

Errata Sheet for Corrections to

Aberdeen Regional Airport, Aberdeen, SD

Final Environmental Assessment, May 2012

Last Update: October 12, 2012

This errata sheet corrects errors or omissions that were identified after notification of availability of the Final Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Decoupling of Runways and Reduction of Hazardous Wildlife Attractants; was published in January, 2012. This errata sheet must be attached to the EA to comprise a full and complete record of the environmental analysis for the project. The Final EA will not be reprinted.

1. On pages 6, 10, 13, 15, 16, 48, 58, 70 and 71 remove the letter from the end of the FAA AC indicating the version of the AC. As FAA ACs are updated frequently, the project should comply with the most current version of each.
2. On page 6, beginning with "If any changes" and ending with "Appendix C" replace with the following language:

If any changes to the runways are made, the length required for the existing and future aircraft fleet at ABR must be met. The critical aircraft for ABR is the CRJ 200ER. This type of aircraft is classified as C II. The needed length for the existing and projected future use was discussed in length in the 2008 Master Plan update. By using three methods, first they used FAA AC 150/5325-4B, "Runway Length Requirements for Airport Design", and then calculated the length for the specific design aircraft, and finally by using FAA AC 150/5200-13 "Airport Design" which includes a program that determines airport design criteria, Airport Reference Code (ARC) and calculates the required runway length for different categories of aircraft.

The fleet mix of aircraft used was aircraft over 12,500 pounds but less than 60,000 pounds. For the specific aircraft method the CRJ 200ER was used since at that time it was forecast that regional jets would be increasing their usage of the airport. Finally, for the use of the computer program the aircraft group used was again over 12,500 pounds but less than 60,000 pounds. Based on all three methods a 7,000 foot runway, for the primary and 5,500 foot runway for the crosswind were recommended. Resulting in ARC C II for the primary runway and ARC B II for the crosswind runway. A copy of the Table generated with the FAA's Airport Design software

follows, along with the summary from the Master Plan. For additional information and complete discussion of the runway length design please see the excerpts from the Master Plan in Appendix C.

3. On page 17, beginning with "The existing RPZ" and ending with "controlled by the airport" replace with the following language:

The existing RPZ for Runway 13 has areas that currently lie outside of airport property and contain businesses. With the decoupling and shifting of the runways, this RPZ is contained within airport property and will be protected from incompatible land uses as prescribed by FAA AC 150/5300-13, "Airport Design". Both Runways 35 and 31 would keep their current RPZ for precision approaches with visibility minimums of 3/4 mile for Runway 35 and less than 3/4 mile for Runway 31. Currently, the RPZ for Runway 17 is on airport property but only allows approaches not lower than 1 mile for aircraft categories A and B. By decoupling the runways and shifting the Runway 17 end south it would allow an RPZ sized for non-precision approaches with visibility minimums of 3/4 mile for all aircraft categories. All of these RPZs will be clear of incompatible uses and controlled by the airport.

4. On page 35, beginning with "This alternative" and ending with " 24-26 weeks" replace with the following language:

This alternative consists of decoupling the Runways at the 13 and 17 ends. This would involve shifting Runway 31 and Taxiway D to the southeast to achieve an overall length of 7,000 feet, removal of Taxiway B, and shifting Runway 35 and Taxiway C to the south to achieve an overall length of 5,500 feet. This would also include mitigating wildlife hazards by filling in approximately 44 acres of wetlands on airport property, redesign of the storm water retention ponds, and drainage of the airport through underground culverts. This would involve equipment working in the area such as scrapers, dozers, loaders, graders, trucks, excavators, pavers, etc. There would be approximately 290,000 to 420,000 cubic yards (CY) of excavation. A portion of the fill needed for filling the wetlands is already available on the airport. The airport has stockpiled excess material from previous projects in anticipation of its use in any future projects requiring fill. Also included would be approximately 80,000 to 100,000 tons of sub-base and base course materials that would be hauled in from sources outside airport property. Any trucks hauling material to the airport will be required to follow all Federal State and local laws and regulations which may include obtaining a haul road permit from the County or Township depending on where the material is coming from. Offsite fill material will be from approved or commercial borrow sites. The City, Airport and contractor must comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal laws and regulations in efforts to obtain fill material. This work would probably be phased over two construction seasons with each season containing 24-26 weeks.

5. On page 38, beginning with "US F&WS" and ending with "on the airport" replace with the following language:

US F&WS in their response letter dated February 12, 2009 identified the endangered species, the Topeka Shiner (*Notropis tokepa*), may be in the project vicinity. The Wildlife Hazard Assessment completed by Gander Island Consulting Service, Inc. also identified the Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*) which is another endangered species that is known to be found in Brown County.

The Whooping Crane is listed as "endangered". The term "endangered" means that the species is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The Whooping Crane is the tallest bird in North America with males standing over seven feet. One of only two migrating flocks passes through SD on their way from southern wintering grounds in Texas to northern nesting grounds in Canada. They will use cropland and pastures especially with wetlands for feeding and resting. Overnight roosting sites typically include areas of shallow water. The greatest concern is the disturbance of the birds during their spring or fall migration.

Whooping Crane is not known in the area, especially in the cropland, pastures or wetlands on current airport property and adjacent land. A determination that the proposed action "may affect - not likely to adversely affect" the Whooping Crane was made by FAA and received concurrence from USFWS on September 20, 2012.

The Topeka Shiner is listed as an "endangered" species. They are known to occupy numerous small streams within eastern SD and are most concentrated within the Big Sioux, Vermillion, and James River watersheds. It should be noted, extensive trapping at ABR has occurred since 2000 in the drainages, ponds, and wetland areas on the Airport property and no Topeka Shiners have ever been discovered. In a telephone conversation with US F&WS on April 13, 2010, they stated that no BMPs were needed if only wetlands and drainages were filled and no flowing streams were affected especially if past observation has never shown Topeka Shiners on the airport. A determination that the proposed action "may affect-not likely to adversely affect" the Topeka Shiner was made by FAA and received concurrence from USFWS on September 12, 2012.

Under Runway Safety Enhancement, under alternatives 2 and 3, replace the sentence, "This alternative will have no adverse impacts to threaten or endangered species", with "This alternative will not likely to adversely affect threaten and endangered species.

On page 43 under alternative 2 and alternative 3 remove "no significant impact" and replace with "no rise".

On page 67 and 70, under Fish, Wildlife, and Plants remove "Topeka Shiner."