which has the exact opposite impact on the environment. You should force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and the wellbeing of area residents. It would certainly help if takeoff and landing patterns followed the nearby Delaware River rather than the residential neighborhoods on each side of the River.</p>	
6.14.21	PC	David Scymanski	399	<p>I live in the Village on the Green Neighborhood near the airport. I have lived here off and on since I was 3 years old. The noise from the airport over the years had been an acceptable level. In all but the colder months of the year we would leave our windows open at night and listen to the sounds of nature. It was a soothing sound that allowed us to drift off to sleep, enjoy a restful night and awake gently to the sounds of nature again. A year or so after Frontier started flights things began to change. We can no longer keep my windows open because after we lay down for ed we are kept awake by jets taking off as late as midnight. In the morning we are jolted awake shortly before 6am by the sounds of jets taking off. Even when we close all of our windows we are still disturbed by this noise. Six hours of sleep is not enough! On various occasions over the years, I have come outside in the morning or evening and smelled the pungent odor of jet fuel. I called and reported this but was told there were no reports of planes dumping fuel. Our quality of life here has been severely affected. I am demanding the mandated environmental impact statement be completed as well as having my property and others tested for residue of jet fuel!</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Inge Wimmers	400	<p>To those working on the TTN Airport expansion plan and Mercer County Commissioners</p> <p>It seems unbelievable and unconscionable to me that you put forth an Environmental Assessment Plan of the planned expansion of the airport that is fully inappropriate and should be rejected by Mercer County Commissioners. The FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement of the airport and surrounding area before going any further.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. Based on the findings of the EA, a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Terminal Size:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Contamination / PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>To begin with, toxic contaminants at the airport and its surrounding property have not been properly evaluated or cleaned to avoid the risk of downstream spread. Even more concerning is the fact that there has not been carried out a comprehensive study of how our health and environment would be affected by such an expansion of the airport. The noise of the low-flying jets over our trees is deafening. Equally upsetting is how close they come to our tree tops on Tall Timbers Drive. We can even see the passengers in their window seats. It seems dangerous to fly so close to our property and I am sure this must be illegal! In addition to the noise, we have to contend with the toxic pollution the planes emit over our houses, backyards, parks, and schools. Not to mention the fact that increasing the number of planes will affect climate change, something we cannot afford to ignore. The increase in destructive weather patterns should be a warning! Finally, two well-established major airports (Philadelphia and Newark) are close by, easily within our reach. There is no need for another. I urge you to reconsider,</p>	<p><b>Flight Paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Air Quality and Climate:</b> An Air Emission Analysis to assess the potential for air quality and climate impacts associated with the Proposed Action. See Draft EA, Section 5.1 and Appendix E.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Lynda Meshkov	401-402	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Amy Wassum	403	<p>Flight traffic into/out of Mercer airport is a major issue for those of us living in Yardley, Bucks County. At present, we have flights all hours creating disturbing our once-quiet homes at all hours. Air traffic has waken us from sleep, and caused the windows to shake in our homes. Current levels of flights have most definitely our affected our quality of life and risks our health from increased levels of pollution, as well as risking our home values. Expansion of flights is unimaginable and will undoubtedly cause harm to my family and to my community. Most of my neighbors, like ourselves, have lived here for decades. We never would have built our lives here if there had been a high-traffic airport right next door. Recent expansion has already caused damage that needs to be addressed. Additional expansion is unacceptable. Mercer Airport is literally threatening our community.</p>	<p><b>Flights Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 1 for definitions of airfield and terminal capacity. See Section 6.2.2, item 10 – 12.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA's AEDT.</p> <p><b>Traffic (Vehicles):</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Property Values:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 12 for discussion of property values.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Sherry Ditko	404	<p>I live on Rockland road and the planes fly so low i feel like I can touch them. I am afraid of accidental crashes into houses soon. And the noise level is getting to be too much. More planes would only make it much worse.</p>	<p><b>Airplanes Flying Low:</b> See Section 6.2.1, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Accidents:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 65 for a discussion of Accidents. As described in Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 the Proposed Action would not affect flight paths, operations, or other factors that would increase the risk of aircraft accidents.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Increase Air Traffic (more planes):</b> See Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 19.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Kevin Hartman	405	<p>I demand that construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our community's environment (Environmental Impact statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA). And that independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs. A project like this benefits so few and hurts so many.</p>	<p><b>Toxic Contaminants:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15. Based on the findings of the EA, a Health Impact Assessment is not warranted.</p> <p><b>Costs / Taxpayers:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item 2.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Eric Wimmers	406	<p>For more than two years now our home has been under what seems like an attack from the skies as large jets roar over the treetops in our North Lawrence neighborhood, reminding us of what it must be like to live in a war zone. In addition to the noise,</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>these low-flying jets are spewing toxic pollutants over our houses and backyards, endangering the health of the community And now there is a proposal to vastly increase the numbers of flights through an expansion of the airport, without regard for the well-being, health, and quality of life of the citizens forced to endure the consequences.</p> <p>No environmental impact study on the region has been done and the true costs to the taxpayers, including effects on their health, have not been ascertained.</p> <p>I therefore ask you to:</p> <p>Delay any construction until its effects on the environment can be properly assessed. This includes the effects not just very close to the airport but those within a radius of at least 10 miles. THE EFFECT THESE POLLUTANTS ON OUR CHILDREN'S HEALTH IS PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT.</p> <p>Begin immediately a study of ways to curb the noise pollution caused by the low flying aircraft presently flying over us.</p> <p>Consider the effects of increasing air travel on the warming of the planet. For supposed convenience and short-term profits, you are sacrificing the future of your children if you approve the unnecessary destruction of the environment caused by this project.</p> <p>If this expansion and other such heedless projects go through with your approval, you will have to explain to your grandchildren why New Jersey and indeed the world are less livable for them and their children as they once were for you.</p>	<p><b>Low flying aircraft:</b> See Section 6.2.1, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Increase Number of Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impact Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3. The impacts to the environment are discussed in EA Chapter 5 - Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Costs / Taxpayers:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2.</p> <p><b>Health Effect:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 15.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Janice Fisher	407	Noise pollution : it's bad enough now what's gonna be like with more planes coming in and out of that airport we're having dinner in the backyard can hardly hear at times!	<b>Noise Pollution:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6. <b>Increase Number of Planes:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.
6.14.21	PC	Christina Canosa	408-409	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</p> <p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Marina	410	<p>Sure, those who lives miles away might not care, but it will effect many houses surrounding the airport area. It's too close to residential area to be expended without an impact to people and the environment where they spend most of their lives. Environmental impact is always bad around airports. How about possibly accidents? This is too much for this area and there are two big airports nearby already. Most people do not fly daily, so a bit of inconvenience to driving to Philadelphia or Newark should not be a problem unless you are ridiculously</p>	<p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> The EA evaluated the effects of the Proposed Action on the quality of the human and natural environment in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) and policies and procedures from the FAA such as Orders 5050.4B and 1050.1F. The EA concluded that the proposed Federal Action is consistent with existing national environmental policies and objectives as set forth in Section 101(a) of the NEPA, and environmental impacts will be less than significant and mitigable per current regulations. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences. No significant impacts were identified.</p> <p><b>Accidents:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 65 for a discussion of Accidents. As described in Section 6.2.2 Items 9-11 the Proposed Action would not affect flight paths, operations, or other factors that would increase the risk of aircraft accidents.</p> <p><b>"Big Airports Nearby":</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Both airports are subject to frequent congestion and delays on both the landside (roads) and airside (runways and taxiways). Both can be challenging to navigate, especially for infrequent leisure travelers that frequent TTN.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
6.14.21	PC	James Burd	411-412	<p>I am contacting you in regard to the enlargement of the Trenton-Mercer Airport. In 1957, my family moved to 181 Scotch Road Titusville, NJ 08560. Our house was XA mile from the airport and the Naval Jet Propulsion Center. Every time the new jet engines were tested; our farmhouse and barns would shake.</p> <p>Now Mercer County is trying to enlarge the Trenton-Mercer Airport . There are many problems that will occur. There will be major noise problems in Hopewell Township, on the northeast side of the airport where the main airstrip is located. On the southwest side of the airport there are developments just over the Delaware River. In both cases, a great number of jets will be taking off and landing on this airstrip. It will cause problems for the homeowners' lifestyle, but it will also cause significant problems with the automobile traffic flow in this entire area. There will also be environmental impact from the exhaust from these jets.</p> <p>A thorough evaluation of the impact on the airport's neighbors must be done. Allowing this expansion in such a densely populated area is a disservice to our community.</p>	<p><b>Enlargement of the Airport:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. Section 6.2.2 Items 16 and 19 discuss the rationale for the size of the proposed terminal.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 4 for discussion of traffic.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Air Quality is described in Section 5.1 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Airfield Capacity / Flight paths:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p>
6.14.21	PC	John Lo Bue	413	<p>Voicing my concerns regarding the expansion at the Trenton Mercer Airport. I am a resident of Ewing, NJ and the current noise level of the commercial flights coming in and out of the airport is a concern to me and ALL of my neighbors. Expanding the airport will only increase an already concern. I am against this expansion and would ask that this not move forward.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p>
6.14.21	PC	Theresa and John Foody	414-416	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> </ol>	<p><b>PFAS:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation are described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3 for discussion of Environmental Impact Statement vs Environmental Assessments.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 15 for discussion of Health.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 20 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 describes the evaluation of operational emissions.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</p> <p>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</p> <p>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</p> <p>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	<p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children's Health and Safety Risks.</p>
6.16.21	PC	Bob Lanning	417	<p>Delaware Raritan Canal Commission: The new 125,000 sq ft Terminal is designed to be built on land that is prohibited to build on. This prohibition was established when the Delaware Raritan Canal Commission was formed decades ago and for good reason. The tributaries (Zone B) of this sensitive ecosystem must be maintained and any waivers sought to disrupt this important resource need to be very well founded. It has come to my attention that in Appendix C there is documentation of a Aug, 19, 2021 meeting with Urban Engineer and the DRCC to find ways to be able to build the new terminal in this prohibited space. ( Page 137-8 of 142). It was suggested by the head of the DRCC that a public need waiver could be sought. ( section 5.d, page 137/142). He did note that there could be public resistance to this option. As someone who has used and enjoyed the Delaware Raritan Canal all my life, I strongly object to the DRCC providing a waiver based on "public need" to build this very large, new Terminal. There is no strong argument that this terminal, more than 4 times larger than the existing terminal, is necessary for public need. The public need is to maintain the Canal and its tributaries so it can be used and enjoyed for decades to come and to not issue unsubstantiated waivers to build on prohibited land. The FAA should withhold further review of this 125,000 sq ft, 4- gate draft Terminal EA until it is determined whether the airport can obtain</p>	<p>As noted in Section 5.12.3, Delaware &amp; Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC) and Mercer County have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement which permits activities in regulated areas to maintain a safe, secure, legally compliant airport. As further noted, a pre-application meeting was conducted with the DRCC on April 15, 2020. The Proposed Action was presented to DRCC to review the project's regulatory viability. The DRCC confirmed that there is precedent for issuance of a waiver for stream corridor impacts. All required permits will be obtained prior to construction of the project.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				a waiver to build on the prohibited land at the site of the new, proposed terminal.	
6.16.21	PC	Bruce Hoechner	418	<p>First, based on my more than 40 years as a Chemical Engineer and as a Chemical Industry executive, a contaminated site should first be remediated before the commencement of construction. The proposed terminal building is planned to be constructed on a contaminated site as the remediation is ongoing. I implore the FAA to halt any and all construction until the site has been fully remediated of hazardous materials. Therefore, the EA should not be approved until this site is remediated. In addition, contrary to the well-coached stories I've heard told by the project sponsors and some of our elected officials, the clear intention of this terminal project is to enable the significant expansion of commercial passenger air traffic at Trenton Mercer airport forever negatively impacting our health, homes and happiness. The carefully executed segmentation of multiple airport expansion projects such as the addition of parallel taxiways, the construction of hi speed exits and the expansion of the runway protection zone, are all focused enabling significant increases in commercial air traffic, but this is being done in such a way as to not require an EIS. This lack of honest transparency alone is a concerning situation but added to this alarming situation is the proximity of a super fund site and existing toxic materials on the airport grounds, including the site of the proposed terminal, that will be disturbed as part of the construction activities thus adding unassessed threats to our land and water. In addition, the cost to taxpayers, close to \$200Million will be a huge debt that has no way to be paid off except thru passenger use tax, so the airport must increase passenger flights to pay for this and this is not factored into the EA. This is why I am requesting the FAA not to proceed with this project until the environmental and health impacts of the toxic materials on and around the airport site have been fully and completely assessed and remediated and a full comprehensive EIS has been completed that is based upon honest commercial air traffic growth data.</p>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Air Traffic Growth:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Segmentation / EIS:</b> Refer to Section 5.12 for discussion of cumulative impacts and Table 5.13 which addresses Independent Utility.</p> <p><b>Cost / taxpayers:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item # 2.</p> <p><b>Transparency / Public Involvement:</b> Appendix I includes public presentation materials. These materials discuss process and timing. Additionally, updates were provided on the project website <a href="http://www.tnterminal.com">www.tnterminal.com</a>. See Section 6.2.1 for a detailed Summary of Public participation.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15.</p>
6.16.21	PC	Mary Kirsch	419	<p>I have sent a comment about serious and life altering concerns I have about the airport expansion This comment is about the last public meeting the commission held. I registered for it and then on the evening of the meeting I was denied admission to the meeting If a meeting is a "zoom" type platform I don't see why one must register beforehand. And if registration is required then the person registering should be sent the link. I was not.</p> <p>You need to make these meetings accessible to all concerned citizens - not just citizens you want to hear from</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Public Hearing:</b> The virtual public hearing was held on June 2, 2021 from 7pm to approximately 10:15 pm when no further comments were offered. The hearing was conducted virtually to ensure the health and safety of all participants due to the ongoing global pandemic. See Appendix I for details. Pre-registration was available but not required for the public to obtain login information in advance of the virtual meeting which was held via Zoom. Instructions were provided in the notice with several options for contacting the project team in case of technical difficulties. Also, a calling in phone number (Phone Call-in: 646-558-8656; Meeting ID: 829 6027 0513) was established for this Public Hearing making it accessible to all concern citizens and general public. Information was posted in project website (<a href="http://www.tnterminal.com">www.tnterminal.com</a>), access via google chrome.</p>
6.16.21	PC	Mary Kirsch	420	I would like to voice my disapproval of the proposed airport expansion.	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>First, I feel that an adequate environmental impact study has not been completed. An EIS must take into account the cumulative impact of past and present projects since the last analysis in 2006 by the FAA. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is short sighted. Planes impact much more than the area immediately around the airport. ( I belong to a csa in chesterfield and the planes are low and noisy that far away from the airport - affecting the pristine farmland of New Jersey, the Garden State)</p> <p>Second, the airport must show that it has examined the impact the planes (noise, air pollution) has on schools, learning and health - particularly what impact the added pollution has on the Delaware River.</p> <p>Expanding the airport is a short term gain and a long term problem for our area.</p>	<p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p>Chapter 5 – Environmental Consequences describes the potential effects for each of the required impact categories and compares those effects to the FAA established significance thresholds. For the applicable categories, (e.g., wetlands) mitigation measures are proposed reducing the action’s environmental impacts below significant impact thresholds. The proposed mitigation measures are described in Chapter 5.</p> <p><b>Cumulative Impacts:</b> Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis in Section 5.13 of the EA.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Aircraft Flying Low:</b> See Section 6.2.2, items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item # 7, for information about noise complaint reporting.</p> <p><b>Air Pollution:</b> As described in Section 5.1 of the EA, operational emissions were evaluated in accordance with FAA requirements, using the FAA’s AEDT. The analysis found that potential impacts to air quality from the Project would be less than significant when compared to the No Action or existing conditions.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The Delaware River will not be directly affected by the project. As described in Section 5.12, implementation of Best Management Practices and full compliance with all water quality regulations minimizes the risk of water quality impacts.</p>
6.16.21	PC	Laurie Lanning	421	<p>The new 125,000 sq ft Terminal is designed to be built on land that is prohibited to build on. This prohibition was established when the Delaware Raritan Canal Commission was formed decades ago and for good reason. The tributaries (Zone B) of this sensitive ecosystem must be maintained and any waivers sought to disrupt this important resource need to be very well founded. It has come to my attention that in Appendix C there is documentation of a Aug, 19, 2020 meeting with Urban Engineer and the DRCC to find ways to be able to build the new terminal in this prohibited space. (Page 137-8 of 142). It was suggested by the head of the DRCC that a public need waiver could be sought. ( section 5.d, page 137/142). He did note that there could be public resistance to this option. As someone who has used and enjoyed the Delaware Raritan Canal all my life, I strongly object to the DRCC providing a waiver based on “public need” to build this very large, new Terminal. There is no strong argument that this terminal, more than 4 times larger than the existing terminal, is necessary for public need. The public need is to maintain the Canal and its tributaries so it can be used and enjoyed for decades to come and to not issue unsubstantiated waivers to build on prohibited land. The FAA should withhold further review of this 125,000 sq ft, 4-gate draft Terminal EA until it is determined whether the airport can obtain a waiver to build on the prohibited land at the site of the new, proposed terminal.</p>	<p>As noted in Section 5.12.3, DRCC and Mercer County have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement which permits activities in regulated areas to maintain a safe, secure, legally compliant airport. As further noted, a pre-application meeting was conducted with the DRCC on April 15, 2020. The Proposed Action was presented to DRCC to review the project’s regulatory viability. The DRCC confirmed that there is precedent for issuance of a waiver for stream corridor impacts. All required permits will be obtained prior to construction of the project.</p>
6.16.21	LA	Megan Brunatti-NJDEP	422-427	<p>State of New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection details comments on regulatory requirements: Freshwater Wetlands (FWW) permit shall require permit authorization; Flood Hazard Area Rules-applicant shall apply for and obtain Flood</p>	<p>The statements in the comment are consistent with those presented in the Draft EA. All required permits will be obtained prior to construction. Comments have been noted and updates have been made to the permitting sections in response to the comment. A pre-application meeting would be scheduled with NJDEP to confirm permit requirements upon completion of the EA.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>Hazard Area Verification; If Preferred Alternative is selected than NJDFW agrees with USFWS timing restriction on tree clearing; no known historic properties around the terminal building; ensure that BMPs are implemented to minimize the impacts from air pollution from this project, such as the effects of off-site odors and/or particulate dust; diesel exhaust construction equipment must follow measures to minimize air toxics/impacts; if construction dewatering is necessary, those types of activities are regulated by the Bureau; Site Remediation-Preliminary Site Assessment and Site Investigation is required by the Technical Requirements for Site Remediation and all discharges must be evaluated by a Licensed State Remediation Professional ; The following sentence should be modified: "The required remedial planning will inform the terminal expansion design effort and mitigation measures will be coordinated through the LSRP and NJDEP." Please note that mitigation measures will not be coordinated by NJDEP, but rather will remain the responsibility of the LSRP and the person conducting the remediation. NJDEP's role is to review and inspect remediation documents.; NJPDES Discharge to Surface Water permit will be needed for any surface water discharge; Treatment Works Approval will be required for this project; Delaware &amp; Raritan Canal Commission: The project is considered a major project and subject to Commission regulation for stormwater runoff and water quality impacts; boundaries of the Commission regulated stream corridors on Airport property area subject of a 2011 Memorandum of Agreement between the Commission and Mercer County regarding the regulation of activities within the Commission's stream corridors; NJPDES Individual Permit Authorization (NJ0173096) must be amended to include additional areas of exposure, drainage control measures, updated Stormwater Prevention Pollution Plan (SPPP) and incorporate BMPs; Stormwater construction general permit will be required and the soil erosion and sediment control plan from the conservation district office must be obtained.</p>	
6.16.21	PC	Mary McHugh	428	<p>It is prohibited to build on the proposed site for the new 125,000 sq ft, 4-gate Terminal. A waiver will need to be obtained from the Delaware Raritan Canal Commission (DRCC) in order to build on this prohibited site. The FONSI/ROD decision should be postponed until it is determined if the airport will be able to obtain this waiver. In Appendix C, page 135/142 in a pre-application meeting with Urban Engineers on 8/19/2020, it was suggested by the Executive Director of the DRCC, John Hutchison, that one of the few waivers available to build on prohibited land is given for public need. He noted it might be a difficult sell to outside stakeholders and the general public. As a local resident who highly values the integrity of the Delaware Raritan Canal, I strongly object to approving a waiver to build on prohibited land based on public need. There is no public need to build an oversized, 125,000 sq ft, 4 gate terminal that will be built on wetlands and in a tributary in Zone B of the DRCC.</p>	<p>As noted in Section 5.12.3, DRCC and Mercer County have entered into a Memorandum of Agreement which permits activities in regulated areas to maintain a safe, secure, legally compliant airport. As further noted, a pre-application meeting was conducted with the DRCC on April 15, 2020. The Proposed Action was presented to DRCC to review the project's regulatory viability. The DRCC confirmed that there is precedent for issuance of a waiver for stream corridor impacts. All required permits will be obtained prior to construction of the project.</p> <p>The Delaware River will not be directly affected by the project. As described in Section 5.12, implementation of Best Management Practices and full compliance with all water quality regulations minimizes the risk of water quality impacts.</p> <p>Oversize termina:: The existing terminal was built in 1975 and is undersized for current demand (enplanements) during peak times and operates at a very poor level of service. As described in the EA, Chapter 1 (Introduction and Proposed Action), the Project consists in the replacement of the existing terminal building with a proposed new terminal building at the Trenton-Mercer Airport (TTN or the Airport). The Proposed Action does not include any modifications to the runways or configuration of the airfield; thus, it will have no effect on airfield capacity. Additionally, the size of aircraft serving TTN is not expected to substantively change due to the physical limitations of the runways. The Proposed Action will improve the terminal's ability to accommodate existing and forecast enplanements however no additional parking positions for boarding/de-boarding of aircraft are planned. The design of the new terminal building is defined by careful planning and the minimum LOS, needed for a useful framework to support the current airport needs and forecast, providing comfort factors to passengers and airlines such as space, maximum waiting time, seating, occupancy, social distancing and security. LOS standards described in ACRP Report 55</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
					<p>“Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals” were utilized as a starting point for the design. The new terminal will accommodate the expected passenger volumes in a far more comfortable, safe, and efficient manner compared to existing conditions, and will provide the amenities desired by modern travelers, including enhanced concessions, and charging stations, among others.</p> <p>The planning for the TTN Terminal was based on sizing and space planning guides and guidelines set forth by the FAA, TSA, and ACRP that include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAA Advisory Curricular (AC) 150/5360-13, Planning and Design Guidelines for Airport Terminal Facilities</li> <li>• FAA AC 150/5360-9, Planning and Design of Airport Terminal Facilities at Non-Hub Locations</li> <li>• TSA Checkpoint Design Guide (CDG)</li> <li>• ACRP Report 25, Airport Passenger Terminal Planning and Design</li> <li>• ACRP Report 55, Passenger Level of Service and Spatial Planning for Airport Terminals</li> </ul>
6.16.21	PC	Werner and Nancy Liebig Jr.	429-430	<p>The Draft Environment Assessment document that is the subject of this public hearing and the TTN Airport plan that it represents should be unconditionally rejected by Mercer County Commissioners and the FAA should require a full Environmental Impact Statement be performed on the expansion plan for the entire airport, not just the terminal and other segments of this project.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Construction be delayed until toxic contaminants have been properly evaluated and cleaned from airport property, eliminating risk of downstream spread.</li> <li>2. A comprehensive study of the finished, operating airport's impact on our local environment (Environmental Impact Statement, EIS) and Public Health (Health Impact Assessment, HIA).</li> <li>3. An independent accounting and full disclosure of actual costs to taxpayers, including cost of borrowed debt, decreased residential property tax revenues and increased public health costs.</li> <li>4. Hold the FAA accountable for its refusal to consider the congressional mandate in the FAA reauthorization act of 2018, Pub. L. 115254, § 188 requiring the FAA to develop alternative metrics to the 24-hour day/night average noise levels.</li> <li>5. Force the airport to carry out a CFR 14 Part 150 analysis for developing noise mitigation procedures which safely accommodate flights and protect the health and well-being of area residents. We have made specific suggestions regarding noise mitigation procedures.</li> <li>6. Shifts in travel patterns and behavior due to COVID-19 have not been factored into any of the current or future needs of the airport.</li> <li>7. Officials have consistently ignored the broader issues</li> </ol>	<p><b>Contamination:</b> Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled. Hazardous Materials and remediation is described in detail in Section 5.5 and Appendix F of the EA.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 item 3 discusses undertaking an Environmental Impact Statement vs the current Environmental Assessment.</p> <p><b>Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15 for discussion of a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Cost:</b> Section 6.2.2 item 2 describes the Mercer County fiscal responsibility. The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document.</p> <p><b>Alternative Noise Metric:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 21 for a discussion of alternative Noise Metrics.</p> <p><b>Part 150 Study:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 18 for a discussion of Part 150 Studies.</p> <p><b>COVID-19:</b> See Chapter 1 for travel patterns and impacts of COVID-19 on air travel.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 6 for aircraft noise. Section 5.8 and Appendix E of the EA describe the evaluation and findings for aircraft noise.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> Section 5.1 of the EA discusses the evaluation of air pollution and emissions.</p> <p><b>Study Area:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 17 for a discussion of how the study area was established.</p> <p><b>Quality of Life:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 13 describes the Quality of Life evaluation. The impacts to the environment are identified in Chapter 5 Environmental Consequences.</p> <p><b>Delaware River:</b> The project will have no impact on the Delaware River. Section 5.12 of the EA discusses the water quality, water pollution, and water resources.</p> <p><b>Impact on Schools:</b> Section 5.9 describes Socioeconomic, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Health and Safety Risks.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>related to air quality, noise, and environmental contamination. There has not been a full examination of the impact of noise and emissions on our area schools, learning, health, and water. The Delaware River is a major water source for the area and has not been sufficiently studied.</p> <p>8. Looking at merely the area of the airport specifically and not the true impact within a 10-mile radius is absurd. Planes use up more real estate and impact more factors than just what's on the ground of the airport.</p>	
6.16.21	GO	PA Senator Steve Santarsiero	431-433	<p>Public Involvement: Requested an additional 30 days in order to more thoroughly review the Environmental Assessment Report and provide complete public comment.</p> <p>Expansion: It is a significant expansion of the current facility, increasing the terminal size fivefold and doubling the number of gates.</p> <p>Contamination: Concerned that PFAS contamination from the adjacent site of the former Naval Air Station will find its way into the Delaware - the source of drinking water for over 13 million people-if this project moves forward. PFAS levels of 178 ppt to nearly 28,000 ppt have been detected at that site; those numbers are many times higher than NJDEP's limit of 13 ppt and greater than the USEPA's limit of 70 ppt.</p> <p>Finally, the argument that the expansion of the airport is needed for economic reasons simply does not ring true. I support the creation of jobs with good pay and benefits in our region and will always support our union building trades because their work is unparalleled. That is why I played a leading role in reviving the KOIZ at the former US Steel site in Falls Township. That project will employ over 5,000 construction workers and over 8,000 permanent workers. Those are jobs that will be filled by Bucks County residents as well as people from Mercer County and other parts of New Jersey. In contrast, a major regional airport is not only a bad fit for our residential region but also unnecessary. Philadelphia Airport is only 40 minutes away to the south, and Newark Airport is only 50 minutes away to the north. Both are connected to the Mercer-Bucks community by the Northeast Corridor rail line that runs through our region and the interstate highway system that already makes our area a major commercial hub. A vast expansion of Trenton Mercer Airport is simply not needed in an area that is already well serviced by transportation infrastructure.</p>	<p><b>Public Involvement:</b> The NEPA process included a 45-day public comment period for the Draft EA, starting from the day of publication (May 03, 2021) of the Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers (<i>Times of Trenton</i> and <i>Bucks County Courier Times</i>). Throughout the NEPA review process, the TTN and the FAA sought input in writing from the public. The comment period closed on June 16, 2021, giving time to the public and agencies to provide input and comments to the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity.</p> <p><b>Contamination:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>Two Large Airports with Adequate Capacity:</b> The closest large airports to TTN are Philadelphia International (PHL) and Newark Liberty (EWR). PHL and EWR are approximately 50 minutes and 1 hour drive respectively from TTN, under free-flowing traffic conditions. Individual airport forecasts consider passenger choice in terms of airports to be used. Given the proximity of TTN to other airports the historic growth in enplanements demonstrate that passengers still select TTN for travel. Enplanements at TTN are forecast to grow in recognition of passenger choice considerations which demonstrates the need for the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Economic Reason:</b> Many have cited the economic benefits of the TTN and project. As described in the Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action is to improve the Level of Service for passengers utilizing TTN. Economic benefits are ancillary to the core purpose of the project. As discussed in the EA, the Trenton-Mercer Airport currently and will continue to contribute to jobs, payroll and output to the local economy in a positive manner. Trenton-Mercer is one of the three largest employing airports of general aviation employment in NJ. The Airport is a crucial part of New Jersey's overall economy including on-airport contributors, such as airport tenants and capital expenditures, to off-airport contributors, such as hotels, restaurants recreation and business travelers. With the Proposed Action, the TTN would continue to support existing jobs, local economy and accessibility of low-cost fares. See Section 5.9.1 for positive economic impact discussed in the EA.</p>
6.16.21	PC	Patricia Fletcher	434	I notice the below suggests my email was sent after the 6/15 5p deadline. I emailed it prior to that deadline. I was unable to attend the public EA comments meeting, as well as email my letter earlier due to the death of my mother and all that comes	Comments received and included under # 121.

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				with it. Pls confirm my letter will be included with The lot if all public comments.	
6.16.21	PC	Kristen Brown	435	I am excited to see a new terminal for TTN. The upgraded facility will really make TTN a great airport to fly in and out of, increasing the amount of people investing in the community and local shops and restaurants.	Comment noted.
6.16.21	PC	Jillian Palmieri and Nicholas Palmieri	436-438	<p>I live in the direct vicinity of the Trenton Mercer Airport and I am concerned the proposed airport expansion is being advanced without adequate consideration for the health and well-being of the surrounding communities. Stakeholders in this project are acting in a willfully deceptive and negligent manner with respect to their responsibility for area residents and the environment. This negligence is evident on slide 40 displayed during the Public Hearing on June 2, "The only change in aircraft operations noise is expected to be associated with the aircraft ground movements around the terminal gates." Will there not be additional, and more frequent noise levels affecting surrounding communities from additional flights flying overhead, taking off, and when descending? It's preposterous to believe otherwise.</p> <p>1) The level of soil toxicity in the area surrounding the airport needs to be adequately evaluated and remediated to levels that are safe in accordance with Federal Law and best practices.</p> <p>2) Comprehensive studies need to be conducted on the impact to the environment and public health. Specifically, I am asking for an Environmental Impact Statement and a Health Impact Assessment.</p> <p>There needs to be an independent accounting and full disclosure to stakeholders regarding actual project costs, the impact to surrounding property values, public health costs, and the suitability of planned future work at Trenton Airport.</p>	<p><b>Airport Expansion:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 1 for definition and explanation Terminal and Airfield Capacity. .</p> <p><b>Slide 40:</b> As described in Section 5.8 of the EA, no difference in aircraft operations is expected between the "Action" and "No Action" alternatives. As further described in that Section, the aircraft parking positions for boarding and de-boarding of passengers will be relocated to the replacement terminal. This slight change in parking positions results in a small change to the noise contours on airport property, and does not change the noise contours off airport property.</p> <p><b>Noise:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 6.</p> <p><b>Additional Flights:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Items 9-11.</p> <p><b>Soil Toxicity:</b> Section 6.2.2, Item 18 describes how potential PFAS contamination will be addressed and controlled.</p> <p><b>EIS:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 3.</p> <p><b>Health Impact Assessment:</b> See Section 6.2.2, Item 15.</p> <p><b>Cost / Taxpayers:</b> The TTN Terminal EA is not a fiscal or financial document. See Section 6.2.2, item 2.</p> <p><b>Property Value:</b> See Section 6.2.2, item 12.</p> <p><b>Suitability of planned future work:</b> Refer to Airport Master Plan. The EA describes a single and complete project with connected actions and independent utility from previous and future planned projects.</p>
6.17.21	PC	Judith Hoechner	439-441	<p>Commenter submitted a comment to the "Federal Aviation Authority" with 2 separate attachments. Comment letter follows:</p> <p>The voluminous, discrepancy filled 2021 draft Terminal EA at TTN was offered with only the minimum required 30-day public comment window. I heard of no one actively registered for Mercer County's email notifications that received an email notification of the May 3, 2021 release of this draft EA by the FAA. Requests to extend the 30-day public comment period for the 2021 draft Terminal EA at TTN were met with absolute silence by Mercer County Commissioner Chairman Samuel Frisby (sfrisby@mercercounty.org). PA State Senator Steve Santarsiero, representing thousands of PA residents affected by the flight operations at TTN, requested an extension while speaking at the</p>	<p><b>Request For Extension of Public Comment Period:</b> See Section 6.2.1 for a detailed Summary of Public participation. The NEPA process included a 45-day public comment period for the Draft EA, starting from the day of publication (May 03, 2021) of the Notice of Availability (NOA) in local newspapers (<i>Times of Trenton</i> and <i>Bucks County Courier Times</i>). Throughout the NEPA review process, the TTN and the FAA sought input in writing from the public. The comment period closed on July 16, 2021, giving time to the public and agencies to provide input and comments to the Proposed Action. The 45 day comment period and hearing both exceed the minimum requirements for an EA. Representative Santarsiero spoke at the hearing and provided written comments on the EA. .</p> <p><b>Discrepancies:</b> The Commentor describes the EA as "discrepancy filled" but does not cite any examples.</p> <p><b>Senator Menendez request for an extension:</b> The project record does not include such a request from Senator Menendez.</p> <p><b>Pre-registration:</b> Pre-registration was available but not required from the public in order to obtain login information in advance of accessing the virtual meeting which was held via Zoom. Instructions were provided in the notice with several options for contacting the project team in case of technical</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	Appendix I: Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>public hearing, by follow up phone call and by email. He did not even receive the courtesy of a reply. There was a precedent set in the past of extending public comment for EA's presented by the Mercer County Commissioners and their consultants and for the current extension requests, several reasons based on necessary further review of the environmental impacts of the proposed action were stated. I believe NJ Senator Bob Menendez, at the request of his constituents, also requested an extension of this very short review period for this &gt;2000 page, complex environmental assessment but he also was ignored.</p> <p>For the record, I am submitting 2 requests by 2 different people to extend the 30-day public comment period for the 2021 draft Terminal EA at TTN. There was no response to these requests by the Mercer County Commissioner Chairman or the County Administrator, Lillian Nazarro, even after numerous people tried to contact them by phone.</p> <p>Attachment 1 – Email from Judith Hoechner to Commissioner Frisby</p> <p>Dear Commissioner Frisby (with several CC's)</p> <p>I understand that several groups have requested an extension of the public comment period for the draft Terminal EA and none of them have received a response from you. The 30-day minimum requirement for public comment is insufficient to thoroughly examine this very large, detailed and complex document. A 60 day window was provided for public comment for the May 9, 2002 draft Terminal EA and it was 1/2 the length of this May 3, 2021 draft Terminal EA.</p> <p>439 2</p> <p>Members of the public were denied access to the June 2, 2021 public hearing because they did not receive the login instructions in time to enter the meeting. It was unclear why prior registration was required for a zoom public hearing but that process excluded members of the public from attending. In addition, there are numerous environmental concerns that require investigation to create meaningful public comment including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-delineation and testing for the presence of PFAS in all areas covered by this EA including the new ARFF building location,</li> <li>-understanding what waivers will be required to build in the prohibited Zone B of the Delaware Raritan Canal Commission,</li> <li>-understanding the relationship between the modeled automobile emissions versus the projected enplanements and flight operations which in this EA are unexplainably projected to drop dramatically in growth versus the pre-Covid growth,</li> </ul>	<p>difficulties. Also, a calling in phone number (Phone Call-in: 646-558-8656; Meeting ID: 829 6027 0513) was established for this Public Hearing making it accessible to all concern citizens and general public. Information was posted in project website (www.ttnterminal.com), access via google chrome.</p> <p><b>PFAS:</b> PFAS investigations and remediation are described in detail in Chapters 4,5 and Section 6.2.2 Item 18.</p> <p><b>Delaware Raritan Canal Commission waivers:</b> Section 5.12.3 describes the required waivers. As described, it is expected that the waivers will be issued. Construction will not commence until all applicable and required regulatory approvals (permits) are received.</p> <p><b>Air Quality:</b> As described in Chapter 5, aircraft and vehicle operations will not change as a result of the Proposed Action, therefore no change in air emissions from either source is expected.</p> <p><b>Public Hearing Comment Process:</b> There were some requests to speak early due to time constraints. To the extent practical, those requests were accommodated. The moderator was working from a list of names and had no advance knowledge of the commentator's opinions or comments that would be offered.</p> <p><b>OPRA Requests:</b> Compliance with OPRA requirements is the responsibility of Mercer County.</p> <p><b>Public Health:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 15.</p> <p><b>Environmental Impacts:</b> Environmental, Social, and Economic Consequences of the Proposed Action are described in Chapter 5.</p> <p><b>Environmental Justice:</b> Environmental Justice is described in Chapter 5. No Environmental Justice community would be affected by the Proposed Action.</p> <p><b>Financial Concerns:</b> See Section 6.2.2 Item 2 for a discussion of Fiscal Concerns</p> <p><b>Airfield Changes:</b> No change to the runways and taxiways are proposed in the Proposed Action.</p>

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>-understanding why airplane emissions are claimed to be de minimis and therefore are not considered in this EA even though passenger handling capabilities will more than triple. For all the reasons outlined above, I respectfully request the public comment period be extended until July 28, 2021 to provide a full 60-day period and that physical copies of the over 2000 page draft Terminal EA remain accessible to the public in public venues for that period.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Hoechner 1406 Silo Road Yardley, PA 19067</p> <p>Attachment 2</p> <p>Email from Debra Baseman to Commissioner Frisby and Jerlene Worthy:</p> <p>Please read into the record at the start of tonight’s meeting. Include my written comments in the printed meeting minutes available to the public.</p> <p>Dear Commissioner Frisby, I am writing to echo many constituents’ requests for an extension of Trenton Mercer Airport Terminal EA Public Comment Period to 60 days. Thirty days is an inadequate amount of time to read and digest the thousands of pages of material in the EA presented to the community. Prior EAs had a 60 day approval period, providing precedent for a longer public review. Additionally, community members had requested much of the recently released data in advance by filing OPRA requests. Keeping with Mercer County’s well-honed lack of transparency, we were told: the terminal EA is in draft form, which does not need to be made publicly available. Indeed, even the public meeting for the Terminal EA was skewed— by having residents register in advance, the organizers suppressed dissent but placing community members known to be vocal about transparency and environmental concerns at the end of the meeting. Any resident who had spoken publicly against the airport in the past 6 months at County Commissioners’ meetings, was given time to speak AFTER two hours into the meeting—a time when the meeting was supposed to have ended. Specifically, the meeting was scheduled for 7-9 PM, but lasted until 10:15 PM, with the bulk of opposition given time AFTER the 9PM mark.</p>	

Date	Comment Category	Name of Commenter	<u>Appendix I:</u> Public Comment Page Number	Summary of Written Public Comments Draft EA 45-day Public Comment Period	Responses to Written Public Comments
				<p>There are serious public health, environmental impacts, environmental justice and financial concerns with regard to the planned massive terminal expansion and airfield changes. Commissioners should want the public to have adequate time to understand and inquire prior to the typical political rubber stamp approval Mercer commissioners are certain to provide.</p> <p>Thank you. Debra Baseman Van Kirk Road</p>	
6.17.21	LO	Steven Taber TRENTON THREATENED SKIES' RESPONSE	512	Repeat comment of pp 442-511	Repeated. See response to Comment 442