

March 2023

West Virginia International Yeager Airport
Airfield, Safety, and Terminal Improvement Project
Environmental Impact Statement

Scoping Report

Prepared for:

Federal Aviation Administration

Prepared by:

RICONDO

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Scoping.....	1
1.1 Scoping Meetings Summary	2
1.1.1 Public Scoping Meeting Summary	2
1.1.2 Agency Scoping Meeting Summary	2
1.2 Scoping Comment Submissions Received.....	3
2. Comment Topics.....	12
2.1 EIS Process.....	14
2.1.1 General Process	14
2.1.2 Community Engagement	14
2.1.3 Political Involvement/External Influence.....	15
2.2 Purpose and Need.....	15
2.2.1 Air Service and Air Traffic Demand	16
2.2.2 Cost/Funding	16
2.2.3 Economy, Tourism, and Population Growth.....	17
2.2.4 Geotechnical Concerns	17
2.2.5 Aircraft and Passenger Safety	18
2.2.6 Runway Length/Deficiencies.....	19
2.2.7 Terminal Deficiencies and Improved Passenger Experience.....	19
2.2.8 General Project Concerns	20
2.3 Alternatives.....	20
2.3.1 No Action	20
2.3.2 Construction of a New Airport.....	21
2.3.3 Bridge the Runway Extension.....	22
2.3.4 Other/New	22
2.4 Environmental Resources	23
2.4.1 Air Quality	23
2.4.2 Biological Resources	23
2.4.3 Climate	24
2.4.4 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources.....	25

2.4.5 Hazardous Materials/Pollution28

2.4.6 Historic Resources28

2.4.7 Noise and Vibration28

2.4.8 Public Health29

2.4.9 Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children’s Environmental Health and Safety
Risks.....30

2.4.10 Visual Resources30

2.4.11 Water Resources.....30

3. FAA Approach to Addressing Scoping Comments 32

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 Agencies Represented at Agency Scoping Meeting 3

Table 2 Commenter Categories 4

Table 3 Index of Agency, Elected Official, and Local organization written comments By Comment
Submission Identification (ID) Number 4

Table 4 Index of Public Commenter written comments By Comment Submission Identification (ID)
Number 5

Table 5 Index of Oral Comments by comment Submission Identification (ID) 12

Table 6 General Comment Topics 12

Table 7 Comment Sub-Topics 13

Table 8 Project Support/Opposition 14

LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Scoping Materials

Attachment 2 Comment Letters

1. SCOPING

On September 30, 2022, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published in the *Federal Register* its Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Request for Scoping Comments for the West Virginia International Yeager Airport (CRW) Airfield, Safety, and Terminal Improvement Project (Proposed Project) proposed by the Central West Virginia Regional Airport Authority (CWVRRAA).¹ Scoping is an early and open process for determining the scope of issues to be addressed in an EIS and identifying the significant issues related to the Proposed Project. As part of the scoping process, the FAA elected to hold one governmental agency scoping meeting and three public scoping meetings. Though public meetings are not required as part of the scoping process, the FAA chose to convene three meetings to promote public participation throughout the scoping process.²

Scoping comments were solicited over a 61-day period, commencing on September 30, 2022, with the publication of the NOI. The public was also notified of the scoping period directly through distribution of an email sent on September 30, 2022, and the publication of a public notice in local newspapers including the *Charleston Gazette-Mail* and the *Herald Dispatch* on September 30, 2022, and the *State Journal* on October 3, 2022. An advertisement was also run on the *West Virginia Metro News* website from September 30, 2022, through October 7, 2022. The project website (www.YeagerAirportEIS.com) was also launched coincident with the release of the NOI. In addition to providing information regarding the project components, EIS process, and “Frequently Asked Questions,” the project website also provided a formal comment submission form, as well as information regarding the public scoping meetings (see Section 1.1.1). On October 27, 2022, the FAA mailed postcards to approximately 3,200 residences in the vicinity of the Airport to inform occupants of the NOI to prepare an EIS and the upcoming public scoping meetings. A banner notification reminder for the upcoming public scoping meetings was also added to the homepage of the project website from October 28, 2022, to November 7, 2022.

The scoping comment period, originally intended to conclude on November 17, 2022, was extended by 12 days in response to requests for an extension by members of the public. The scoping comment period extension provided agencies and the public additional time to submit formal scoping comments. A notice of the scoping comment period extension was published in the *Federal Register* on November 14, 2022. Public notices were also published in local newspapers including the *Charleston Gazette-Mail* and the *Herald Dispatch* on November 11, 2022, and the *State Journal* on November 21, 2022. An advertisement was also run on the *West Virginia Metro News* website from November 11, 2022, to November 18, 2022. A banner notification announcing the comment period extension was also added to the project website on November 7, 2022. The extended scoping comment period concluded at 5:00 p.m. on November 29, 2022. A total of 523 comments were received during the scoping period.

The purpose of the scoping process was to receive input from interested parties, responsible agencies, and the public, with respect to the purpose and need for the project, alternatives to be considered, potential environmental impacts, and to identify any specific concerns that should be examined in the EIS.

¹ The Notice of Intent was formally published on September 29, 2022; however, the effective date is considered September 30, 2022.

² The FAA also voluntarily held informal pre-scoping meetings for elected officials, stakeholders, and community leaders in August 2022.

1.1 SCOPING MEETINGS SUMMARY

1.1.1 PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING SUMMARY

The FAA held three public scoping meetings for the Proposed Project. Two in-person public scoping meetings were held from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Eastern Time on Wednesday, November 2, 2022, and Thursday, November 3, 2022, at the Embassy Suites by Hilton Charleston Hotel located at 300 Court Street, Charleston, West Virginia. The in-person public scoping meetings were held in an open house format with project information displayed on boards around the room with representatives from the FAA, CWMRAA, and Ricondo & Associates, Inc. (the FAA's EIS consultant) and its sub-consultants available to answer questions. At the in-person meetings, the FAA had stations for accepting (1) handwritten or pre-prepared³ comments; (2) comments typed on a computer made available to the public; and (3) oral comments transcribed by a stenographer. In an effort to support all members of the community, the FAA offered to provide translators in additional languages if requested; however, no requests were received. Factsheets were made available to all public scoping meeting participants. A total of 53 individuals signed in at the November 2, 2022, meeting, 3 of whom represented local media. A total of 46 individuals signed in at the November 3, 2022, meeting. Media coverage of the public scoping meetings ran on the local news, including *WCHS-TV* and *WOWK-TV*. In addition, several articles regarding the public scoping meetings were published on news outlets including *West Virginia Public Broadcasting*, *AviationPros*, *West Virginia News*, *Charleston Gazette-Mail* and *WCHS-TV*.

The FAA also held a virtual public workshop from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Monday, November 7, 2022. The virtual workshop was held via Zoom and provided the opportunity for interested members of the public to participate in a question-and-answer session with representatives from the FAA, CWMRAA, and Ricondo & Associates, Inc. and its sub-consultants. Registration for the virtual public workshop was made available on September 30, 2022, coinciding with the release of the NOI; registration for the virtual workshop closed at 4:00 p.m. on November 7, 2022. A total of 75⁴ individuals registered for the workshop, and a total of 33 participants attended the virtual public workshop. The FAA promoted the virtual public workshop on its social media platforms including Facebook, Twitter, and LinkedIn. The virtual public workshop was also available for live viewing without registration on FAA's YouTube and Facebook pages.⁵ The FAA noted a total of approximately 27,000 impressions, 970 engagements, and 3,500 video views across all streaming platforms.⁶

Copies of the display materials, factsheet, newspaper proofs and affidavits, postcards, and public scoping meeting sign-in sheets are included in **Attachment 1**.

1.1.2 AGENCY SCOPING MEETING SUMMARY

A governmental agency scoping meeting for all federal, state, and local regulatory agencies which have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to any potential environmental impacts associated with the Proposed Project was held on Thursday, November 3, 2022, at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Time, at the Embassy Suites by Hilton Charleston Hotel located at 300 Court Street, Charleston, West Virginia, and was available virtually via Zoom with a dial-in number to participate via web/telephone, if preferred. Emails describing the project and inviting federal, state, and local agencies to the agency meeting were sent to 54 individuals. The format of the agency scoping meeting was a

³ Pre-prepared comments include written comments that were prepared (that is, written or typed) by members of the public prior to arriving at the public scoping meetings but were submitted in-person at the public scoping meetings.

⁴ Some individuals registered for the virtual public workshop more than once.

⁵ Recordings of the virtual public workshop remain available for viewing on the FAA's YouTube and Facebook pages.

⁶ Impressions are the number of times the workshop content entered a user's screen; multiple impressions can come from a single user. Engagements are the number of times users commented on the video and video views are unique/individual views of the video.

brief presentation given by the FAA and the EIS consultant staff followed by a period of questions and answers. Copies of the email invitation, mailing list, presentation, and sign-in sheets are included in **Attachment 1**. The agency scoping meeting was attended by 17 individuals representing 11 agencies, as listed in **Table 1**.

TABLE 1 AGENCIES REPRESENTED AT AGENCY SCOPING MEETING

AGENCY TYPE	AGENCY
Federal Agencies	US Army Corps of Engineers ¹
	US Environmental Protection Agency ¹
	National Park Service ¹
	US Department of Interior ¹
State Agencies	West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection ¹
	West Virginia Development Office
	West Virginia Division of Natural Resources ¹
	West Virginia State Historic Preservation Office
Regional/Local Agencies	Kanawha County Planning Department
	Kanawha County Commission ¹
	City of Charleston Planning Department

NOTE:

¹ Attended the agency scoping meeting virtually via Zoom.

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

1.2 SCOPING COMMENT SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

A comment submission is defined as an instance of an individual expressing thoughts on the Proposed Project via written or oral media. A single comment submission may include statements on many topics. A total of 513 written comment submissions, including letters, emails, website submissions, or hardcopy forms were received during the scoping period; of these, there were 508 unique comment submittals.⁷ In addition to written comments, oral comments were also received during scoping. A stenographer was present at the two in-person public scoping meetings to transcribe oral comment submissions; the stenographer transcribed comments from 10 individual visits by attendees.⁸

An alphanumeric index system using prefix codes was used to identify each comment submission received based on commenter category. The prefix codes used for categorizing the written comment submissions include federal agencies ("AF"), state agencies ("AS"), local agencies ("AL"), elected officials ("EO"), local organizations⁹ ("LO"), and public commenters ("PC"). The prefix codes for oral comments were categorized as public meetings ("PM"). For example, the US Geological Survey was the first of two federal agencies that submitted a written comment during the scoping period. The subject letter was assigned the alphanumeric label "AF00001," representing "Agency-Federal-Commenter No. 1." The same basic format and approach was used for all commenter categories. **Table 2** identifies the number of comment submittals within each commenter category.

⁷ Note that some individuals submitted duplicate emails.

⁸ Note that some individuals provided comments to the stenographers in more than one visit.

⁹ Comment submissions were categorized as LO for commenters identifying as commenting on behalf of an organization, with an official organization title, and/or commenting on official organization letterhead.

TABLE 2 COMMENTER CATEGORIES

LETTER ID PREFIX	DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF COMMENT SUBMITTALS
WRITTEN COMMENTS		
AF	Federal Agency	2
AS	State Agency	0
AL	Local Agency	2
EO	Elected Official	2
LO	Local Organization	6
PC	Public Commenter	501
ORAL COMMENTS		
PM	Public Meetings	10

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

To assist the reader's review, an index of written agency, elected official, and local organization comment submissions is provided in **Table 3**. This index provides the alphanumeric label number, commenter name, affiliation (i.e., name of agency or organization that the commenter represents), and date when the comment submission was received. An index of written public commenter submissions has been included in **Table 4**, which provides the alphanumeric label number, commenter name, and date of when comments were received. An index of oral comments/commenters received at the public meetings is provided in **Table 5**. **Attachment 2** provides copies of all written and oral comments, organized by comment letter prefix.

TABLE 3 INDEX OF AGENCY, ELECTED OFFICIAL, AND LOCAL ORGANIZATION WRITTEN COMMENTS BY COMMENT SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION (ID) NUMBER

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	AFFILIATION/AGENCY	DATE RECEIVED
AF00001	Brett Kopec	US Geological Survey	2022-10-01
AF00002	Joy Gillespie	US Environmental Protection Agency	2022-11-22
AL00001	Sean Hill	Kanawha Valley Regional Transportation Authority	2022-11-09
AL00002	Jennifer Elkins	Kanawha County Commission	2022-11-29
EO00001	Joe Solomon	Charleston City Council	2022-11-22
EO00002	Beth Kerns	Charleston City Council	2022-11-30
LO00001	Jamie Billman	Preservation Alliance of West Virginia	2022-11-23
LO00002	Mike Jones	WV Rivers Coalition	2022-11-23
LO00003	Kenneth E. Tawney	Elk River Trail Foundation	2022-11-28
LO00004	Melissa Waggy	WV Chapter of Sierra Club	2022-11-29
LO00005	Chad Cordell	Kanawha Forest Coalition	2022-11-29
LO00006	Kathy Ferguson	Our Future West Virginia	2022-11-29

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

TABLE 4 INDEX OF PUBLIC COMMENTER WRITTEN COMMENTS BY COMMENT SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION (ID) NUMBER

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED	COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00001	Jefferson Acree	2022-10-02	PC00036	KD	2022-11-03
PC00002	Sarah	2022-10-11	PC00037	Jordan	2022-11-03
PC00003	Wylie Faw	2022-10-17	PC00038	Beverly D. Douglas	2022-11-03
PC00004	Zach	2022-10-17	PC00039	Kaitlin Jordan	2022-11-03
PC00005	Robert Belding	2022-10-18	PC00040	Laura Babiak	2022-11-03
PC00006	Brittany Ritchea	2022-10-19	PC00041	Kelly Babiak	2022-11-03
PC00007	Hunter Starks	2022-10-20	PC00042	Zachary Humphries	2022-11-03
PC00008	Patricia Perry	2022-10-20	PC00043	Annette Cable	2022-11-03
PC00009	Edward Milam	2022-10-26	PC00044	Laura Babiak	2022-11-03
PC00010	Denise Giardina	2022-10-26	PC00045	Steve Roadcap	2022-11-03
PC00011	K. Scott	2022-10-27	PC00046	Randy Damron	2022-11-03
PC00012	K. Scott	2022-10-27	PC00047	Allen E. Tackett	2022-11-03
PC00013	K. Scott	2022-10-27	PC00048	Bette Damron	2022-11-03
PC00014	Tomi Bergstrom	2022-10-28	PC00049	Autumn Walker	2022-11-03
PC00015	Matthew Walker	2022-10-29	PC00050	Kris Stalter	2022-11-04
PC00016	Charles Stodola	2022-10-30	PC00051	Kristen Stalter	2022-11-04
PC00017	Travis L. Copen	2022-10-31	PC00052	Casee Jones	2022-11-04
PC00018	Jodi McMillian	2022-10-31	PC00053	Paige Butcher	2022-11-04
PC00019	Melanie Clark	2022-11-01	PC00054	Vanessa Harper	2022-11-04
PC00020	James Cochran	2022-11-02	PC00055	Ashton Hawley	2022-11-04
PC00021	Teresa Quigley	2022-11-02	PC00056	Emily Whittington	2022-11-04
PC00022	Brace Mullett	2022-11-02	PC00057	Rachel D. Cole	2022-11-04
PC00023	Shelley J. Lively	2022-11-02	PC00058	Jerry Tackett	2022-11-04
PC00024	Heather Sprouse	2022-11-02	PC00059	Lisa King	2022-11-05
PC00025	Jeanne Chandler	2022-11-02	PC00060	Maura Lewis	2022-11-05
PC00026	Margaret E. Zaleski	2022-11-02	PC00061	Gary Davis	2022-11-06
PC00027	Susan Patterson	2022-11-02	PC00062	Elizabeth Segessenman	2022-11-06
PC00028	Shawn Means	2022-11-02	PC00063	Theresa Miller	2022-11-06
PC00029	Amy McLaughlin	2022-11-02	PC00064	Teresa Marie Koon	2022-11-07
PC00030	Andy Richardson	2022-11-02	PC00065	[personal information removed]	2022-11-07
PC00031	K. Scott	2022-11-02	PC00066	Jennifer Geyer	2022-11-07
PC00032	K. Scott	2022-11-02	PC00067	Dan McLaughlin	2022-11-07
PC00033	D. Scott Clark	2022-11-02	PC00068	Mitch Lucas	2022-11-07
PC00034	Samuel Richardson	2022-11-03	PC00069	David DeBolt	2022-11-07
PC00035	Elizabeth George	2022-11-03			

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00070	Denise Giardina	2022-11-07
PC00071	Lisa L. Clay	2022-11-07
PC00072	Sanra Hissom	2022-11-09
PC00073	Wesley Smith	2022-11-09
PC00074	Rachel Sallade	2022-11-09
PC00075	Debbie Kyle	2022-11-09
PC00076	Virginia Slack	2022-11-09
PC00077	Marlene R. Dial	2022-11-09
PC00078	Rachel Moon	2022-11-10
PC00079	Joshua Moon	2022-11-10
PC00080	Susan Patterson	2022-11-10
PC00081	Zach Fletcher	2022-11-10
PC00082	Mark Tabbert	2022-11-11
PC00083	Courtney Dowell	2022-11-13
PC00084	Lesley Robinson	2022-11-13
PC00085	Kathie Giltinan	2022-11-13
PC00086	Lindsay Emmite	2022-11-13
PC00087	Laura Alvis	2022-11-14
PC00088	Rachel Rubin	2022-11-14
PC00089	Debra Larch	2022-11-14
PC00090	Jonathan Marshall	2022-11-14
PC00091	Rhonda Marrone	2022-11-14
PC00092	Edward Milam	2022-11-15
PC00093	Edward Milam	2022-11-15
PC00094	Edward Milam	2022-11-15
PC00095	Edward Milam	2022-11-15
PC00096	Edward Milam	2022-11-15
PC00097	Robb Livingood	2022-11-16
PC00098	Stephanie Hysmith	2022-11-16
PC00099	Jennifer Bauman	2022-11-16
PC00100	Jp	2022-11-16
PC00101	Scott Wade	2022-11-16
PC00102	Beth Campbell	2022-11-17
PC00103	Jonathan Hill	2022-11-17
PC00104	Jennifer Hill	2022-11-17
PC00105	Kristen Sayre	2022-11-17
PC00106	Tina Stodola	2022-11-17

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00107	Benny Maynard	2022-11-17
PC00108	Anne Strawn	2022-11-17
PC00109	Tyler Tiano	2022-11-17
PC00110	Joshua Lucas	2022-11-17
PC00111	Nancy Ritter	2022-11-17
PC00112	Tia Triplett	2022-11-17
PC00113	Doug Krause	2022-11-17
PC00114	Libby Hoffmann	2022-11-17
PC00115	Carole Williams	2022-11-17
PC00116	Cassandra Wiley	2022-11-17
PC00117	Lorenz Steininger	2022-11-17
PC00118	Timothy Simmons	2022-11-17
PC00119	Steven Vogel	2022-11-17
PC00120	Erik Melear	2022-11-17
PC00121	Michelle Boyce	2022-11-17
PC00122	Neil Randolph	2022-11-17
PC00123	Michelle Sewald	2022-11-17
PC00124	Nancy Ward	2022-11-17
PC00125	Jillian Forschner	2022-11-17
PC00126	Kathryn Madison	2022-11-17
PC00127	Tom France	2022-11-17
PC00128	Leigh Taylor	2022-11-17
PC00129	Robert Skeen	2022-11-17
PC00130	Juli Johnson	2022-11-17
PC00131	Greg	2022-11-17
PC00132	Jennifer Dowmey	2022-11-17
PC00133	Elizabeth Farr	2022-11-17
PC00134	Kelly Mullins	2022-11-17
PC00135	John Brady	2022-11-17
PC00136	Carol Denney	2022-11-17
PC00137	Rachel McGuire	2022-11-17
PC00138	Kevin Moore	2022-11-17
PC00139	Rebecca S. Linger	2022-11-17
PC00140	Jerry Rivers	2022-11-17
PC00141	Heather Bladen	2022-11-17
PC00142	John Brady	2022-11-17
PC00143	Mary Wildfire	2022-11-17

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00144	Rachel M.	2022-11-18
PC00145	Bill Franz	2022-11-18
PC00146	Cynthia Ellis	2022-11-18
PC00147	Laura Miller	2022-11-18
PC00148	Rebecca Simpson	2022-11-18
PC00149	Julie Pratt	2022-11-18
PC00150	David DeBolt	2022-11-18
PC00151	Mary Lickert	2022-11-18
PC00152	John Harvey	2022-11-18
PC00153	Beverly Flores	2022-11-18
PC00154	Bailey Robert Chandler	2022-11-19
PC00155	Charles P. Wilson	2022-11-19
PC00156	Lauren Murdock	2022-11-19
PC00157	Mary L.	2022-11-19
PC00158	Megan Withrow	2022-11-19
PC00159	Karen Robinson	2022-11-19
PC00160	Sandra Squire	2022-11-19
PC00161	Hilary Glazer	2022-11-19
PC00162	Dan Carpenter	2022-11-19
PC00163	Robert Stanley	2022-11-19
PC00164	Kim	2022-11-19
PC00165	Dianne Anestis	2022-11-20
PC00166	Janet Belding	2022-11-20
PC00167	Tracey Todd	2022-11-20
PC00168	Ashley Piatt	2022-11-20
PC00169	Brian Pruegger	2022-11-20
PC00170	Ankur Kumar	2022-11-20
PC00171	Galen Miller	2022-11-20
PC00172	Mike Torreyson	2022-11-20
PC00173	Doug Wood	2022-11-20
PC00174	Melody Sizemore	2022-11-20
PC00175	Laura Ashley	2022-11-20
PC00176	Laura Ashley	2022-11-20
PC00177	Barbie Dallmann	2022-11-20
PC00178	Debra Vickers	2022-11-20
PC00179	Al Peery	2022-11-20
PC00180	Mark Halburn	2022-11-20

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00181	Faye Shaffer	2022-11-20
PC00182	[no name provided]	2022-11-20
PC00183	Anne Berry	2022-11-20
PC00184	Katie Mills	2022-11-20
PC00185	Kimberly Brown	2022-11-20
PC00186	Bill Ellison	2022-11-20
PC00187	Linda Farwell	2022-11-21
PC00188	Lois A. Ludwig	2022-11-21
PC00189	Jim Lange	2022-11-21
PC00190	Dottie Hess	2022-11-21
PC00191	Danita Nellhaus	2022-11-21
PC00192	Kathryne Smith	2022-11-21
PC00193	April Yoak	2022-11-21
PC00194	Margaret Schoening	2022-11-21
PC00195	Lewis Collins	2022-11-21
PC00196	Kara Arden	2022-11-21
PC00197	Joan Breiding	2022-11-21
PC00198	Melissa Waggy	2022-11-21
PC00199	Sheri Meadows	2022-11-21
PC00200	Eric Peters	2022-11-21
PC00201	Jack Hughes	2022-11-21
PC00202	Taylor Miller	2022-11-21
PC00203	Wesley Stover	2022-11-21
PC00204	Tori Myres	2022-11-21
PC00205	George Stablein	2022-11-21
PC00206	James V. Kelsh	2022-11-22
PC00207	Burton V. Sands	2022-11-22
PC00208	Sara O'Connor	2022-11-22
PC00209	Ellen Owen	2022-11-22
PC00210	Patricia Goff	2022-11-22
PC00211	Lisa Westfall	2022-11-22
PC00212	Betty Proctor	2022-11-22
PC00213	Connie M. Roadcap	2022-11-22
PC00214	Connie M. Roadcap	2022-11-22
PC00215	Bob Coffield	2022-11-22
PC00216	Zach	2022-11-22
PC00217	Jacob Daley	2022-11-22

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00218	Angelita Nixon	2022-11-22
PC00219	Martha Hopper	2022-11-22
PC00220	Rose Namay	2022-11-22
PC00221	Rhonda Marrone	2022-11-22
PC00222	John Doyle	2022-11-22
PC00223	Rhonda Marrone	2022-11-22
PC00224	Doug Krause	2022-11-22
PC00225	Rhonda Marrone	2022-11-22
PC00226	Timothy Simmons	2022-11-22
PC00227	Caitlin Brash	2022-11-22
PC00228	Rob Robertson	2022-11-22
PC00229	Barbara Steinke	2022-11-22
PC00230	Charles J. Wirts	2022-11-22
PC00231	Jeana Lipscomb	2022-11-22
PC00232	Natalie Proctor	2022-11-22
PC00233	Susan Churchill	2022-11-22
PC00234	Brooklynn Alls	2022-11-22
PC00235	Timothy J. Smith	2022-11-22
PC00236	Tracy Marsh	2022-11-22
PC00237	Helena Lee	2022-11-22
PC00238	Denise Ferris	2022-11-22
PC00239	Ted Boettner	2022-11-22
PC00240	John Harshbarger	2022-11-22
PC00241	Nancy Myers	2022-11-22
PC00242	Valerie Strege	2022-11-22
PC00243	Jason Gibson	2022-11-23
PC00244	Nick McCracken	2022-11-23
PC00245	Sierra Petry	2022-11-23
PC00246	Dan Bailey	2022-11-23
PC00247	Hope Cossin	2022-11-23
PC00248	Nick McCracken	2022-11-23
PC00249	Connie M. Roadcap	2022-11-23
PC00250	Connie M. Roadcap	2022-11-23
PC00251	Greg Buckley	2022-11-23
PC00252	Joseph	2022-11-23
PC00253	Tom Misch	2022-11-23
PC00254	Donna Miller	2022-11-23

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00255	Angelica Painter	2022-11-23
PC00256	Steve Roadcap	2022-11-23
PC00257	Nancy Taylor	2022-11-23
PC00258	Jennifer Baker	2022-11-23
PC00259	April Kittle	2022-11-23
PC00260	Marilou McClung	2022-11-23
PC00261	Rachel McGuire	2022-11-23
PC00262	Annette Roberts	2022-11-23
PC00263	Justyn Horton	2022-11-23
PC00264	Gabriele Wohl	2022-11-24
PC00265	Katie	2022-11-24
PC00266	Shawn Means	2022-11-24
PC00267	Timmy Mullins	2022-11-24
PC00268	David Sanchez	2022-11-24
PC00269	Jeff Sikorovsky	2022-11-24
PC00270	Matthew Schoolcraft	2022-11-24
PC00271	Carrie Dandy	2022-11-24
PC00272	Michael Robinson	2022-11-24
PC00273	Caleb Kinsolving	2022-11-24
PC00274	Perry Bryant	2022-11-24
PC00275	Osel	2022-11-24
PC00276	Kimberly Campbell	2022-11-24
PC00277	Dawn Shaw	2022-11-24
PC00278	Brianna Wood	2022-11-24
PC00279	Anthony Newhouse	2022-11-24
PC00280	Karen Kingrey	2022-11-24
PC00281	Sara Allen	2022-11-24
PC00282	Ruby Abdulla	2022-11-24
PC00283	Kathryn Stone	2022-11-24
PC00284	Gerald Stewart	2022-11-24
PC00285	Gina Griffith	2022-11-24
PC00286	Teresa Parcell	2022-11-24
PC00287	September	2022-11-25
PC00288	Brion Bearclaw	2022-11-25
PC00289	Dan Fields	2022-11-25
PC00290	Samuel Caldwell	2022-11-25
PC00291	Zachary McGuire	2022-11-25

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00292	Paula Jones	2022-11-25
PC00293	Angela Cruikshank	2022-11-25
PC00294	Bill Price	2022-11-25
PC00295	Amy Michael	2022-11-25
PC00296	Patricia D. Keiffer	2022-11-25
PC00297	Sydney	2022-11-25
PC00298	Elaine Komarow	2022-11-25
PC00299	Susan Kuhn	2022-11-25
PC00300	Doug Hughes	2022-11-25
PC00301	Joe Fitzwater	2022-11-25
PC00302	Derek T. Howard	2022-11-25
PC00303	Eva Crockett	2022-11-26
PC00304	Edwina Zeigler	2022-11-26
PC00305	Bonnie Stark	2022-11-26
PC00306	Barbara Smith	2022-11-26
PC00307	Sally Caraway	2022-11-26
PC00308	April	2022-11-26
PC00309	Kristina Whiteaker	2022-11-26
PC00310	Margaret H. Knorr	2022-11-26
PC00311	Carol Mollohan	2022-11-26
PC00312	Sarah McClanahan	2022-11-26
PC00313	Cullen	2022-11-26
PC00314	Taylor Jones-Martin	2022-11-26
PC00315	Marjorie Clarkson	2022-11-26
PC00316	Carlee Ojeda	2022-11-27
PC00317	D. Carnefix	2022-11-27
PC00318	Jonathan	2022-11-27
PC00319	Felicia Lewis	2022-11-27
PC00320	Jennifer Harrison	2022-11-27
PC00321	Ri-Anna Holcomb	2022-11-27
PC00322	Kimberly Frier	2022-11-27
PC00323	Edward Milam	2022-11-27
PC00324	Perry Bryant	2022-11-27
PC00325	Leslie Stone	2022-11-27
PC00326	Thomas Brown	2022-11-27
PC00327	Christopher Bryan Lavigne	2022-11-27
PC00328	Natalia Sanchez	2022-11-27

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00329	Steve Roadcap	2022-11-27
PC00330	Melinda J. Wines	2022-11-27
PC00331	Odell Russell	2022-11-27
PC00332	Ethan Evers	2022-11-27
PC00333	Peggy J. White	2022-11-27
PC00334	Connie M. Roadcap	2022-11-27
PC00335	Emily West	2022-11-27
PC00336	Emily West	2022-11-27
PC00337	Mary Ellen O'Farrell	2022-11-27
PC00338	Jamison Miller	2022-11-27
PC00339	Janet James	2022-11-27
PC00340	Rene Hill	2022-11-27
PC00341	Jeremy Severn	2022-11-27
PC00342	Earl Fridley	2022-11-27
PC00343	Jenica Showman	2022-11-27
PC00344	Mara Thompson	2022-11-27
PC00345	Hunter Hissom	2022-11-27
PC00346	Elwood Penn	2022-11-27
PC00347	Conni Gratop Lewis	2022-11-27
PC00348	Billie McNeely	2022-11-27
PC00349	Kathryn Stone	2022-11-27
PC00350	Chris Ramos	2022-11-27
PC00351	Earl Fridley	2022-11-27
PC00352	Rick Bolser	2022-11-28
PC00353	Kendal	2022-11-28
PC00354	Kylie Byers	2022-11-28
PC00355	Ruth Burdette	2022-11-28
PC00356	Chester Burdette	2022-11-28
PC00357	Julia Statler	2022-11-28
PC00358	Noah A. Gillispie	2022-11-28
PC00359	Michael G. Miskowiec	2022-11-28
PC00360	Adam Fleck	2022-11-28
PC00361	Grant Wesley Morris	2022-11-28
PC00362	Dennis Strawn	2022-11-28
PC00363	Anita May	2022-11-28
PC00364	Betty Ann Miskowiec	2022-11-28
PC00365	Darren Olofson	2022-11-28

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00366	Wv Tim	2022-11-28
PC00367	Linda G. Koval	2022-11-28
PC00368	Thomas Hamrick	2022-11-28
PC00369	Lynn Gunnoe	2022-11-28
PC00370	Mary Sheets	2022-11-28
PC00371	Ellen Kaye Halstead	2022-11-28
PC00372	Kaylynn Mollohan	2022-11-28
PC00373	Jennifer Weidlich	2022-11-28
PC00374	Marylin McKeown	2022-11-28
PC00375	John Northeimer	2022-11-28
PC00376	Charles Maurer	2022-11-28
PC00377	Emily Davis	2022-11-28
PC00378	Theresa Daugherty	2022-11-28
PC00379	David McMahon	2022-11-28
PC00380	James Peterson	2022-11-28
PC00381	Michael Pauley	2022-11-28
PC00382	Steve Thompson	2022-11-28
PC00383	Darin Crow	2022-11-28
PC00384	Cynthia Ellis	2022-11-28
PC00385	Tina Humphreys	2022-11-28
PC00386	Judith Skidmore	2022-11-28
PC00387	Janell West	2022-11-28
PC00388	Tim Bradford	2022-11-28
PC00389	Courtney Dowell	2022-11-28
PC00390	Rebecca Park	2022-11-28
PC00391	Charles E. Halstead	2022-11-28
PC00392	Sara, a Mom in Kanawha County	2022-11-28
PC00393	Seven Year-Old in Kanawha County	2022-11-28
PC00394	Sharon Pittman	2022-11-28
PC00395	Jeanne Chandler	2022-11-28
PC00396	Autumn Walker	2022-11-28
PC00397	Susan Black	2022-11-28
PC00398	Crystal	2022-11-28
PC00399	Pam Rockwell	2022-11-28
PC00400	Pam Ruediger	2022-11-28
PC00401	Holly Bradley	2022-11-28

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00402	Alan Kuhlman	2022-11-28
PC00403	Chelsea Schoolcraft	2022-11-28
PC00404	Barbara Frierson	2022-11-28
PC00405	Mia Barreda	2022-11-28
PC00406	Adam Craten	2022-11-28
PC00407	Christina Hudson	2022-11-28
PC00408	Rosemary Severn	2022-11-28
PC00409	Martha Horvath	2022-11-28
PC00410	Richard Wolfe	2022-11-28
PC00411	Rosa Maurer	2022-11-28
PC00412	Chrissy Zeltner	2022-11-28
PC00413	Scott Moreland	2022-11-29
PC00414	David Wheatcraft	2022-11-29
PC00415	Tony Basham	2022-11-29
PC00416	Fox Burroughs	2022-11-29
PC00417	Kiah	2022-11-29
PC00418	Autumn Gardner	2022-11-29
PC00419	Joyce Armstead	2022-11-29
PC00420	Shannon Grizzle	2022-11-29
PC00421	Ned Whiteaker	2022-11-29
PC00422	Julianne Grady	2022-11-29
PC00423	Tim Cavender	2022-11-29
PC00424	Dr. Desiree Harper	2022-11-29
PC00425	Chris White	2022-11-29
PC00426	Eve Marcum-Atkinson	2022-11-29
PC00427	Sam Bedinger	2022-11-29
PC00428	Jay O'Neal	2022-11-29
PC00429	Robert Belding	2022-11-29
PC00430	Jackie Hughes	2022-11-29
PC00431	Patricia McGill	2022-11-29
PC00432	Emily	2022-11-29
PC00433	Danielle	2022-11-29
PC00434	Meg Reishman	2022-11-29
PC00435	Pam Curry	2022-11-29
PC00436	Susan Dust	2022-11-29
PC00437	Mark B. Davis	2022-11-29
PC00438	James D. Kauffelt	2022-11-29

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00439	Mick Wiseman	2022-11-29
PC00440	Debora Mattingly	2022-11-29
PC00441	Ed Weber	2022-11-29
PC00442	Robin L. Godfrey	2022-11-29
PC00443	Takeiya Smith	2022-11-29
PC00444	Takeiya Smith	2022-11-29
PC00445	Morgan King	2022-11-29
PC00446	Samantha Nygaard	2022-11-29
PC00447	Sarah Fox	2022-11-29
PC00448	Taylor W. Raab	2022-11-29
PC00449	Linda Kolb	2022-11-29
PC00450	Donald Holcomb	2022-11-29
PC00451	Kaylee Runyan	2022-11-29
PC00452	[personal information removed]	2022-11-29
PC00453	Lois Kuhl	2022-11-29
PC00454	Jo Anne Christian	2022-11-29
PC00455	Michelle Burk	2022-11-29
PC00456	James Caudill	2022-11-29
PC00457	Paula Kaufman	2022-11-29
PC00458	Mary Ann Workman	2022-11-29
PC00459	Thornton Cooper	2022-11-29
PC00460	Olaf R. Funfstuck II	2022-11-29
PC00461	Alexis Yost	2022-11-29
PC00462	Shirley Bonnett	2022-11-29
PC00463	Adam Knauff	2022-11-29
PC00464	Sarah Wright	2022-11-29
PC00465	Erin Holmes	2022-11-29
PC00466	Jorene	2022-11-29
PC00467	Marshall Spradling	2022-11-29
PC00468	Greg Ray Hill	2022-11-29
PC00469	Amanda Fields	2022-11-29
PC00470	Lisa Pettigrew	2022-11-29

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PC00471	Jennie Hill	2022-11-29
PC00472	Daniel Christopher Hale	2022-11-29
PC00473	Kim Hundley	2022-11-29
PC00474	Cherokee	2022-11-29
PC00475	Mary Biel	2022-11-29
PC00476	Margi Bush	2022-11-29
PC00477	Jon Boggs	2022-11-29
PC00478	Pam Hylbert-Eder	2022-11-29
PC00479	Jim Waggy	2022-11-29
PC00480	B. Scott Eder	2022-11-29
PC00481	Reba Murphy	2022-11-29
PC00482	Frank Skidmore	2022-11-29
PC00483	John	2022-11-29
PC00484	Laurie Thompsen	2022-11-29
PC00485	Ella Belling	2022-11-29
PC00486	Nancy Hill	2022-11-29
PC00487	Billy Wiseman	2022-11-29
PC00488	Jean Davis	2022-11-29
PC00489	Tawney Mangus	2022-11-29
PC00490	Johnna Bailey	2022-11-29
PC00491	R. Hughes	2022-11-29
PC00492	Phillip Smith	2022-11-29
PC00493	Teresa Quigley	2022-11-29
PC00494	Teresa Quigley	2022-11-29
PC00495	R. Hughes	2022-11-29
PC00496	Ginny Stuck	2022-11-29
PC00497	William Ross	2022-11-30
PC00498	Michael Chapman	2022-11-30
PC00499	David Dickens	2022-11-30
PC00500	Nadia	2022-11-30
PC00501	Nicole Grimes	2022-11-30

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., February 2023.

TABLE 5 INDEX OF ORAL COMMENTS BY COMMENT SUBMISSION IDENTIFICATION (ID)

COMMENT ID	COMMENTER	DATE RECEIVED
PM00001	Travis Copen	2022-11-02
PM00002	Julie Sigmon	2022-11-02
PM00003	Rosemary Letart	2022-11-02
PM00004	Heather Sprouse	2022-11-02
PM00005	Chad Cordell	2022-11-02
PM00006	Jim Waggy	2022-11-02
PM00007	Wesley Holden	2022-11-03
PM00008	Wesley Holden	2022-11-03
PM00009	Jack Jarvis	2022-11-03
PM00010	Jack Jarvis	2022-11-03

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

2. COMMENT TOPICS

Individual comments within comment submissions received were categorized based on the general topics listed in **Table 6**. Comment submission letters, forms, or oral statements were not limited to one category; for example, if a comment letter included comments on multiple topics, it was included in the count for each topic addressed. Similarly, individual comments were further categorized by subtopic, as shown in **Table 7**. Key issues and specific concerns for each topic and subtopic are further discussed below. Individual comments have been summarized and/or combined as appropriate, with certain comments requiring some degree of interpretation. However, it is important to note that the FAA has not verified the accuracy of any comments. See Section 3 for FAA’s approach to addressing scoping comments. Comment submission letters, forms, or statements that included either support for or opposition of the Proposed Project are shown in **Table 8**. Comment submission letters, forms, or statements that did not specifically state a clear opinion for or against the Proposed Project were counted separately.

TABLE 6 GENERAL COMMENT TOPICS

TOPIC	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COMMENTS
EIS Process	130
Purpose and Need	240
Alternatives	145
Environmental Resources	460

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

TABLE 7 COMMENT SUB-TOPICS

SUB-TOPIC	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COMMENTS
EIS Process	
General Process	115
Community Engagement	110
Political Involvement/External Influence	15
Purpose and Need	
Air Service and Air Traffic Demand	160
Cost/Funding	40
Economy, Tourism, and Population Growth	75
Geotechnical Concerns	150
Aircraft and Passenger Safety	30
Runway Length/Deficiencies	40
Terminal Deficiencies and Improved Passenger Experience	20
General Project Concerns	40
Alternatives	
No Action	10
Construction of a New Airport	100
Bridge the Runway Extension	10
Other/New	50
Environmental Resources	
Air Quality	20
Biological Resources	170
Climate	100
Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) Resources	435
Hazardous Materials/Pollution Prevention	35
Historic Resources	20
Noise and Vibration	15
Public Health	30
Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, and Children's Environmental Health and Safety Risks	15
Visual Resources	10
Water Resources	185

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

TABLE 8 PROJECT SUPPORT/OPPOSITION

	APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF COMMENTS
Opposition	120
Support	30
Unspecified Project Opinion	370

SOURCE: Ricondo & Associates, Inc., January 2023.

2.1 EIS PROCESS

Approximately 130 of the comment submissions received expressed concerns related to the EIS process required for the Proposed Project, including: the general EIS process; community engagement; and political and external involvement and influence. Comments related to each subtopic are discussed below.

2.1.1 GENERAL PROCESS

Approximately 115 comment submissions expressed concerns regarding the general EIS process and the underlying data used to determine the scope of the Proposed Project. Stated concerns included a lack of trust for the EIS process and requests for all planning data and supporting documents to be made publicly available.

Specific comments included:

- Request(s) for an extension to the public comment period
- Concern(s) that the project has been rushed without a complete look into environmental impacts and alternatives
- Expression(s) of a lack of trust in the EIS process
- Opinion(s) that the EIS should be completed prior to considering construction options
- Fear(s) that the Proposed Project is final, and acquisition of Coonskin Park will happen regardless of the conclusions in the EIS
- Opinion(s) that the public should be able to vote on the Proposed Project
- Request(s) that all project information should be provided in layman’s terms
- Statement(s) that the EIS must include a project feasibility analysis
- Concern(s) over what professional engineering expertise is being consulted
- Request(s) that all internal data and reports used to prepare the EIS should be made publicly available
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should calculate the potential cost for the greatest amount of environmental damages that could occur from the Proposed Project and set aside a contingency fund or bond to cover such costs

2.1.2 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

Approximately 110 comment submissions provided feedback related to community engagement throughout the EIS process. Submitted comments included requests for public hearings, opinions regarding the importance of public engagement, and concerns related to full transparency.

Specific comments included:

- Request(s) for public hearings to provide the opportunity for the interested public to speak and receive responses from officials, with a request for at least one public hearing held in Coonskin Park
- Concern(s) that public input in the decision-making process will be disregarded and that the scoping process is only intended to allow the public to air their grievances
- Report(s) that notice of the public comment period was not published on the Airport's website
- Opinion(s) that public transparency and engagement are essential throughout the EIS process

2.1.3 POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT/EXTERNAL INFLUENCE

Approximately 15 comment submissions expressed concerns related to potential political involvement and external influence associated with the Proposed Project. Stated concerns related to promises for financial compensation, conflicts of interest, and the acquisition of Coonskin Park.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) that promises were made to individuals that would benefit from the Proposed Project
- Belief(s) that an agreement exists between the Kanawha County Commission and the Airport, promising that Coonskin Park can be used for Airport development
- Request(s) that the EIS fully disclose what organizations, individuals, companies, and/or politicians would financially benefit from the Proposed Project
- Statement(s) that those in power get what they want regardless of what the public thinks about it
- Opinion(s) that residents will not stay in Charleston when they feel their government has no respect for the land they value
- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project is intended to benefit politicians and Airport officials
- Concern(s) that members of the CWVRAA may have a conflict of interest in keeping CRW at its existing location
- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project is a result of politicians looking for federal funding for their districts
- Belief(s) that the Kanawha County Commission only appoints members to the Parks and Recreation Board who value the Airport more than Coonskin Park
- Concern(s) as to whom the runway extension is intended to benefit
- Concern(s) that portions of Coonskin Park have already been purchased by CWVRAA

2.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

Approximately 240 of the comment submissions received expressed concerns related to the Purpose and Need of the Proposed Project, including: air traffic and passenger demand; funding mechanisms and overall cost of the project; impacts to economy, tourism, and population retention; geotechnical and landslide safety; passenger and aircraft safety; existing runway length and runway deficiencies; existing terminal deficiencies and the proposed improved passenger experience; and general project concerns. Comments related to each subtopic are discussed below.

2.2.1 AIR SERVICE AND AIR TRAFFIC DEMAND

Approximately 160 comment submissions were received regarding projected air traffic demand. Stated concerns included the lack of existing commercial air traffic and the underlying data used to forecast future air traffic demand.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that the Airport operates four commercial flights a day; daily air traffic does not justify the Proposed Project
- Concern(s) as to what data was used to determine the need for increased aviation service
- Belief(s) that there is not a need to accommodate larger aircraft even if there is a demand
- Prediction(s) that the Proposed Project would provide opportunities for new aircraft technology and would place West Virginia at the forefront of modern aviation advancement
- Opinion(s) that added service to Orlando, Dallas, and Detroit offer little benefit and are speculative
- Belief(s) that travelers do not fly out of CRW because it is too expensive
- Claim(s) that the Airport has experienced a decline in passengers over the last decade
- Prediction(s) that aircraft technology will be different in 20 years and a longer runway may no longer be needed
- Belief(s) that local workforce is traveling less due to the convenience of teleconferences
- Claim(s) that most residents who live within 50 miles of the Airport live closer to the Huntington Tri-State Airport
- Statement(s) that the Proposed Project is driven by the Airport's 20-year aviation forecast; however, in 20 years, Charleston's population would be less than 40,000 people and largely made up of senior citizens
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS consultant team should confirm with airline performance teams that the Proposed Project would allow for maximum amount of revenue to be brought in and out of the proposed upgraded Airport
- Claim(s) that half of the gates at the existing terminal are not used
- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project is intended to accommodate private jets
- Concern(s) over maintaining a mountaintop airport that cannot meet the demands of the future

2.2.2 COST/FUNDING

Approximately 40 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to cost and funding for the Proposed Project. Concerns included inefficient use of funding, lack of justification for the cost of the project, and beliefs that funding would be better spent on construction of a new airport.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) as to how the Airport would pay for the Proposed Project
- Opinion(s) that existing air traffic demand does not justify the cost of the Proposed Project
- Opinion(s) that construction of a new airport would be more cost-effective
- Opinion(s) that the financial investment would be wasted on a temporary fix to a larger problem
- Opinion(s) that the Proposed Project is a waste of taxpayers' money

- Opinion(s) that funding for the Proposed Project would be better spent on other projects
- Claim(s) that CRW cannot pay existing airlines to add new routes, nor can they pay new airlines to begin service at the Airport
- Opinion(s) that funding should be used to improve the Airport within its existing footprint
- Concern(s) that the cost is significant for only a 285-foot runway extension
- Concern(s) that funding will be spent without assurances that new airlines would begin service at the Airport

2.2.3 ECONOMY, TOURISM, AND POPULATION GROWTH

Approximately 75 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to economic development, impacts on tourism, and local population retention. Stated comments included desire for increased economic development opportunities and concern about decreased tourism and population retention associated with impacts to Coonskin Park.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) that a longer runway at CRW would not promote tourism
- Statement(s) that the state, county, and city are attempting to improve regional population growth and retention; reducing the footprint of Coonskin Park would negatively impact these efforts
- Statement(s) that the West Virginia Department of Tourism designed the West Virginia Waterfall trail system to promote tourism; loss of the grotto and hiking trails within Coonskin Park would negatively impact tourism
- Statement(s) that the Airport is integral to the local economy; the Proposed Project would benefit the economy and the state's infrastructure
- Suggestion(s) for investment in economic stimulus that would benefit both businesses and citizens; not one at the expense of the other
- Concern(s) that acquisition of Coonskin Park would sabotage Elk River towns' tourism plans
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study the potential economic benefits of constructing a new central airport
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would improve the quality of life for southern West Virginians by increasing business opportunities
- Concern(s) as to what role business demand plays in supporting the Proposed Project
- Opposition to the perceived notion of "build it and they will come"

2.2.4 GEOTECHNICAL CONCERNS

Approximately 150 comment submissions were received concerning the geotechnical safety of the fill necessary for the proposed runway extension. Comments included distrust following previous slope failures and environmental concerns related to a potential failure.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project has an even greater chance of collapse than the previous small extension that failed in 2015, which devastated residential homes and a place of worship

- Belief(s) that the Keystone Drive catastrophe shows that this site cannot withstand the scope of the Proposed Project
- Statement(s) that residents experienced destruction to their personal properties following the 2015 slope failure; some damage to personal property has yet to be resolved by the Airport
- Statement(s) that mudslides are prone to occur in the steep slopes surrounding the Airport; past mistakes should not be repeated
- Concern(s) that landing heavy aircraft on an engineered extension would increase the risk of failure
- Opposition to building up unstable land surrounding a mountaintop in the name of safety
- Opinion(s) that, while the chance of a slope failure is small, the consequences would be severe
- Concern(s) that a slope failure would dam the Elk River
- Concern(s) as to what preventative measures are being taken to ensure another slope failure does not occur
- Concern(s) that prior expansions have resulted in environmental damages to Coonskin Park and the Elk River Rail Trail, as well as aquatic damages to Coonskin Branch and the Elk River
- Statement(s) that the public is not confident in the construction feasibility of the Proposed Project
- Suggestion(s) that a Slide Mitigation Plan should be developed and discussed in detail in the EIS
- Concern(s) over the retaining wall failing and flooding the Elk River, and subsequently Mink Shoals
- Concern(s) over the amount of fill material needed for the project

2.2.5 AIRCRAFT AND PASSENGER SAFETY

Approximately 30 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to aircraft and passenger safety at the Airport. Stated comments included support for the proposed safety enhancements, but concern over the Airport's location and existing runway safety.

Specific comments included:

- Opinion(s) that the Proposed Project would enhance safety at the Airport
- Concern(s) about safety of aircraft operations at CRW with existing runway deficiencies
- Opinion(s) that passengers would feel safer landing on a longer runway that is consistent with FAA safety standards
- Concern(s) that CRW has a greater-than-average aircraft incident frequency due to its position on a mountaintop
- Concern(s) over the current usable runway safety area (RSA) following the 2015 slope failure and what usable length various aircraft require
- Question(s) as to whether implementation of the Proposed Project is mandated by the FAA to continue current operations at the Airport
- Concern(s) regarding the safety of the Airport's location
- Concern(s) that the area's mountainous terrain may adversely impact lengthy descents and landings of larger aircraft

2.2.6 RUNWAY LENGTH/DEFICIENCIES

Approximately 40 comment submissions provided feedback regarding the existing runway length and associated deficiencies, as well as questions regarding future runway length. Comments included concerns regarding the current runway length, what data was used to determine the forecast fleet mix, and how surrounding terrain would impact runway operations.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) as to how the existing runway length was deemed insufficient and how the desired runway length was determined
- Opinion(s) that the Airport needs a 10,000-foot runway
- Statement(s) that Southwest Airlines aircraft land at Chicago Midway International Airport with a runway length of 6,521 feet
- Report(s) that the instrument landing system (ILS) approach to the Runway 23 end sets off the radar altimeter on short final landing and current restrictions do not allow for autopilot usage below 1,700 feet
- Report(s) that it is difficult to land on Runway 5-23 with under a 7,000-foot runway
- Report(s) that even with a 0.8 percent downgrade, the Runway 5 departure end is almost always unavailable due to the terrain off the departure end due to performance requirements for Bombardier Canadair Regional Jet (CRJ) aircraft
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should consider if the mountain to the northeast and climb gradients when taking off to the east would be a factor in the proposed runway extension
- Opinion(s) that the project is being proposed because the Air National Guard needs a longer runway for their aircraft
- Concern(s) as to how the forecast fleet mix was determined
- Concern(s) as to what data was used to determine that the current and future aircraft fleet cannot safely utilize Runway 5-23 as is
- Claim(s) that the extended runway would still end in a steep drop off

2.2.7 TERMINAL DEFICIENCIES AND IMPROVED PASSENGER EXPERIENCE

Approximately 20 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to existing terminal deficiencies and the improved passenger experience associated with the Proposed Project. Comments pertained to the small and outdated terminal facility and the need for modern amenities and desirable service routes.

Specific comments included:

- Statement(s) of existing terminal deficiencies such as: the entrance is too small; there is only one entrance to the security gate; security lines are too long; lack of elevators for those with ability needs; and the main waiting facility restrooms are too small
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would reduce the need to make connecting flights
- Opinion(s) that West Virginia deserves the modern amenities that a new terminal building would offer
- Claim(s) that travelers would no longer need to drive to neighboring states for desirable service routes

- Claim(s) that parking connected to the terminal would be convenient
- Desire for there to be room to add additional gates to the proposed terminal
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would expand flight sizes and options and accommodate travel to more destinations
- Claim(s) that there is no space for large cargo carriers to park their aircraft; therefore, cargo service goes to Huntington Tri-State Airport instead of CRW
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would not significantly improve passenger's overall travel experience
- Statement(s) that the Proposed Project is long overdue
- Concern(s) over the amount of maintenance that would be required following implementation of the Proposed Project

2.2.8 GENERAL PROJECT CONCERNS

Approximately 40 comment submissions expressed concern regarding the justification of the Proposed Project. Concerns included declining state and city-wide populations, project feasibility, and trivial improvements to the Airport.

Specific comments include:

- Claim(s) that state and city-wide populations are declining; the Airport is sufficient to serve the local population
- Prediction(s) that Charleston will likely always be a small city; CRW will never be a large hub Airport for any airline
- Statement(s) that additional airlines and flight services are not guaranteed
- Opinion(s) that improvements associated with the Proposed Project would be minimal
- Prediction(s) that the Proposed Project would not reduce the price of airline tickets
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project is generally unwanted by most residents

2.3 ALTERNATIVES

Approximately 145 of the comment submissions received provided feedback on alternatives to the Proposed Project. Commenters provided support for and/or suggestions of project alternatives. Alternatives to the proposed Runway 5-23 shift and extension consisted mostly of construction of a new airport. Comments related to each subtopic are discussed below.

2.3.1 NO ACTION

Approximately 10 comment submissions from public commenters and a local organization provided feedback pertaining to the No Action Alternative. Comments expressed support for a no action/no build alternative.

Specific comments included:

- Opinion(s) that this expansion is not worth losing Coonskin Park
- Expression(s) of satisfaction with current service and size of planes
- Claim(s) that the Airport successfully served Charleston when its population was larger than it is today

- Opinion(s) that the EMAS on the Runway 5 end functions successfully
- Opinion(s) that the runway length is sufficient as is
- Claim(s) that there is no more available space to expand CRW

2.3.2 CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW AIRPORT

Approximately 100 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to the construction of a new airport. Comments related to capacity for future Airport development and expansion, potential airport locations, economic benefits, and support for revisiting the construction of a central airport for Charleston and Huntington.

Specific comments included:

- Suggestion(s) to consider a location previously leveled by surface mining or mountaintop removal.
- Specific commented locations include:
 - Between Kanawha County and Putnam County
 - Eastern Kanawha, Lincoln, Boone, Nicholas, or Mason Counties
 - Sissonville, a census-designated place in Kanawha County
 - Old strip mine in Belle across from Riverside High School
 - Buffalo, a town in Putnam County
 - Between Hurricane and Huntington
 - The Hobet mine site off US Route 119 South
 - The Kanawha or Teays Valley
 - The Interstate 64 (I-64) corridor between Charleston and Huntington
 - Across the Kanawha River north of Montgomery
- Claim(s) that a new regional airport on flat land would provide room for future development and would benefit local economies
- Suggestion(s) to revisit the idea of building a central airport to support both Charleston and Huntington
- Suggestion(s) to build a new airport rather than continuously trying to make a tenuous location safer and large enough to serve increasing passenger demand
- Opinion(s) that relocation seems practical as the Airport is proposing to improve everything other than the parking garage
- Claim(s) that construction of a new airport would provide sufficient parking space required for large cargo carriers such as FedEx and UPS
- Request(s) that the EIS should include a feasibility study for constructing a new airport
- Suggestion(s) that, if CRW is relocated, a natural energy facility could be constructed at the Airport's existing location as it receives ample sun and wind; this could improve the county's tax revenue and energy delivery
- Expression(s) of support for a full evaluation of alternative sites for a new airport

- Suggestion(s) to sell CRW to the Air National Guard and use the money, along with the funding for the Proposed Project, to build a new airport
- Suggestion(s) to relocate the Airport to a more accessible area where a larger portion of the population would use the airport, resulting in more business
- Claim(s) that it would take more effort to engineer the runway extension than it would to relocate the Airport
- Suggestion(s) to construct a regional international airport for West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio

2.3.3 BRIDGE THE RUNWAY EXTENSION

Approximately 10 comment submissions provided feedback regarding a bridged runway extension. Comments included feasibility examples and suggestions for implementation. Commenter support for a bridged runway extension derives from an interest in decreasing the level of impact on Coonskin Park.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that bridging has been used for runway extensions at other airports, such as the former Stapleton International Airport
- Suggestion(s) to build a bridge using the same steel that was used for the New River Gorge Bridge, which is an example of bridging capabilities over a park
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park would be kept mostly intact and environmental damage would be less severe if the runway extension were bridged
- Suggestion(s) to consider bridging the runway extension to the southwest
- Suggestion(s) to extend the runway with a bridge over Twomile Creek and Keystone Drive and connect the runway to the flattened hilltop on the south side of the valley
- Claim(s) that a bridge would reduce the need for soil excavation and would reduce maintenance needs

2.3.4 OTHER/NEW

Approximately 50 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to other or new alternatives, instead of the Proposed Project. Comments included interest in only minor upgrades to the Airport, use of an Engineering Materials Arresting System (EMAS), and extending the runway in another direction.

Specific examples included:

- Suggestion(s) that a permanent runway solution should be studied and implemented
- Suggestion(s) to leave the Airport as is with only a few minor upgrades to the terminal
- Suggestion(s) to offer a shuttle service for passengers who desire route service on aircraft that cannot be accommodated at CRW
- Opinion(s) that the Proposed Project should be on a much smaller scale
- Suggestion(s) that, rather than extending the runway, try to get smaller airline companies to increase service to existing routes to capture the needs of those who utilize CRW
- Suggestion(s) to place EMAS at the Runway 23 end
- Suggestion(s) to only allow improvements within the property owned by the Airport

- Suggestion(s) to revise the cut/fill plan to leave the grotto and the Alice Knight Trail untouched
- Suggestion(s) to extend the runway to the southwest
- Suggestion(s) to designate a separate location and runway, outside of Charleston city limits, for training, specifically touch-and-go runs
- Suggestion(s) to build a tunnel that would allow access to the back end of the park
- Suggestion(s) to consider an alternative that fulfills the project's purpose and need but retains as much green space in Coonskin Park as possible

2.4 ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES

Approximately 460 of the comment submissions received expressed concern pertaining to one or more of the individual environmental resource categories discussed below. Comment submission totals for each of the individual resource categories is representative of the number of comments, out of the 460, that expressed concern over that specific resource category. Commenters expressed concern for air quality, wildlife and habitat impacts, climate impacts, Section 4(f) resources and the community's natural areas, hazardous materials and pollution, impacts to historical and cultural resources, noise impacts, socioeconomic impacts, visual impacts, and impacts to water resources. Comments centered around concerns regarding the loss and replacement of portions of Coonskin Park and associated impacts on the community.

2.4.1 AIR QUALITY

Approximately 20 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to air quality. Comments pertained to existing poor air quality conditions, a lack of air quality reports to date, and requests for air quality assessments.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) as to how the Proposed Project would impact air quality
- Concern(s) regarding the lack of air quality reports produced by the Airport to date
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should provide an air quality assessment for both current and anticipated air and roadway traffic
- Request(s) that the EIS study air quality and community impacts associated with hauling significant amounts of fill material
- Prediction(s) that the Proposed Project would further remove Charleston's natural air filtration defense system by removing a mature forest
- Claim(s) that the Kanawha Valley has a history of poor air quality due to air inversions

2.4.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Approximately 170 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to biological resources. Comments included requests for thorough wildlife and habitat surveys; concern over impacts to flora, fauna, and native habitats; and the presence of threatened and endangered species.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) over the disruption and loss of flora, fauna, and native habitat within Coonskin Park

- Claim(s) that Eastern Box Turtle populations are threatened by human development and are listed as a threatened species by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN); the slow reproductive rate of the Eastern Box Turtle would not allow for fast recovery in the face of severe local population decline
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study impacts on local wildlife populations and subsequent cumulative impacts on the species as a whole
- Report(s) that the Elk River and Coonskin Branch are designated as critical habitat for the endangered Diamond Darter
- Report(s) of sightings of Bald Eagles, Scarlet Tanagers, Saw-whet Owls, and Great Horned Owls; concern(s) over disrupting bird nesting cycles and losing birdwatching opportunities
- Claim(s) that the Elk River supports six federally listed threatened and endangered mussel species, including Clubshell, Fanshell, Northern Riffleshell, Pink Mucket, Rayed Bean, and Snuffbox
- Suggestion(s) that thorough surveys of all terrestrial and aquatic habitats within the proposed expansion footprint should be conducted to assess a base level of habitat quality and flora and fauna found in the habitats year-round
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should develop a rapid-response plan to immediately mitigate environmental damages incurred to terrestrial and aquatic habitats caused by project failures
- Report(s) that there are five federally listed threatened and endangered bat species, and their habitats, within Coonskin Park, including the Indiana Bat, Gray Bat, Northern Long-eared Bat, Tri-colored Bat, and the Virginia Big-eared Bat
- Concern(s) over migratory birds, squirrels, raccoons, foxes, deer, frogs, bats, turtles, lizards, chipmunks, wild turkeys, and other mammals and reptiles present within Coonskin Park
- Report(s) that the Goldenseal Root and several species of fungi are native to Coonskin Park and are not frequently found in other areas
- Concern(s) over Hemlock trees, which are near threatened
- Report(s) that Coonskin Branch provides habitat for threatened and endangered species, including habitat for the Cerulean Warbler and Green Salamander, two state-listed species in Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN)
- Concern(s) as to what steps would be taken to lessen impacts on aquatic species and their habitats
- Report(s) that WVDNR has listed 14 species of salamanders as species of concern; a survey should be completed to determine the presence of salamanders and bog turtles within Coonskin Park
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should mitigate for reductions in biodiversity

2.4.3 CLIMATE

Approximately 100 comment submissions provided feedback related to climate. Climate concerns include deforestation, carbon storage loss, and severe weather impacts.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) that air traffic contributes to global warming; there is no need to invest in soon-to-be obsolete technology and infrastructure
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would negatively impact climate

- Concern(s) over decreases in carbon sequestration and carbon storage loss associated with deforestation
- Statement(s) that the Biden Administration requires federal agencies to incorporate the prevention of greenhouse gas emissions and biodiversity losses into their project oversight processes
- Recommendation(s) that the EIS should calculate the amount of carbon that would be emitted from increased air traffic emissions and a reduction in vegetated landscape
- Recommendation(s) that wildlife, streams, forests, and quality of life must be prioritized as the environmental crisis accelerates
- Report(s) that mature forests, which reduce CO₂ in the atmosphere, have positive, anti-warming effects on the climate
- Claim(s) that Charleston already experiences significant rainfall that will be exacerbated by climate change; severe rainfall events contribute to the likelihood of land and mudslides
- Concern(s) as to how reductions in carbon storage loss would be quantified
- Suggestion(s) that carbon sequestration losses should be mitigated by planting diverse species of native forbs, shrubs, and trees on open lands at a replacement ratio of 10:1, since mature forest sequester significantly more carbon than early succession forests

2.4.4 SECTION 4(f) AND SECTION 6(f) RESOURCES

Approximately 435 of the comment submissions received expressed concerns pertaining to impacts on Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources. Stated concerns related to existing uses and projected impacts to Coonskin Park and the selection of replacement property for Coonskin Park. Comments related to each subtopic are discussed below.

2.4.4.1 COONSKIN PARK

Approximately 400 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to impacts to Coonskin Park. Stated concerns included the acquisition of portions of Coonskin Park, the loss of recreational opportunities, and the loss of unique geographic park features.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that Charleston residents only fly occasionally but frequently visit Coonskin Park (more people use Coonskin Park daily than the Airport)
- Concern(s) over losing irreplaceable natural geographic features, including rock formations, waterfalls, streams, and caves
- Concern(s) over losing valuable park features including picnic shelters, playgrounds, the clubhouse, the Gorman shelter, the Kanawha Valley Railroad Club, and the sports field
- Statement(s) that Coonskin Park provides an essential space for children to recreate and explore nature
- Claim(s) that families, churches, and community groups and organizations hold events in the picnic shelters; Coonskin Park provides free and accessible outdoor public meeting spaces
- Concern(s) over filling in the upper portion of Coonskin Park; it is insufficient to preserve the pool and golf course but not recreational natural areas

- Statement(s) that Coonskin Park is a part of Charleston history; members of the public have built memories at and have emotional connections to the park
- Concern(s) over losing hiking trails including the Elk River Trail and the Alice Knight Memorial Trail; the public would no longer frequent Coonskin Park without access to these trails
- Opinion(s) that the negative impact to Coonskin Park outweighs any potential benefit of the Proposed Project
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park provides the only non-roadside walking trails in Charleston
- Statement(s) that Coonskin Park provides a respite from Charleston's built environment; other cities are working to increase their green spaces, not destroy them
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park is the only local park accessible by public transportation
- Statement(s) that the oxygen-producing capacity of forests provides benefits to wildlife, land/water quality, and human health
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should consider the unique nature and high-quality scenic value of Coonskin Park while considering approval of the Proposed Project and/or mitigation measures
- Claim(s) that rock formations along the Alice Knight Trail are valued for their size, frequency, and unlikeness to other rock formations in the area
- Claim(s) that park users depend on the natural elevation within Coonskin Park for cardio exercise
- Report(s) that Coonskin Park provided a safe space for families to escape isolation during the COVID-19 pandemic
- Report(s) that the Kanawha County Commission recently banned timbering in Coonskin Park to allow the forest to return to an old-growth condition
- Claim(s) that the other two parks in Kanawha County do not provide the same natural amenities and opportunities as close to downtown Charleston as Coonskin Park does
- Concern(s) as to who owns Coonskin Park and when and why the land transfer took place
- Concern(s) as to when and why the entrance to Coonskin Park changed
- Concern(s) as to how much land funded by the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) is involved in the Proposed Project
- Concern(s) as to what data is being used to baseline the usage of picnic shelters, trails, and forested areas within Coonskin Park; request for picnic shelter reservation records to be used in creating a baseline
- Report(s) that an old clay mine, approximately a mile long, is located behind the maintenance buildings in Coonskin Park; this area should be surveyed to determine how far underground the clay mine is and how many spurs run off it
- Concern(s) as to why fill material would be taken from Coonskin Park rather than other government-owned, non-park land

2.4.4.2 SECTION 4(F) REPLACEMENT PROPERTY

Approximately 140 comment submissions related to replacement property for Coonskin Park. Stated comments included doubts regarding the ability to find an in-kind replacement, replacement property suggestions, and the difficulty of quantifying intrinsic value and environmental losses within the park.

Specific comments include:

- Opinion(s) that irreplaceable unique geography including rock formations, caves, and waterfalls make replacement of Coonskin Park infeasible
- Opinion(s) that environmental losses within and the value of Coonskin Park cannot be quantified
- Suggestion(s) that, as parkland was purchased with LWCF funds, the replacement property must be in a natural area with hiking trails and be located in the northeastern part of Kanawha County
- Opinion(s) that natural area within Coonskin Park must not be replaced with playgrounds, sports fields, or swimming pools
- Concern(s) as to whether a failed runway extension could be converted back to parkland
- Interest in selling personal farm property to be used as a replacement property
- Suggestion(s) that Dobbin Slashing (north of Dolly Sods North in Tucker County) should be considered as a replacement property for Coonskin Branch and the Alice Knight Trail
- Suggestion(s) that replacement park property should include green space with hills, streams, picnic shelters, and a 50-year forest
- Suggestion(s) that replacement of Coonskin Park must be at one site; spreading replacement across multiple sites is not sufficient
- Claim(s) that most forested land in Kanawha County is privately owned by large land management companies
- Suggestion(s) that replacement of Coonskin Park must be comparable, accessible, and mitigated on a ten-to-one basis
- Recommendation(s) to consider a rail-trail connection to the Elk River Rail Trail to mitigate the loss of recreation at Coonskin Park
- Opinion(s) that returning a flattened mountaintop to the public after using it as fill material is not sufficient as replacement property
- Concern(s) as to how a mature forest would be replaced
- Suggestion(s) that the replacement property should include a road that is paved, approximately 3 miles in length, and has up and downhill slopes
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study the potential increase in travel time needed to find similar park access
- Concern(s) that the Airport would later acquire the remaining portions of Coonskin Park for airfield development
- Suggestion(s) to acquire the railroad corridor held by Norfolk & Southern and convert it to Rail Trail
- Suggestion(s) to consider the 9,800-acre tract of land bordering the Elk River between Clendenin and Queen Shoals

2.4.5 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS/POLLUTION

Approximately 35 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to hazardous materials and pollution. Concerns related to pollution of water resources, stormwater treatment, and Airport runoff.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would pollute the Elk River, which provides Charleston's drinking water supply
- Concern(s) that Airport runoff would enter the Elk and Kanawha Rivers and/or Twomile and Mill Creeks
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study what remediation efforts would be required under the Proposed Project
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should consider stormwater treatment options if stormwater has the potential to be contaminated during facility operations
- Concern(s) as to what information is being used to assess the impact of runoff into Coonskin Park
- Claim(s) that the Proposed Project would remove a mature forest that absorbs chemical toxins experienced by the community in disproportionate amounts

2.4.6 HISTORIC RESOURCES

Approximately 20 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to historic resources. Comments included the possible presence of historical artifacts and historic and indigenous sites within Coonskin Park.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) of the possibility for a nearby residential home to be listed as a historic property; however, the homeowner has not yet undergone the listing process
- Suggestion(s) that caves within Coonskin Park need to be explored for historical artifacts
- Claim(s) that there are several historical sites located across Coonskin Park that are known to locals; however, the sites have not been fully investigated for archeological significance
- Report(s) of the possible presence of an old cemetery within Coonskin Park; there are an estimated 10 to 15 graves located within the proposed project area
- Report(s) of the possibility of a Civil War site located within Coonskin Park
- Report(s) of the possible presence of Indigenous artifacts, historical Native American sites, and archaeological relics within Coonskin Park
- Suggestion(s) that Coonskin Park should be surveyed for evidence of Native American seasonal hunting camps
- Request(s) for a full inventory and/or ratification of existing historical, cultural, native indigenous, anthropological, or archaeological sites present within the proposed project area

2.4.7 NOISE AND VIBRATION

Approximately 15 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to noise and vibration. Concerns included already low-flying aircraft and disruptive aircraft and construction noise levels.

Specific comments included:

- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study adverse health conditions and educational obstacles associated with increased air traffic noise
- Concern(s) that increased air traffic would be disruptive to those living in the current Runway 5 landing pattern
- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project would allow for larger and noisier planes
- Concern(s) that increased noise levels would ruin the ability to enjoy the sounds of nature or partake in quiet reflection
- Concern(s) that construction blasting would damage nearby residences; request(s) for compensation for any incurred damages
- Concern(s) over daytime noise levels for residents who work at night and sleep during the day
- Concern(s) that construction would be loud for those who live near the Airport
- Concern(s) over potential increases in already low-flying aircraft
- Concern(s) over reduction in property value for homes that may experience increased noise levels
- Concern(s) that noise increases would disturb wildlife and migratory birds in the remaining forested areas of Coonskin Park
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should include a noise compatibility program
- Claim(s) that the Knollwood community experienced foundation cracking from construction blasting during a previous Airport project

2.4.8 PUBLIC HEALTH

Approximately 30 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to public health. Concerns included a loss of recreational space and Charleston's drinking water supply.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) over losing a green space where community members frequently exercise
- Claim(s) that the city and state suffer from high rates of obesity, diabetes, mental illness, and opioid addiction; natural spaces are essential for combating public health crises
- Claim(s) that the state, county, and city are trying to promote physical activity; reducing the footprint of Coonskin Park would negatively impact these efforts
- Concern(s) that minimum altitude regulations that protect both public health and safety would not be honored
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study the impact that a lack of park space would have on the mental health of the local community
- Claim(s) that the community would be at a greater risk of experiencing floods, mudslides, and contaminated runoff
- Concern(s) that chemicals would spill into the Elk River, rendering the city's drinking water supply unusable
- Concern(s) for the health of senior citizens and those with preexisting health conditions

2.4.9 SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, AND CHILDREN'S ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY RISKS

Approximately 15 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to socioeconomics (including traffic), environmental justice, or children's health and safety risks. Concerns included existing high poverty rates, impacts on children at schools near the Airport, and park access for low-income communities.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park is accessible to and enjoyed by residents of all socioeconomic backgrounds; however, the runway expansion would only benefit those of certain socioeconomic backgrounds
- Claim(s) that, in a state with high poverty rates, the runway expansion would further disadvantage those who do not travel by taking away portions of Coonskin Park
- Concern(s) that dust from construction and other air quality affects would be a health concern for students and children at Elk Center School, Elk Elementary School, and the nearby daycare
- Claim(s) that Southern West Virginia, Southeastern Ohio, and Southwestern Virginia are historically underserved communities that would benefit from the proposed improvements
- Concern(s) over a reduction in greenspace for the underprivileged and disenfranchised area of Kanawha County
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park is one of the only public parks accessible by bus line; many families do not have cars and/or cannot afford increasing gas prices to commute to further parks
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park is frequented by people of color from low-income communities
- Concern(s) over accessibility to Barlow Drive, a one-lane road with only two pullover stops, while the road is being used by heavy trucks and construction equipment
- Concern(s) that Barlow Drive would be left in a poorer condition than it was prior to its use during construction

2.4.10 VISUAL RESOURCES

Approximately 10 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to visual resources. Concerns include the high visibility of the proposed runway extension and unsightly alterations to the natural landscape.

Specific comments included:

- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project would be highly visible to tourists and residents
- Concern(s) that the proposed retaining walls would be unpleasant for park users to look at
- Concern(s) that the runway extension would be unsightly for those who live near the Airport
- Concern(s) that the Proposed Project would alter the community's natural landscape
- Concern(s) that erosion on the west side of the Airport is visible by driving Interstate 79 (I-79) North

2.4.11 WATER RESOURCES

Approximately 185 comment submissions provided feedback pertaining to water resources. Concerns included flooding risks, water quality, and water features present in Coonskin Park.

Specific comments included:

- Claim(s) that Coonskin Branch is a unique water feature; filling in the resource would affect wildlife and water and drainage systems
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study the ecological impact of losing a natural stream that feeds into the Elk River
- Concern(s) that construction of a retaining wall along Coonskin Branch would displace water and adversely affect low reaches along the Elk River
- Concern(s) over sediment entering nearby water resources
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should study where runoff from the proposed runway extension would go following increases in non-permeable surfaces and changes to natural terrain
- Concern(s) over impacts to Coonskin Park's watershed
- Claim(s) that FEMA regulations prohibit raising land elevation in flood-prone areas
- Claim(s) that Coonskin Park's old-growth forest absorbs rainfall, reduces flooding risks, and provides a buffer that protects Charleston's drinking water supply
- Claim(s) that drastically changing natural landscape and diverting Coonskin Branch pose significant flooding concerns for the community
- Report(s) that Coonskin Branch is a unique water feature that carved a deep gorge in the park; the Alice Knight Trail was established to allow visitors to view this unique feature
- Concern(s) over a potential landslide into and subsequent flooding of the Elk River
- Concern(s) over erosion and water quality problems
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should discuss current impairments to water bodies under Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act and how implementation of the Proposed Project may affect, positively or detrimentally, existing impairments and their listing status
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should provide baseline information on the physical, chemical, and biological condition of streams and wetlands proposed to be impacted
- Suggestion(s) that, following implementation of the Proposed Project, secondary impacts to remaining onsite streams, wetlands, and the Elk River should be evaluated, including changes to hydrology and increased sedimentation and compaction from construction, to ensure the project results in no more than minimal adverse effects
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should determine whether a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and/or stormwater construction permits are required
- Suggestion(s) that the EIS should discuss the proposed stormwater infrastructure, including a map of the stormwater infrastructure layout
- Suggestion(s) that, due to an increase in impervious surface, stormwater runoff should be controlled using low-impact design (LID) or green infrastructure (GI) where possible
- Concern(s) as to where the water from Coonskin Branch would go if portions were filled in
- Suggestion(s) that the Elk River should be designated as a Scenic River
- Report(s) that Keystone Drive residents currently experience flooding from Airport runoff

- Concern(s) as to how flood risks associated with the Proposed Project would be mitigated
- Concern(s) as to how the filling in of Coonskin Branch's headwater source would be mitigated

3. FAA APPROACH TO ADDRESSING SCOPING COMMENTS

The EIS team is evaluating all comment submissions received, examining the scope of work, discussing comments with the FAA, and adjusting the scope of work as necessary to evaluate relevant issues raised during scoping. At FAA's direction, the EIS team will be incorporating pertinent and relevant information into the alternatives analysis and environmental impact analysis.

- Relative substantive comments will be considered to ensure that the EIS adequately addresses public comments related to the purpose and need for the project.
- Alternatives raised by commenters are being considered in the identification of alternatives to be screened in the EIS.
- Concerns related to potential adverse impacts will be considered in revising the scope of work to ensure that those concerns are addressed in the EIS, as appropriate.