

Appendix F

Public Comments

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT EA AND FAA RESPONSES

Introduction

This appendix includes a summary of public comments received on the FAA's June 2026 Draft Environmental Assessment for Amazon Prime Air Package Delivery Operations in Omaha, NE (Draft EA). The NOA announcing the public availability of the Draft EA was published on the FAA's website on Tuesday, June 23, 2026, which included a public review and comment period through Wednesday, July 22, 2026.

In total, the FAA received 21 comment submissions. When multiple topics were discussed in a single comment submission, each topic was individually identified and addressed through the use of bracketed letters (e.g., [A], [B], etc.). Commenters were notified that any personally identifiable information included as part of their comment submission could be made publicly available, but the FAA has attempted to redact personally identifiable information when requested. The comments are presented exactly as they were received and may contain typographical errors and/or misspellings. They have not been edited in any way and are provided in this manner to show that they were quoted exactly as they were in their original form.

The FAA developed Topic Specific Responses to cover topics that were raised in multiple comment submissions (e.g., drone noise, privacy, etc.). The Topic Specific Responses also contain background information on the general context of the EA to assist the public in better understanding the FAA's responses to comments. Specific responses were developed based on the nature of comments received or additional questions that were raised within each topic. A response was provided to each of the comment letters. A Topic Specific Response number(s) might also be provided and referenced for a response to the comment and/or question. If a comment letter contained a comment or question that was not covered under these general responses, an individual response was provided.

Note: While each topic identified by a commenter is assigned a letter for purposes of clearly matching comments and responses, it is not uncommon for a specific topic to appear more than once in a single comment submission (e.g., comment extension, comment restatement, etc.); as such, the comment response lettering may, at times, appear out of alphabetical order.

Topic Specific Responses

1. Biological Resources

Biological resources include plant and animal species and their habitats, including special status species (federally listed or state-listed threatened or endangered species, species proposed for listing, species that

are candidates for federal listing, marine mammals, and migratory birds) and environmentally sensitive or critical habitat. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973 [16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.] requires the evaluation of federal actions to determine whether a proposed action is likely to jeopardize any proposed, threatened, or endangered species or proposed or designated critical habitat. Critical habitat includes areas that will contribute to the recovery or survival of a listed species. Federal agencies are responsible for determining if an action may affect listed species or critical habitat, which determines whether formal or informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) is needed. In addition, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 703-712) protects migratory birds, including their nests, eggs, and parts, from possession, sale, purchase, barter, transport, import, export, and take. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act applies to migratory birds identified in 50 CFR § 10.13 (defined hereafter as “migratory birds”). Prime Air will be responsible for compliance with the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

According to FAA Order 1050.1G, impacts to biological resources are considered significant when the USFWS or NMFS determines that a proposed action would be likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed threatened or endangered species or would be likely to result in the destruction or adverse modification of federally designated critical habitat. Through consultation with USFWS, it was determined that the Proposed Action would not adversely affect and threatened or endangered species of their critical habitat. An action need not involve a threat of extinction to federally listed species to meet the NEPA standard of significance. Lesser impacts, including impacts on non-listed or special status species, could also constitute a significant impact. Therefore, it is important to consider the area of potential impact. The Proposed Action within this ecoregion would take place largely over high to medium density developed urban and commercial areas in the northern half of the operating area and the majority of the southern portion of the operating area consisting of agricultural use. A small portion of the southern edge operating area occurs over the Platte River. Therefore, wildlife habitats within the operating area predominantly include parks, a few open spaces, waterways, and vacant lands.

During the review process, state and federal databases were accessed, including the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (NGPC) Conservation and Environmental Review Tool (CERT) which lists species of fish, plants and wildlife that are protected under the Nebraska Nongame and Endangered Species Conservation Act (Neb. Rev. Stat. §§ 37-801 to 37-811). In addition to this list, data was also received using the USFWS IPaC system for potential species listed as endangered, threatened, or species of concern, including potential migratory birds and USFWS’s Birds of Conservation Concern that may occur within the study area. **Appendix B** of the draft EA provides a list of federal and state-listed species for each county within the action area.

Prime Air understands the importance of reporting collisions between aircraft and wildlife and will report any wildlife strikes via FAA Form 5200-7: Bird and Other Wildlife Strike Report. From this list, species that have the greatest potential to be impacted by the Proposed Action were identified understanding that Prime Air’s aircraft would not touch the ground in any other place than the PADDCC (except during emergency landings) since they remain airborne while conducting deliveries. The operations would be taking place within airspace, and typically well above the tree line and away from sensitive habitats. After launch, Prime Air’s drone would rise to a cruising altitude between 205 feet and 370 feet AGL and follow a preplanned route to its delivery site. The pre-planned route is optimized to avoid terrain and object

obstructions, areas of high aircraft traffic, and areas where people may gather in large numbers such as highways, parks, and schools.

Aircraft would typically stay between 205 and 370 feet AGL except when descending to drop a package. When making a delivery, the aircraft descends, and packages are dropped to the ground from approximately 13 feet AGL. Packages are carried internally in the aircraft's fuselage and are dropped by opening a set of payload doors on the aircraft. After the package is dropped the drone then climbs vertically to approximately 205 to 370 feet and reverses the path taken, returning to the takeoff/landing pad at the PADDCC. The drone would take approximately 61 seconds to complete a delivery, which includes the descent from en route altitude, dropping the package, and returning back to en route altitude. As a result, the duration of exposure by most wildlife on the ground to the visual or noise impacts from the drone would be of very short duration (approximately one minute).

It is not likely that listed species would be in the vicinity of the delivery location because such locations would be developed areas. However, even if species were expected to be exposed to this noise level, the noise would be unlikely to cause significant disturbance (for context, a drone overflight at 50 feet is approximately 74.2 decibels, whereas a leaf blower at 50 feet is approximately 73 to 77 decibels)¹. At a potential maximum of 1,000 flights per day across the entire action area (or 2,000 total per day), the distribution and altitude of the flights are not expected to significantly affect wildlife in the action area.

The FAA initiated Section 7 consultation with the USFWS Nebraska Ecological Services Field Office on May 14, 2026. On June 25, 2026, the Nebraska Ecological Services Field Office issued a written concurrence that the Proposed Action is unlikely to adversely affect wildlife within the Action Area.

2. Noise Exposure

Section 3.6 and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA present the noise exposure estimates associated with the individual delivery, en route, and PADDCC operational flight phases in addition to total overall noise exposure from the Proposed Action.

For PADDCC operations, the EA evaluated the anticipated average daily maximum of 1,000 deliveries provided by Prime Air for each PADDCC, with 100 of the 1,000 daily deliveries (10%) occurring during the periods from 6 a.m. to 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. This is equivalent to 1,900 daytime equivalent delivery operations, and the extent of noise exposure associated with PADDCC operations is shown in **Figure 3-1** and presented in **Table 3-4** in the EA.

For en route operations, the EA conservatively assumed that a maximum number of overflights over any one location would be half, or 500 daily delivery overflights with approximately 50 of the 500 daily delivery overflights (10%) occurring during the periods from 6 a.m. to 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. When combined with the daytime delivery overflight operations, this would be representative of a combined total of 950 daytime equivalent delivery overflight operations. As detailed in the EA, en route noise levels could reach DNL 46.0 dB in any location within the Study Areas.

¹ Appendix E: Noise Assessment Amazon Prime Air MK27-2 Unmanned Aircraft Operations at College Station Texas, Table 10 and Characteristics of Lawn and Garden Equipment Sound: A Community Pilot Study (National Institutes of Health) (National), December 2017, Available <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6707732/>, Table 2

For delivery operations, the EA developed a minimum and maximum representative average annual daily distribution of deliveries that could occur at a single delivery location within each operating area. The distribution of average annual daily deliveries ranges from one to four deliveries per operating day and conservatively assumes that at least one delivery will occur during the nighttime period between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. This nighttime delivery is equivalent to 10 daytime deliveries, and when combined with daytime deliveries, is equivalent to a total combined maximum of 13 equivalent daytime delivery operations. The noise exposure for delivery operations includes outbound and inbound en route overflights at the operating altitude range of between 205 and 370 ft AGL for operations associated with deliveries to other locations. The noise exposure for any one delivery point (with en route noise as mentioned above) is presented in **Table 3-5** of the EA.

When considering the overall noise exposure from the combination of the individual delivery, en route, and PADDC operational flight phases, the maximum noise exposure levels within the operating area would occur at the PADDC site where noise levels at or above DNL 50 dB would extend approximately 1,050 ft from each PADDC. Noise levels at or above DNL 65 dB would extend approximately 150 ft from the PADDC. Additionally, the estimated noise exposure for en route operations could reach up to DNL 46 dB at any location within the action area. Lastly, the resulting noise exposure at any residential-zoned property line would not be expected to exceed DNL 48.1 dB. As noted in the EA, overall noise impacts from operations are not expected to be significant and are not expected to be incompatible with noise sensitive resources within each operating area. For additional details regarding the noise analysis for the Proposed Action, please refer to **Section 3.6** of the EA.

3. Noise Metrics

The FAA uses the A-Weighted sound level to calculate DNL consistent with the Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) recommendations as detailed in the 1974 report entitled "Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety". The 1974 EPA report, often referred to as the "Levels Document", stated that a frequency-weighted sound pressure level is the most appropriate choice for describing the magnitude of environmental noise. The EPA also concluded that:

- The A-Weighted sound level has been shown to correlate well with human response to noise,
- has been widely used for describing transportation and community noise exposure, and
- can be easily measured by sound monitoring equipment and represents the most suitable choice for quantifying noise exposure levels.

In addition to use of the A-weighted sound level, the 1974 EPA report recommended the DNL metric as the best metric to describe the effects of environmental noise in a simple, uniform, and appropriate way. The EPA noted that representing a fluctuating noise level in terms of a steady state noise having an equivalent energy content, such as is the case with the DNL metric, accurately describes the onset of noise-induced hearing loss and is supported by substantial evidence that correlates with annoyance for a variety of circumstances as it relates to environmental noise.

The FAA's use of the A-weighted sound level and the DNL metric is also consistent with the findings of the June 1980 Federal Interagency Committee on Urban Noise (FICUN) report entitled "Guidelines for Considering Noise in Land Use Planning and Control." The 1980 FICUN report was adopted by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), both of which were FICUN members. FAA represented DOT at proceedings of FICUN and continues to coordinate across the Federal government to carry out interagency coordination on matters related to aviation noise research including with FICUN's successor bodies.

Additionally, the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (the Act) (Pub. L. 115-254) (Section 188) directed the FAA to submit a report evaluating alternative noise metrics to the current DNL standard.² The report includes information on the A-Weighted sound level and DNL used to inform federal policies as it relates to aircraft noise. The FAA has considered the use of other noise metrics as a supplement to DNL, such as Number Above (NA) a Maximum Sound Level (Lmax) as detailed in the report referenced above, for quantifying the noise exposure from unmanned aircraft (UA) operations. However, due to the low noise levels associated with UA operations, DNL, to-date, has represented a better metric for quantifying noise exposure for UA. As DNL is a cumulative noise metric, it considers the additive effect of multiple noise events including duration and loudness of the event regardless of if the event exceeds a specified sound level threshold. Number Above Lmax (NALmax) only account for noise exposure if a specified Lmax is exceeded, and as such do not sufficiently capture the additive effect of exposure to repeated low noise operations such as is the case with UA.

4. Health Effects of Noise

The FAA implements NEPA through FAA Order 1050.1G. Associations between aviation noise and disruption to normal activity are key components in the establishment of FAA's residential noise impact thresholds defined in FAA Order 1050.1G and the 1050.1 Desk Reference. Use of the DNL 65 dB as the threshold for significant noise exposure is designed to account for sleep disturbance, speech interference, and annoyance among other factors. The EA was prepared consistent with FAA's noise criteria currently identified within FAA Order 1050.1G and the 1050.1 Desk Reference. Applying the noise criteria in FAA Orders and guidance, the aviation noise from drone overflights and delivery locations in the Proposed Action is well below the threshold of significance; even in the vicinity of the PADDC, the Proposed Action is not expected to exceed the significance threshold at the nearest noise sensitive location.

5. Privacy

The FAA's mission is to provide the safest, most efficient airspace system in the world, but that does not include regulating privacy. Although the FAA is not authorized to impose regulations based on privacy concerns, it intends to continue collaborating with stakeholders, including the public and other agencies with authority and expertise in privacy law and policy. The FAA's lack of jurisdiction over privacy, however, does not relieve Prime Air from complying with other laws and regulations, including those related to privacy, that may be applicable to Prime Air's operations in Nebraska.

² See "Report to Congress on an Evaluation of Alternative Noise Metrics": https://www.faa.gov/sites/faa.gov/files/about/plans_reports/congress/Day-Night_Average_Sound_Levels_COMPLETED_report_w_letters.pdf.

The MK30 drone does not capture imagery from underneath while in forward flight and the camera array is only used to ensure safe flight. During the delivery phase, the drone descends to the customer's property and hovers, using camera and sensor technology to ensure the delivery area is clear of obstacles and the delivery can be made safely. The cameras and sensors on the drones are operational to see what's around them to aid in flight navigation and safety. The operator does not see the feed from the cameras. They are not built or operated to be surveillance drones. They store only critical mission data to improve systems and flight planning.

6. Safety

49 U.S.C. § 44807 provides the Secretary of Transportation (the Secretary) with authority to determine whether a certificate of waiver, certificate of authorization, or a certificate under § 44703 or § 44704, is required for the operation of certain UAS. Section 44807(b) instructs the Secretary to base their determination on which types of UAS do not create a hazard to users of the National Airspace System (NAS) or the public. In making this determination, the Secretary must consider the size, weight, speed, and operational capability of the UAS, as well as other aspects of the proposed operation. The Secretary delegated this authority to the FAA Administrator on October 1, 2021. In accordance with the statutory criteria provided in 49 U.S.C. § 44807, and in consideration of the size, weight, speed, and operational capability, proximity to airports and populated areas, and specific operations, the FAA determined that Prime Air's drones and operations do not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public. As with all operations authorized to be conducted under a § 44807 exemption, the FAA set appropriate conditions and limitations to minimize risk and maintain an equivalent level of safety to that provided and intended by the rules that would otherwise apply to the operation.

The current exemption, Exemption No. 18601E, was issued August 7, 2025³. The FAA's safety determinations regarding the regulatory relief necessary to enable these operations are available at Regulatory Docket No. FAA-2019-0573.

The FAA Hotline accepts reports related to the safety of the National Airspace System, violations of Federal Aviation Regulations, aviation safety issues, and reports related to FAA employees or FAA facilities⁴. The FAA Hotline provides a single venue for FAA employees, the aviation community, and the public to file their reports.

7. Quality of Life

"Quality of life" is not an environmental resource category that is referenced in NEPA or FAA Order 1050.1G. The concept of quality of life is associated with certain environmental resource categories addressed in NEPA documents, including noise and socioeconomics.

The Proposed Action is not expected to result in significant impacts to any of the environmental resource categories, including noise and socioeconomics. In accordance with the requirements of NEPA, the purpose of the EA is to assess and disclose the environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and make a determination as to the significance of the impact(s). While some of the environmental resource

³ <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FAA-2019-0573-0087>

⁴ https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/aae/programs_services/faq_hotlines

categories could have project-related environmental effects (e.g., noise), these effects would not be significant. **Chapter 3** of the EA discusses the effects of the Proposed Action on each environmental resource category, including noise and socioeconomic impacts, which are most frequently associated with quality-of-life effects.

8. Visual Effects

Visual effects were analyzed in **Section 3.7** of the EA, and it is estimated that at typical operating altitude and speeds the drone would be observable for approximately 3.6 seconds by an observer on the ground. Any visual effects are expected to be similar to existing air traffic in the vicinity of the operating area and therefore, the Proposed Action would not result in significant visual impacts.

9. Scope of FAA Authority

In accordance with 49 U.S.C. § 40103(a)(1), “[t]he United States Government has exclusive sovereignty of airspace of the United States.” Congress has provided the FAA with exclusive authority to regulate airspace in the United States, as well as aviation safety, the efficiency of navigable airspace, and air traffic control through Title 49, Subtitle VII of the U.S.C. Because a drone is considered an aircraft under both 49 U.S.C. § 44801 and 14 Code of Federal Regulations, any drone flown outdoors is subject to FAA regulation. In addition, 49 U.S.C. § 40103(a)(2) dictates that airspace is public space, stating that “A citizen of the United States has a public right of transit through the navigable airspace.” As such, the FAA regulates drone operations to ensure the safe and efficient use of navigable airspace, while also considering the public’s right of transit through the airspace.

The FAA does not select the locations for commercial drone operators to conduct operations. Those locations are selected by the operators. Land use and zoning are typically governed by state and local laws. Operators are responsible for complying with any such applicable laws relevant to establishing their operations. Operators are expected to site their distribution hubs in accordance with all local land use ordinances and zoning requirements.

10. Reasonably Foreseeable Effects

Any future Part 135 operators will be required to work with the FAA to complete an environmental review before beginning operations, ensuring that any potential reasonably foreseeable effects are properly analyzed and disclosed, and the appropriate siting of potential drone operating facilities would be considered to avoid a significant impact on the environment. In the future, other drone operators may propose locating operations within this Proposed Action’s action area. Should that occur, Prime Air understands the potential for impacts may increase due to another operator’s activities and would work with that operator and the FAA to mitigate potential impacts. Additionally, the FAA would conduct a new environmental analysis – including noise and reasonably foreseeable impacts – prior to another operator beginning drone package delivery operations in this area.

11. Public Engagement

As required by FAA Order 1050.1G, the FAA initiated a number of actions to inform and engage the public and potentially interested regulatory agencies about the Proposed Action, which include:

- Agency coordination/consultation/notification, to include the Nebraska SHPO, USFWS, Sarpy County, Cities of, Bellevue, La Vista, Papillion, Ralston, and Springfield government officials, local political representatives, and local officials with jurisdiction over Section 4(f) properties or resources
- Native American/Tribal consultation
- Public review and comment period of 30 days (June 23, 2026, to July 22, 2026)

The FAA provided a NOA of the Draft EA on June 23, 2026, to local interest groups, local government officials, public park authorities, and the SHPO, tribes and THPOs. On the same date, the FAA made the Draft EA available to the general public on the FAA website. All communications and consultations between the FAA and the abovementioned stakeholders are documented in the following appendices of the Supplemental EA:

- **Appendix B – Biological Resources and Agency Consultation**
- **Appendix C – Section 4(f) and 6(f) Resources**
- **Appendix D1 – Section 106 Resources and SHPO Consultation**
- **Appendix D2 – Tribal Consultation**

Appendix A of the EA also describes the public involvement process that Prime Air initiated for the Proposed Action. A robust public involvement program was implemented to ensure information regarding the Proposed Action, alternatives, and potential environmental impacts was made available to the public, and that comments from the public were considered during the preparation of the EA.

Public Comments and FAA Responses

Public Comment No.	Commenter Name
01_Andersen	Chris Andersen
02a_Anonymous	Anonymous
02b_Anonymous	Anonymous
03_Carlson	Dr. Emily Carlson
04_Chapman	Jade Chapman
05_Chapman	Shirley Chapman
06_Gibson	Robert Gibson
07_Heron	Craig Heron (1 additional duplicate submission)
08_Mitchell	Horace Mitchell
09_Ryan	Stacy Ryan
10_Schindler	Ruth Schindler
11a_SDevault	S Devault (1 additional duplicate submission)
11b_SDevault	S Devault

Public Comment No.	Commenter Name
11c_SDevault	S Devault
12_Skarda	Cindy Skarda
13_Stover	Laura Stover
14_Swanson	Terri Swanson
15_Teague	Laura Teague
16_Vanderwyst	Nathan Vanderwyst

Public Comment – 01_Andersen

I do NOT support Amazon's request for drone delivery in Omaha. No one, myself included, wants these drones flying over their houses and property. Landowners own the property, mineral rights and so forth. Airspace should be respected as well. The first one that's drops a stay package on my property or home will be the last. Do NOT approve the Omaha drones unless the intend of following streets and driveways ONLY.

Sent from my iPhone

FAA Response – 01_Andersen

Thank you for your comment. For more information on the FAA's ability to regulate drone operations, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

Public Comment – 02a_Anonymous

I wish to voice my opposition to the Prime Air Omaha Draft EA and support the "No Action Alternative" to such possible changes. My opposition is attached above. I kindly ask that it be read in full.

(All equations and calculations, to the best of my knowledge, were derived and solved correctly. I make no claims that all information included within the attached letter is 100% accurate.)

I also request that to the extent possible my personal identifiable information be withheld during public review.

(Transcript of email attachment follows)

Opposition to the FAA Omaha Prime Air Delivery EA

[A] *I wish to voice my opposition to the proposed Prime Air drone delivery service within the service area known as OMA2. Having read through the proposed plan contained within the FAA document, I am concerned about a substantial impact to human quality of life and the local ecosystem within OMA2. This letter is composed of three parts: Risk to Life, Impact to Welfare and Impact to Wildlife.*

[B] *First, Risk to Life. I feel many residents living within OMA2 are being exposed to overly hazardous conditions through little choosing of their own. The FAA states in its write-up that the proposed Prime Air drone known as the MK-30, in its proposed operating state will allow two characteristics of its design to be extremely hazardous to human life. Consider, first, the MK-30 as*

reported by the FAA weighs approximately 78.3 lbs on its own and a combined proposed total of 83.2 lbs including a package held within its fuselage (Federal, Section 1.2). Second, the MK-30 is also proposed to fly at heights between 180-377ft AGL (above ground level) during transportation within OMA2 (Federal, Section 2.3.3). These two characteristics together create an extremely avoidable hazardous condition to human life. While I acknowledge that the chances are minimal, a drone of any size could malfunction and fall out of the sky uncontrolled. Considering that the MK-30 drone, at minimum, would weigh approximately 78.3 lbs at 180 ft in the air, this is a significant hazard to human life. Consider for the moment the physics equation $= \frac{1}{2}mv^2$. With the MK-30, the equation fills in as follows. $PE = (35.5\text{kg}) \left(9.8 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}^2}\right) (54.9\text{m}) = 19.1\text{kJ}$. Consider another

$$\text{equation } v = \sqrt{2gh}. \text{ Using the same characteristics: } V = \sqrt{2 \left(9.8 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}^2}\right) (54.9\text{m})} \approx 32.8 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}} \approx$$

73.8mph (This does not account for air resistance.) Yet, can one really state that this is creating a safe environment with due consideration? Having an almost 80 lbs object come crashing down at 73.8 mph in the best conditions is extremely unsafe. This would no doubt cause significant damage to property and, at its worst, could cost human lives. Yet, this does not even account for the fact that up to 1000 proposed flights per day may occur in OMA2 (Federal, Section 2.2.1). Also, that OMA2 encompasses approximately 288,000 citizens (Federal, Section 3.6.2). The risk is unnecessarily hazardous considering packages can be delivered in two days on average with an Amazon Prime subscription. ("Amazon"). In which approximately 180 million Americans have as of 2024 (Bitters). Second, Impact to Welfare. I believe the Prime Air OMA2 project also has a significant impact on human welfare. [C] To be more precise, human quality of life. Consider the current status quo. There are currently no commercial drone operations within OMA2 as of time of writing (Federal, 3.6.3.3). This means that these operations currently have no impact on quality of life. Now, for a moment, consider all of the potential impacts: visual impact, physical impact and audible impact. Firstly, the FAA gives no size for the MK-30 drone, however, the picture provided in Figure 2-2 (Federal) shows this drone model is of substantial size. Many videos, can also prove as such, one example being: (An Up-Close) as provided in the sources. This video in particular, at 1 minute and 24 seconds, shows a worker standing next to the drone, and it is nearly as tall as the worker. [D] This would have substantial visual impact on the environ

$F_{thrust} = (35.5 \text{ kg}) \left(9.8 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}^2}\right) = 347.9 \text{ N}$. Consider then the equation $V_{thrust} = \sqrt{\frac{F_{thrust}}{2\rho A}}$, where $\rho = 1.225 \frac{\text{kg}}{\text{m}^3}$, the density of air. This means the propellers, assuming a radius of 10 in, would result in an air velocity of $V_{thrust} = \sqrt{\frac{347.9}{2(1.225)(\pi(0.254)^2)}} \approx 26.46 \frac{\text{m}}{\text{s}} \approx 59.2 \text{ mph}$. This would cause

significant wind disturbance underneath and around the drones. This could potentially displace small objects like plants, boxes, and various small objects. This wind speed could also significantly disturb a human, pet or other various wildlife. [F] Thirdly, and most importantly, audible impact. The FAA claims that the drones can emit noise up to 57.2 dBA with the listener standing 16.4 ft. away (Federal, Table 3-5). Consider a chart provided by the FAA ("Fundamentals of Noise and Sound"), 57.2 dBA is almost as loud as a "commercial area". Should residents within OMA2 be subjected to this noise disturbance to get a 5 lbs package delivered, possibly up to 1000 times in a day? Consider a drone flying overhead at the proposed standard of 180ft., using the closest FAA provided value at 125 ft. these drones would provide noise around 40 dBA. According to the FAA, this is as loud as a "Large Conference Room". This audible noise would substantially disturb the peace for residents within OMA2. Consider also that these drones are proposed to operate between the hours of 6 AM to 10:30 PM each day. This is not even an eight-hour time window in which a

human could sleep without possible drone noise disturbance. [G] It is worth noting that the CDC also recommends that humans, on average, get about 8 hours of sleep for the average adult (Centers). Drones could heavily affect sleep patterns of residents living within OMA2.

[Same Topic as E above] Thirdly, Impact to Wildlife. It is also worth noting the creatures that inhabit the nature around us. They too are affected by this decision and in turn, the drones could have significant impact on the environment around and within OMA2. According to the FAA, the OMA2 site will have a 7.5 mi service radius around the Amazon Warehouse located at 144th and Highway 370. This includes several parks, including, but not limited to, Chalco, Walnut Creek and Prairie Queen parks. Lots of wildlife live in and around these parks and their habitat would likely be overflowed by MK-30 drones daily. The FAA actually lists several possibly impacted species, those of which listed are considered at least a minimal “risk of extinction” to put it simply. In Table 1, these species are listed below:

Table 1: Effected Species Table

Common Name	Species Name	Federal Status
Northern long-eared bat	<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	Endangered
Tricolored bat	<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>	Proposed Endangered
Piping plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	Endangered
Pallid sturgeon	<i>Scaphirhynchus albus</i>	Endangered
Western regal fritillary	<i>Argynnis idalia occidentalis</i>	Proposed Threatened
Suckley’s cuckoo bumble bee	<i>Bombus suckleyi</i>	Proposed Endangered
Monarch butterfly	<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	Proposed Threatened
Western prairie fringed orchid	<i>Platanthera praeclara</i>	Threatened

These flora and fauna are common to the local area and would likely be disturbed by these drones. The fauna, much more so than the flora. Consider also that the FAA claims that: “Certain species of birds are known to harass, mob, and attack aerial predators [drones] that fly into or near their territory...The defending birds will chase, dive bomb, attack the backside, and vocalize to harass the aerial predator until the offender is far enough from the territory that the defending birds cease attacking” (Federal, Section 3.3.3). This is not only a hazard to birds, but the possible bird attacks could cause damage to a drone and create a possible situation as described in Part I, a Risk to Life. The FAA also claims that Bald Eagles also live within OMA2 (Federal, 3.3.2.3). In fact, there is a well-known set of eagles to locals that nest in Chalco every year. A video by David DeVol (DeVol), claims to have seen these eagles brooding and feeding there in 2024. The FAA claims in such a case that Prime Air will do its due diligence and: “If nests are identified, Prime Air will establish an avoidance area such that there is 1,000 ft vertical and horizontal separation distance between the vehicle’s flight path and the nest.” Can we truly expect this to be followed so closely? To the best of my knowledge, Amazon, does not, and most likely will not retain a database keeping track of possible and current nesting sites for bald eagles, let alone all the different types of birds. How would these autonomous drones even log the location of such an activity? Overall, these drones would have a significant impact on wildlife, especially any creatures that fly. These drones could be perceived as predators and enemies to wildlife, any could cause further unnecessary damage to what’s currently left of the local ecosystem.

In the end, I find my argument and opposition against these drones is three-fold. Risk to Life, Impact to Welfare and Impact to Wildlife. In this way, I find it extremely irresponsible to move forward with the Prime Air MK-30 drone approval for the OMA2 area. The benefits it will bring to the community far underweigh the costs and potential risks to both humans and creatures alike. Even to consider that every resident within the OMA2 zone is now subject to a possible drone flyover at any moment between 6:00 AM to 10:30 PM is rather alarming as well. [H] This argument does not even cover the possible privacy concerns. Not to mention sleep and peace. Also consider the fact that vehicles can very easily achieve similar delivery times (usually delivery just hours after ordering). So, once again I ask, is it worth it to have massive, hazardous, loud, 78-pound drones fill the sky just so residents might get a package a few hours sooner? To disturb wildlife? To risk property and human life? I fundamentally believe this measure is too extreme. This would subject residents to live a science-fiction future where convenience overrules common sense, human safety and practicality. [I] Besides, what stops 5000, 10000 or 20000 drones in the future? Where one goes the others will follow.

Sources Cited

“Amazon Prime Shipping Time & Benefits.” Amazon Customer Service, Amazon, <https://www.amazon.com/gp/help/customer/display.html?nodeId=GRPQFCNVUDYCBG24>. Accessed 19 July 2026.

Bitter, Alex. “Americans Are Obsessed with Amazon Prime, and It Shows.” Business Insider, 17 Apr. 2024, <https://www.businessinsider.com/amazon-prime-has-180-million-members-report-shows-2024-4>. Accessed 19 July 2026.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. “About Sleep.” CDC, 15 May 2024, www.cdc.gov/sleep/about/index.html. Accessed 19 July 2026.

DeVol, David. “Chalco Hills Eagle and 3 Eaglets.” YouTube, uploaded by David DeVol, 11 Apr. 2024, www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIRY5ZPaCHQ. Accessed 19 July 2026.

Federal Aviation Administration. Draft Environmental Assessment for Amazon Prime Air Package Delivery Operations in Omaha, Nebraska. U.S. Department of Transportation, June 2026, https://www.faa.gov/uas/advanced_operations/nepa_and_drones/AMZ-OMA-Draft-EA_ADA-508-Final.pdf. Accessed 19 July 2026.

Federal Aviation Administration. “Fundamentals of Noise and Sound.” Federal Aviation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, 22 July 2022, https://www.faa.gov/noise/aviation_noise/fundamentals_of_noise. Accessed 19 July 2026.

“An Up-Close, Inside Look at Amazon’s New Delivery Drones Flying in KCK.” YouTube, uploaded by KSHB 41, 26 Mar. 2026, www.youtube.com/watch?v=QFG6yNcMlZI. Accessed 19 July 2026.

FAA Response – 02a_Anonymous

Thank you for your comments.

[A] For more information on the FAA’s ability to regulate drone operations, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA’s primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air’s drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 4: Health Effects of Noise*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

Public Comment – 02b_Anonymous

My letter is below. I would ask that my personal information is withheld during public review. Thank you.

To Who it May Concern,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding Amazon Prime Air, the company’s drone delivery service, and to respectfully request consideration of the No Action Alternative. While I recognize the convenience this program may offer, [A] I am concerned that increased drone operations could contribute to noise

pollution and [B] create risks to residential property. These concerns are based on my review of publicly available information rather than professional expertise, and the supporting sources are provided below.

[Same Topic as A above] *Available measurements and reports from existing service areas suggest that Prime Air could introduce a noticeable and recurring source of noise into residential neighborhoods. An FAA-published technical analysis found that, during maximum-weight delivery tests measured 75 feet from the delivery point, the MK30 produced an average equivalent sound level of 63.4 dBA and an average maximum sound level of 69.1 dBA (1). Because the drone descends, releases the package, and climbs away near the delivery property, its sound may be more sustained and noticeable than ordinary passing traffic. Each flight serves one delivery address, and the proposed Omaha operation could include up to 1,000 delivery flights per day, creating the potential for recurring noise as multiple homes are served (2). Residents in Texas and Michigan with this current program have compared the sound of these drones to “a loud swarm of bees” and “flying leaf blower...50 times a day”, suggesting that it can be disruptive (3; 4).*

[Same Topic as B above] *In its current form, Prime Air also raises two property-safety concerns: how residents would be notified and expected to respond if a contingency landing occurs on or near their property, and whether drones could strike nearby structures or infrastructure. The FAA document states that the approximately 78-pound MK30 ordinarily remains airborne outside the Prime Air facility except during a safe contingency landing and may respond to contingencies without operator input (2). Although the assessment explains that Amazon would locate the drone and coordinate with local first responders, it does not provide clear public instructions regarding how affected residents would be contacted or what they should do while awaiting assistance (2). Documented incidents further show that collision risks are not entirely hypothetical: Prime Air drones have struck an overhead internet cable, a construction crane, and an apartment building (5; 6; 7). Although no serious injuries were reported, these incidents underscore the importance of clear resident-notification and drone-retrieval procedures, as well as a defined process for addressing any resulting property damage.*

I respectfully ask that there is careful evaluation of Prime Air’s potential effects on neighborhood noise and property safety and consider the No Action Alternative of the program if these concerns cannot be adequately addressed. As a lifelong resident who intends to remain within the vicinity of OMA2, I appreciate your consideration of this issue.

- (1) Environmental Science Associates. (2025). *Estimated Noise Levels for Amazon Prime Air MK30 Drone: Technical Noise Report, Appendix B, Table B-1, p. B-5*. Published as Appendix E to the FAA environmental assessment.
- (2) Federal Aviation Administration. (2026, June). *Draft environmental assessment for Amazon Prime Air package delivery operations in Omaha, Nebraska*. U.S. Department of Transportation.
- (3) Perdomo, N. (2026, June 23). *Richardson residents raise concerns over noise from Amazon drone deliveries*. Spectrum News 1 Texas.
- (4) Osborne, P., & Nagel, J. (2026, June 24). *Hazel Park residents complain Amazon delivery drones are too loud, fly too low*. ClickOnDetroit/WDIV Local 4
- (5) Reuters. (2025, November 26). *“FAA probes Amazon after delivery drone snaps internet cable in Texas.”*
- (6) Shepardson, D. (2025, October 2). *“NTSB, FAA to probe crashes of two Amazon delivery drones in Arizona.”* Reuters.
- (7) WFAA. (2026, February 6). *“Amazon delivery drone crashes into North Texas apartment building.”*

FAA Response – 02b_Anonymous

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA’s primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air’s drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

Public Comment – 03_Carlson

To whom it may concern,

I am strongly opposed to drone delivery in my neighborhood and surrounding areas. [A] I find this to be an unnecessary addition to an already burdened flight space. Commercial flights, hospital transportation and police traffic are all prevalent and necessary already overhead. [B] I am very concerned about the environmental impact this will have on the native and migratory birds in the area. As a veterinarian, I am concerned about the safety of pets and how this will increase anxiety and risk of animals outside during deliveries. [Same Topic as A above] My biggest concern is for the safety of my children who are constantly playing outside. They know not to be in the streets and to be aware of vehicles but it seems an incredible undue burden on them to also be aware of drones delivering into yards. If their own backyards are no longer safe, where will the children play?

Sincerely,

Dr. Emily Carlson

FAA Response – 03_Carlson

Thank you for your comments.

[A] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Safety*. The FAA’s primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air’s drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-

based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis, and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[B] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

Public Comment – 04_Chapman

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose Amazon Prime Air's proposed drone delivery operations in the Papillion and Omaha area and to ask the FAA to select the No Action Alternative.

The proposal could allow Amazon to conduct up to 1,000 drone delivery flights per day, seven days per week, between 6:00 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. This could amount to approximately 365,000 delivery operations per year.

[A] I am concerned about the noise, [B] visual intrusion, [C] privacy, [D] public safety, [E] wildlife disruptions, especially to birds, [Same Topic as D above] collisions with planes, protection of airspace for both Offutt Air Force base as well as the Omaha and regional airports in the area, [F] and overall effect these operations would have on our neighborhoods and quality of life.

[G] Residents should not have to accept commercial drones routinely flying over or near their homes simply so small consumer products can be delivered faster. This is an unacceptable invasion of privacy and unneeded service.

[H] Amazon will not be the only company interested in drone delivery. If this proposal is approved, Walmart, Target, Walgreens, and many other companies may seek permission to operate similar services. I do not want the future of our neighborhoods to be skies increasingly filled with commercial delivery drones.

[Same Topic as G above] Please deny or pause the proposed operation and select the No Action Alternative. At a minimum, the FAA should require additional [I] public involvement, [Same Topic as G above] strict limits on operating hours and flight volume, [Same Topic as C above] meaningful privacy protections, [Same Topic as D above] and public reporting of accidents and safety incidents.

Sincerely,

*Jade Chapman
Papillion, NE 68046*

FAA Response – 04_Chapman

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 05_Chapman

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose Amazon Prime Air's proposed drone delivery operations in the Papillion and Omaha area and to ask the FAA to select the No Action Alternative.

The proposal could allow Amazon to conduct up to 1,000 drone delivery flights per day, seven days per week, between 6:00 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. This could amount to approximately 365,000 delivery operations per year.

[A] *I am concerned about the noise, [B] visual intrusion, [C] privacy, [D] public safety, [E] wildlife disruptions, especially to birds, [Same Topic as D above] collisions with planes, protection of airspace for both Offutt Air Force base as well as the Omaha and regional airports in the area, [F] and overall effect these operations would have on our neighborhoods and quality of life.*

[G] *Residents should not have to accept commercial drones routinely flying over or near their homes simply so small consumer products can be delivered faster. This is an unacceptable invasion of privacy and unneeded service.*

[H] *Amazon will not be the only company interested in drone delivery. If this proposal is approved, Walmart, Target, Walgreens, and many other companies may seek permission to operate similar services. I do not want the future of our neighborhoods to be skies increasingly filled with commercial delivery drones.*

[Same Topic as G above] *Please deny or pause the proposed operation and select the No Action Alternative. At a minimum, the FAA should require additional [I] public involvement, [Same Topic as G above] strict limits on operating hours and flight volume, [Same Topic as C above] meaningful privacy protections, [Same Topic as D above] and public reporting of accidents and safety incidents.*

Sincerely,

*Shirley Chapman
Papillion, NE 68046*

FAA Response – 05_Chapman

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the

FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 06_Gibson

Dear Mr. Derek Hufty and the FAA UAS Environmental Review Team,

Please accept this formal public comment and safety objection regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for Amazon Prime Air's proposed commercial drone package delivery operations in Omaha, Nebraska, originating from the Drone Delivery Center (PADDC) at the OMA2 fulfillment center in Papillion (144th & Hwy 370).

[A] *As a local resident and active observer of airspace safety in the Sarpy and Douglas County corridors, I strongly urge the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to deny the proposed amendment to Amazon's Operations Specifications (OpSpecs) under 49 U.S.C. § 44807. Approving an 8-mile autonomous flight radius in this highly congested corridor represents an unacceptable risk to low-altitude general aviation, military training maneuvers, emergency services, and suburban residential safety.*

The Draft EA fails to adequately evaluate the following critical, site-specific airspace risks:

[B] *1. Low-Altitude Military Glide Slopes, Wake Turbulence, and Pilot Cognitive Load (Offutt AFB / KOFF)*

The eastern edge of Amazon's proposed delivery radius severely encroaches on the outer boundaries of Class D and Class E controlled airspace associated with Offutt Air Force Base.

** The Flight Pattern Overlap: Heavy military aircraft—including KC-135 Stratotankers and C-130 Hercules transport aircraft transitioning from the Nebraska National Guard in Lincoln—routinely execute low-altitude maneuvers directly north and west of the OMA2 warehouse to align with the ILS glide slope for Offutt's Runway 13/31.*

** The E-4B "Nightwatch" Wake-Turbulence Risk: Offutt AFB is the home base for the U.S. military's nuclear-survivable E-4B Nightwatch fleet (modified Boeing 747s). These heavy aircraft conduct frequent, weekly low-altitude training loops, racetrack patterns, and touch-and-go simulations over the Papillion, Gretna, and West Bellevue residential corridors. An 80-pound commercial drone operating autonomously between 180 and 377 feet AGL is highly susceptible to the massive, invisible wake turbulence and wingtip vortices generated by a low-flying Boeing 747. The Draft EA fails to model the physical impact of heavy military wake turbulence on the MK30's flight stability, which could lead to mid-air structural failures and subsequent crashes into high-density suburban neighborhoods.*

** Pilot Cognitive Load and Crisis Management: Aircrews flying heavy strategic assets should not have their cognitive load further burdened by having to actively scan for and avoid dozens of autonomous commercial delivery drones. In the event of an in-flight emergency, immediate tactical diversion, or rapid-response security scramble, military pilots must have complete, uncompromised freedom of maneuver in the lower altitudes. Forcing pilots to negotiate a "swarm" of commercial drones in the heat of a critical moment is an unnecessary hazard that degrades operational safety.*

2. Conflict with Civilian General Aviation & Flight Training (Millard Airport / KMLE)

The northern edge of the planned delivery radius heavily overlaps with the Class E airspace of Millard Airport (KMLE) at 132nd & Q Street.

** High-Frequency Touch-and-Go Patterns: Millard is one of the busiest general aviation and flight training hubs in Nebraska. On any given day, student pilots and local aviators execute continuous "touch-and-go" landing practices.*

** The Northwest Alignment Hazard: These aircraft do not follow rigid high-altitude corridors; they routinely line up on final approach 2 to 5 miles out, descending from the northwest to align with the runway. During these low-altitude pattern runs, civilian aircraft are flying incredibly low and slow—constantly transitioning through the exact sub-500-foot airspace corridor that Amazon intends to utilize for autonomous MK30 transit.*

** "Sense and Avoid" Limitations: Expecting an autonomous drone's on-board optical and acoustic sensors to reliably detect and avoid a light piston aircraft (such as a Cessna 172 or Piper Archer) during low-altitude, high-frequency runway pattern work is an unproven safety concept that presents an unacceptable risk of a mid-air collision over high-density residential areas.*

3. Unaddressed Low-Altitude Rotary-Wing (Helicopter) and Special-Mission Airspace Conflicts

Helicopters operate almost exclusively in the very low altitudes target-marketed by Amazon (under 500 feet AGL), creating high-density collision risks with both regular and occasional airspace users that the Draft EA largely ignores:

** Critical Care Medevac Flights: Medical helicopters (such as LifeNet) transporting critical care patients to regional trauma centers (like CHI Health Lakeside or Nebraska Medicine) routinely transit the Papillion, Gretna, and Bellevue corridors. In life-or-death situations, medevac pilots fly direct, low-altitude routes where immediate transit is necessary. They cannot afford to deviate or lose critical seconds to avoid autonomous delivery drones.*

** Law Enforcement Air Support (OPD Able One): Omaha Police Department's helicopter, Able One (based out of Blair Airport but heavily utilized throughout the Omaha metro), and Nebraska State Patrol air units routinely operate at extremely low altitudes during active public safety missions. These tactical maneuvers require pilots to focus entirely on ground-based targets, not dodging 80-pound commercial drones.*

** Agricultural Aviation (Crop Dusting): The peri-urban transition zones from Papillion to Gretna feature active agricultural fields where helicopters and planes are occasionally utilized for seasonal crop dusting. These aircraft operate extremely close to the ground (frequently between 10 and 50 feet AGL). Amazon's planned delivery transit altitudes (180–377 feet AGL) and hovering delivery drops (12–13 feet AGL) directly intersect the working airspace of these low-flying agricultural operators.*

** Transient Military Rotary-Wing Traffic: The local airspace also accommodates occasional, unpredictable military helicopter transit. Transient military utility helicopters, such as UH-1 "Huey" units, have been observed utilizing Millard Airport (KMLE) and transiting the local low-altitude airspace under Visual Flight Rules (VFR). The presence of these occasional but highly unpredictable heavy rotary assets further complicates a crowded sub-500-foot airspace corridor.*

4. Privacy, Local Zoning, and Ground-level Safety Vulnerabilities

During the package drop phase, the MK30 drone must descend vertically to a stationary hover at approximately 13 feet AGL to release its payload.

* *Physical Trespass and Noise: [C] Descending to 13 feet over private driveways or backyards creates highly disruptive, acute noise events (exceeding 90 dB SEL at close range) [D] and represents a severe intrusion of privacy due to the drone's obstacle-avoidance camera arrays scanning private yards.*

* *[E] Property Boundaries and Local Authority: The Draft EA fails to reconcile how Amazon will maintain strict compliance with local Sarpy County zoning regulations and residential property rights, as the low-altitude delivery zone directly targets rapidly expanding high-end subdivisions from Gretna to West Bellevue (such as Shadow Lake, Ashbury Creek, and Portal Ridge).*

Conclusion and Requested Action

The Sarpy and Douglas County airspace is uniquely congested due to the proximity of a major general aviation airport (KMLE), a high-priority military installation (KOFF), active agricultural spraying, law enforcement air support, and critical care medical flight paths. Introducing up to 1,000 autonomous drone deliveries (2,000 operations) per day into this fragile, low-altitude ecosystem is a recipe for disaster.

[Same Topic as B above] *I request that the FAA reject the OpSpec amendment for the Papillion (OMA2) facility, or, at a minimum, mandate a comprehensive Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that physically models the hazards of heavy military wake turbulence, agricultural low-altitude operations, and the impact on military and emergency pilot cognitive load before any flights are authorized.*

Thank you for your time and serious consideration of these community safety issues.

*Sincerely,
Robert Gibson
Omaha, NE*

FAA Response – 06_Gibson

Thank you for your comment.

[A] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[C] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive

area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*

[E] In parallel with the public comment and review period for the draft EA and after conclusion of the NEPA process, it is important for Prime Air and local governments to continue to engage the local community for concerns related to drone operations. Drone package delivery operations require local approvals in addition to the FAA's airspace authorization. The siting of Prime Air's PADDC and associated drone delivery infrastructure are subject to applicable state and local land use and zoning requirements. As such, the FAA does not select the locations for Prime Air to conduct operations, and Prime Air is responsible for complying with any such applicable laws relevant to commencing and continuing their operations and includes any state or local requirements for conducting public outreach or meeting specific reporting requirements. As such, the FAA encourages state and local governments, and the public, to engage with Prime Air directly for any concerns or requests related to Prime Air's drone operations. Requests or concerns may be relayed to Prime Air via email at amazondronefeedback@amazon.com or by calling 888-283-0587.

Public Comment – 07_Heron

To the Federal Aviation Administration:

I am submitting this public comment regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment for Amazon Prime Air package-delivery operations in the Omaha area.

My family and I live in Papillion within the proposed operating area. We are directly affected residents, and we strongly oppose approval of the Proposed Action in its current form.

[A] *The proposed scale of this operation is deeply concerning. Amazon is seeking authorization for up to 1,000 deliveries per day, seven days per week, 365 days per year, with operations potentially occurring from 6:00 a.m. until 10:30 p.m. Because each delivery requires an outbound and return flight, this could introduce thousands of daily drone movements throughout the operating area.*

This would not be an occasional or insignificant use of the airspace. It would introduce recurring commercial aircraft noise over homes, backyards, parks, nature preserves and wildlife habitat for most of the waking day.

[B] *I request that the FAA select the No Action Alternative. At minimum, the FAA should decline to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact based on the current Draft Environmental Assessment, require additional location-specific analysis and consider a limited pilot program with enforceable protections.*

[C] *The noise analysis does not adequately evaluate how residents will experience these flights*

The Draft Environmental Assessment relies heavily on Day-Night Average Sound Level, or DNL, which averages noise over long periods. That measurement does not adequately reflect how residents will experience repeated individual drone flights.

A sound can be clearly audible, disruptive and irritating each time it occurs even when its energy, averaged across an entire day or year, remains below the FAA's conventional significance threshold.

This is particularly relevant for drone noise because the Draft Environmental Assessment acknowledges that drones produce higher-frequency sound that may be more distinguishable from ordinary neighborhood background noise.

The FAA should not conclude that noise impacts would be insignificant without analyzing and disclosing:

- 1. Maximum sound levels during normal flight, descent, delivery, ascent and return flight.*
- 2. The anticipated number of audible flights per hour in affected neighborhoods.*
- 3. The duration of each audible event and the likely time between events.*
- 4. The degree to which drones would be audible above actual local background noise.*
- 5. Tonal and high-frequency sound characteristics that may increase annoyance.*
- 6. Potential interference with sleep, conversation, outdoor recreation and the enjoyment of residential property.*
- 7. Actual baseline noise measurements collected in quiet residential neighborhoods, parks, nature preserves and rural portions of the operating area.*

The fact that annual averaged noise may remain below a threshold developed largely for conventional aviation does not demonstrate that frequent and distinctive drone flights would be insignificant to the people living beneath them.

[D] The Draft Environmental Assessment does not account adequately for major differences in background noise across the area

The proposed operating area includes major transportation corridors, including Nebraska Highway 370, Nebraska Highway 50 and Interstate 80, as well as commercial and industrial property near the proposed Amazon facility.

Those locations experience substantially more roadway and industrial noise than the interior of many residential neighborhoods.

A broad, generalized or area-wide characterization of ambient noise would therefore be misleading. Noise from major highways could raise the apparent background level for the wider study area while failing to represent the actual conditions experienced by homes on interior residential streets, particularly in Papillion's older, heavily wooded neighborhoods.

Many homes, backyards, parks and nature preserves are separated from continuous highway noise by distance, terrain, mature trees and intervening development. In those locations, the existing sound environment is often quiet enough that birds, insects and ordinary neighborhood activity are clearly audible.

A distinctive high-frequency drone may therefore be much more noticeable and intrusive than an analysis based on noisier highway-adjacent conditions would suggest.

The Draft Environmental Assessment recognizes that human perception depends on audibility above background sound and on the local ambient noise level. Nevertheless, it does not disclose neighborhood-specific background measurements sufficient to evaluate those factors.

The FAA should require baseline sound monitoring at representative locations that reflect the full range of conditions within the operating area, including:

- 1. Interior residential streets located away from major highways.*
- 2. Older wooded Papillion neighborhoods.*
- 3. Backyards and other outdoor residential-use areas.*
- 4. Public parks and nature preserves.*
- 5. Wildlife corridors and wooded natural areas.*
- 6. Highway-adjacent, commercial and industrial locations for comparison.*

Measurements should be taken during different times of day, including early morning and evening, rather than relying on a single regional estimate or measurements taken primarily near the proposed facility.

The FAA should then evaluate the audibility and frequency of individual drone events relative to the actual background conditions at each type of location. Highway noise near a limited number of major corridors should not be used, directly or indirectly, to minimize the effect of drone flights over quieter homes and natural areas.

[Same Topic as A above] *The Draft Environmental Assessment does not show where flights will actually occur*

The analysis assumes that deliveries will be broadly or evenly distributed throughout the operating area. However, Amazon's aircraft will follow predefined routes based on actual delivery demand, operational constraints and the locations of participating customers.

Demand will not necessarily be distributed evenly. Certain streets, neighborhoods and corridors may experience far more flights than others.

The Draft Environmental Assessment does not provide proposed route maps, route-density projections, neighborhood-level flight estimates or hourly traffic projections. Residents therefore have no meaningful way to determine whether their homes will experience a few flights each day or repeated flights throughout the day.

Before approving the operation, the FAA should require Amazon to disclose its expected flight corridors and produce route-density maps showing anticipated daily and hourly traffic throughout the operating area.

There should also be binding limits preventing Amazon from concentrating flights over particular neighborhoods, properties or natural areas without additional environmental review and public participation.

[E] *The wildlife analysis does not reflect the actual character of Papillion*

The Draft Environmental Assessment repeatedly characterizes the operating area as urban or developed and suggests that wildlife exposure would generally consist of a brief encounter with a passing aircraft. That does not accurately describe Papillion, particularly its older neighborhoods.

Papillion is heavily wooded in many of its established neighborhoods. Our community contains multiple parks, natural areas and nature preserves that support abundant wildlife. The wildlife is not limited to isolated parkland. Our backyards, mature trees and connected residential canopy are themselves part of an active ecosystem.

Residents regularly observe owls, hawks, eagles, songbirds and many other species living, nesting, hunting, feeding and moving throughout these neighborhoods.

Wildlife is not an abstract concern for our family or our neighbors. Our yards and surrounding trees are regularly used by birds and other animals. We hear and observe them throughout the day and evening. This active ecosystem is one of the primary reasons we value living here.

The proposed operation would not expose wildlife to a single isolated drone encounter. It could introduce repeated low-altitude aircraft movements throughout the day, every day of the year, including during early morning and evening hours when birds and other wildlife are especially active.

The Draft Environmental Assessment does not adequately evaluate how repeated drone flights could affect wildlife behavior, including:

- 1. Nesting and reproduction.*
- 2. Feeding and hunting activity.*
- 3. Communication and song.*
- 4. Migration and movement through connected habitat.*
- 5. Avoidance of frequently disturbed areas.*
- 6. Abandonment of nesting, hunting or roosting locations.*
- 7. Interactions between drones and territorial birds of prey.*

This is especially concerning for owls, hawks, eagles, nesting birds and songbirds that depend on Papillion's mature tree canopy and connected natural areas.

The FAA should not evaluate each drone flight as an isolated and temporary disturbance. It must consider the cumulative effect of repeated flights over the same wooded neighborhoods, parks, nature preserves, backyards, waterways and wildlife corridors, potentially from 6:00 a.m. until 10:30 p.m.

Before issuing any approval, the FAA should require a location-specific wildlife assessment identifying parks, nature preserves, wooded corridors, waterways, nesting areas, roosting locations and other sensitive habitat within the operating area.

The FAA should also require consultation with Nebraska Game and Parks and appropriate local parks and natural-resource officials before making its final decision, not merely allow Amazon to coordinate with them later if problems arise.

At minimum, any authorization should require Amazon to:

- 1. Avoid parks, nature preserves and identified wildlife habitat wherever operationally feasible.*
- 2. Establish meaningful buffers around known nesting and roosting areas.*
- 3. Restrict flights during sensitive nesting, breeding and migration periods where appropriate.*
- 4. Avoid routine flights during dawn and dusk in wildlife-sensitive areas.*
- 5. Conduct independent monitoring of wildlife impacts after operations begin.*
- 6. Reduce, reroute or suspend flights if wildlife disturbance is documented.*
- 7. Publish proposed flight corridors so residents and wildlife officials can evaluate the habitats that would experience repeated overflights.*

The generalized conclusion that wildlife effects would be minor is not adequately supported without this location-specific analysis.

[F] Existing military and aviation noise must be considered accurately

Our neighborhood already experiences aircraft associated with Offutt Air Force Base and other aviation activity. Military aircraft pass over the area several times on some days and can be loud and disruptive.

The proposed drones would not replace that existing aircraft noise. They would add a new and potentially much more frequent form of aviation noise throughout the day.

Existing flights are already noticeable because the underlying environment is otherwise relatively quiet. Adding recurring commercial drone traffic could materially change the everyday sound environment of these neighborhoods.

[Same Topic as B above] *The cumulative question should not be limited to whether combined noise reaches a particular annual DNL threshold. The FAA must examine whether existing intermittent aircraft noise combined with hundreds or thousands of daily drone movements would meaningfully reduce the quiet currently experienced by residents.*

[Same Topic as F above] *The Draft Environmental Assessment should use actual local aviation activity and [Same Topic as D above] baseline sound measurements rather than generalized assumptions.*

[G] The FAA should evaluate reasonable reduced-operation alternatives

The Draft Environmental Assessment effectively considers only Amazon's requested operation and the No Action Alternative. It does not meaningfully evaluate obvious intermediate options that could reduce harm.

Reasonable alternatives include:

- 1. A limited pilot program with a much lower daily delivery limit.*
- 2. Daytime-only operations.*
- 3. Operations beginning no earlier than 8:00 a.m. and ending no later than 8:00 p.m.*

4. *Defined routes avoiding nature preserves, parks, schools, wooded corridors and quiet residential areas.*
5. *A smaller initial service radius.*
6. *Phased expansion based on independently collected noise, wildlife and complaint data.*
7. *Limits on the number of flights allowed over any individual neighborhood or corridor.*

These alternatives are particularly reasonable because part of the stated purpose of the project is to evaluate commercial viability, customer demand and community response. Amazon does not need immediate authorization for the maximum proposed operation to conduct such a test.

The FAA should evaluate a genuine limited-pilot alternative rather than presenting residents with an all-or-nothing choice.

Statements that Amazon may modify its operations or coordinate with agencies if problems occur are not adequate mitigation. Protections must be specific, binding, measurable and enforceable.

Any authorization should include:

1. *Maximum flights per hour and per route, not only a daily maximum.*
2. *A binding prohibition on routine flights before 8:00 a.m. or after 8:00 p.m.*
3. *Route exclusions and buffers around parks, nature preserves, schools and sensitive wildlife habitat.*
4. *Publicly available flight-path, route-density and flight-volume data.*
5. *Independent post-authorization noise monitoring in affected neighborhoods.*
6. *Wildlife monitoring developed in consultation with qualified wildlife experts.*
7. *A publicly accessible complaint process with required investigation and response standards.*
8. *Public reporting of complaints, crashes, emergency landings, aborted deliveries and wildlife incidents.*
9. *Periodic FAA review with authority to reduce or suspend operations.*
10. *Additional environmental review before increasing flight volumes, changing routes, extending operating hours or introducing materially different aircraft.*

Conclusion

These flights are not an essential public service. They are a proposed expansion of Amazon's private retail business. The commercial benefits would largely go to Amazon and participating customers, while noise, wildlife disturbance and loss of neighborhood quiet would be imposed on the broader community.

Amazon's proposed operation is not needed to meet a critical community need. It is an unnecessary expansion of its business model at the expense of residents who did not consent to having their neighborhoods turned into commercial delivery corridors.

People choose to live in Papillion because of its quiet neighborhoods, mature trees, parks, nature preserves, wildlife and residential character. [Same Topic as B above] The air above our homes and natural areas should not be treated as unlimited commercial infrastructure merely because [Same Topic as C above] averaged noise calculations remain below a conventional threshold.

I request that the FAA select the No Action Alternative.

At minimum, the FAA should decline to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact based on the current Draft Environmental Assessment, conduct additional [H] location-specific noise and [Same Topic as E above] wildlife analysis, [Same Topic as G above] evaluate a genuinely limited pilot alternative and [I] provide affected residents with a meaningful opportunity to review route-specific information before any authorization is issued.

Please include this comment in the administrative record and provide substantive responses to each of the issues raised above in the Final Environmental Assessment.

Sincerely,

*Craig Heron
Papillion, Nebraska*

Craig Heron (Inzana)
*Owner, Digital Marketing Specialist
Craig Inzana Media LLC*

FAA Response – 07_Heron

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** of the EA, it was conservatively assumed that for en route operations, a maximum number of overflights over any one location in the Study Area would be 500, which is half of the anticipated total of 1,000 daily deliveries associated with the PADDC and operating area. To account for operations from the PADDC during the period from 6 a.m. to 7 a.m. and from 10 p.m. to 10:30 p.m., it is assumed approximately 50 of the 500 daily delivery overflights (10%) would occur during these periods. These 50 night-time delivery overflight operations would be equivalent to 500 daytime deliveries. When combined with the daytime delivery overflight operations, this would be representative of a combined total of 950 daytime equivalent delivery overflight operations. Since each delivery involves both an outbound and inbound flight path, this equates to 1,900 daily overflights.

The EA also assumes that any one location in the Study Area could receive from one to four deliveries per-operating day and conservatively assumes that at least one of the four deliveries will occur during the nighttime period between 6 a.m. and 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. and 10:30 p.m. This nighttime delivery is equivalent to 10 daytime deliveries, and when combined with daytime deliveries, is equivalent to a total combined maximum of 13 equivalent daytime delivery operations, which is much lower than the maximum number of daytime equivalent overflights that may be experienced at any one location in the Study Area.

Although it is possible any location in the Study Areas could experience up to 1,900 equivalent daytime en route overflights, or up to 13 equivalent daytime deliveries, the PADDC is located at a centralized location within the proposed operating area, and delivery locations would be distributed throughout operating area. This will have the effect of dispersing operations. In addition, Prime Air's flight planning

software is designed to avoid areas designated as No-Fly Zones. With the diversification of flight paths due to dispersed deliveries and the avoidance of No-Fly Zones, the frequency and concentration of overflights will inversely scale as the distance from the PADDC increases.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 3: Noise Metrics*.

[D] Monitoring ambient noise levels before the implementation of the Proposed Action or aviation noise levels after the implementation of the Proposed Action are not required and are outside the scope of the NEPA process. As such, there will not be noise monitoring of ambient noise levels before the commencement of drone operations or ongoing noise monitoring of drone operations after the implementation of the proposed action.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] Noise exposure resulting from implementation of the Proposed Action along with other actions were evaluated in **Section 3.6** of the EA. The evaluation found that, even in areas with existing aviation noise sources within the Action area, including noise from civilian aircraft and military aircraft associated with Offutt Air Force Base, the Proposed Action would not contribute to significant reasonably foreseeable noise impacts.

Additionally, Prime Air's flight route planning software would take into account air traffic to avoid dense airspace restrictions, such as airport runways and heliports. This would help avoid potential noise reasonably foreseeable effects with other air traffic near Class C airspace. In the future, other drone operators may propose locating operations within this Proposed Action's action area. Should that occur, Prime Air understands the potential for impacts may increase due to another operator's activities and would work with that operator and the FAA to mitigate potential impacts. Additionally, the FAA would conduct a new environmental analysis – including noise and reasonably foreseeable effects – prior to another operator beginning drone package delivery operations in this area.

[G] Under NEPA, the FAA only has authority to regulate the scope of the Proposed Action, which includes the approval of Prime Air's expansion of commercial drone package delivery operations using the MK30 drone in the Omaha operating area. The Proposed Action does not include the siting of the PADDC, which is an existing commercial distribution facility operated by Amazon Services, Inc, nor does it include determining alternative sites or operational levels.

In parallel with the public comment and review period for the draft EA and after conclusion of the NEPA process, it is important for Prime Air and local governments to continue to engage the local community for concerns related to drone operations. Drone package delivery operations require local approvals in addition to the FAA's airspace authorization. The siting of Prime Air's PADDC and associated drone delivery infrastructure are subject to applicable state and local land use and zoning requirements. As such, the FAA does not select the locations for Prime Air to conduct operations, and Prime Air is responsible

for complying with any such applicable laws relevant to commencing and continuing their operations and includes any state or local requirements for conducting public outreach or meeting specific reporting requirements. As such, the FAA encourages state and local governments, and the public, to engage with Prime Air directly for any concerns or requests related to Prime Air's drone operations. Requests or concerns may be relayed to Prime Air via email at amazondronefeedback@amazon.com or by calling 888-283-0587.

[H] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 08_Mitchell

Too loud. I vote no!

Sent from my iPhone

FAA Response – 08_Mitchell

Thank you for your comment. As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

Public Comment – 09_Ryan

Sirs,

No.

*Omahans don't want College Stations problems. **[A]** Noise pollution.*

[B] *I saw nothing in your info about the dangers of dropping 5lb packages from the air.*

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

FAA Response – 09_Ryan

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

Public Comment – 10_Schindler

Greetings,

I have concern about allowing Amazon to deliver packages by drone in the Omaha area. Some areas of the Omaha Metro are very rural and have livestock that might react negatively to something flying around. In the city, this might be an ok option but I hope it is not allowed outside of it.

Thank you for your time.

*Ruth Schindler
Plattsmouth, NE.*

FAA Response – 10_Schindler

Thank you for your comment. The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

Public Comment – 11a_SDevault

Please do not allow these [A] dangerous, [B] noisy, nuisance drones to operate in the Omaha area. [Same Topic as A above] Please do not reduce public safety or liberties for Amazon profit. Thank you.

FAA Response – 11a_SDevault

Thank you for your comments.

[A] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA’s primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air’s drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[B] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

Public Comment – 11b_SDevault

Please do not allow this. Please, help avoid the nuisance Amazon drones will create. Please stop this.

FAA Response – 11b_SDevault

Thank you for your comment. Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

Public Comment – 11c_SDevault

Thank for not listening.

FAA Response – 11c_SDevault

Thank you for your comment. Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 12_Skarda

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose Amazon Prime Air's proposed drone delivery operations in the Papillion and Omaha area and to ask the FAA to select the No Action Alternative.

The proposal could allow Amazon to conduct up to 1,000 drone delivery flights per day, seven days per week, between 6:00 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. This could amount to approximately 365,000 delivery operations per year.

[A] *I am concerned about the noise, [B] visual intrusion, [C] privacy, [D] public safety, [E] wildlife disruptions, especially to birds, [Same Topic as D above] collisions with planes, protection of airspace*

for both Offutt Air Force base as well as the Omaha and regional airports in the area, [F] and overall effect these operations would have on our neighborhoods and quality of life.

[G] Residents should not have to accept commercial drones routinely flying over or near their homes simply so small consumer products can be delivered faster. This is an unacceptable invasion of privacy and unneeded service.

[H] Amazon will not be the only company interested in drone delivery. If this proposal is approved, Walmart, Target, Walgreens, and many other companies may seek permission to operate similar services. I do not want the future of our neighborhoods to be skies increasingly filled with commercial delivery drones.

[Same Topic as G above] Please deny or pause the proposed operation and select the No Action Alternative. At a minimum, the FAA should require additional [I] public involvement, [Same Topic as G above] strict limits on operating hours and flight volume, [Same Topic as C above] meaningful privacy protections, [Same Topic as D above] and public reporting of accidents and safety incidents.

Sincerely,

Cindy Skarda
Papillion Ne 68046

FAA Response – 12_Skarda

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the

FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 13_Stover

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to oppose Amazon Prime Air's proposed drone delivery operations in the Papillion and Omaha area and to ask the FAA to select the No Action Alternative.

The proposal could allow Amazon to conduct up to 1,000 drone delivery flights per day, seven days per week, between 6:00 a.m. and 10:30 p.m. This could amount to approximately 365,000 delivery operations per year.

[A] I am concerned about the noise, [B] visual intrusion, [C] privacy, [D] public safety, [E] wildlife disruptions, especially to birds, [Same Topic as D above] collisions with planes, protection of airspace for both Offutt Air Force base as well as the Omaha and regional airports in the area, [F] and overall effect these operations would have on our neighborhoods and quality of life.

[G] Residents should not have to accept commercial drones routinely flying over or near their homes simply so small consumer products can be delivered faster. This is an unacceptable invasion of privacy and unneeded service.

[H] Amazon will not be the only company interested in drone delivery. If this proposal is approved, Walmart, Target, Walgreens, and many other companies may seek permission to operate similar services. I do not want the future of our neighborhoods to be skies increasingly filled with commercial delivery drones.

[Same Topic as G above] Please deny or pause the proposed operation and select the No Action Alternative. At a minimum, the FAA should require additional [I] public involvement, [Same Topic as G above] strict limits on operating hours and flight volume, [Same Topic as C above] meaningful privacy protections, [Same Topic as D above] and public reporting of accidents and safety incidents.

Laura Stover

Papillion, Ne 68046

FAA Response – 13_Stover

Thank you for your comments.

[A] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[C] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

[E] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[F] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.

Public Comment – 14_Swanson

In regards to Amazon using drones for delivery, I have concerns. My home is in the path of the planes that come into both Eppley Airport and Offit Airforce Base. Lifeflight also flies over my home regularly. There is already more than enough air traffic. I'm not comfortable adding additional air traffic.

*Terri Swanson
Omaha, NE*

FAA Response – 14_Swanson

Thank you for your comment. Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed to protect for event-based airspace restrictions. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

Public Comment – 15_Teague

We enjoy and support the drone usage. Carry on!!!

Laura/Charles

FAA Response – 15_Teague

Thank you for your comment. The FAA has noted your general support for the Proposed Action.

Public Comment – 16_Vanderwyst

To Whom It May Concern,

[A] *I am writing to oppose the proposed Amazon Prime Air drone delivery operations in Papillion, Nebraska, and to ask the FAA to select the No Action Alternative.*

*I am deeply concerned about the effect widespread commercial drone deliveries would have on our neighborhoods, **[B]** privacy, **[C]** natural environment, **[D]** and quality of life. Residents should not have to accept commercial drones routinely flying over or near their homes simply so consumer products can be delivered a little faster.*

[E] *Amazon will not be the only company seeking to use this technology. If these operations are approved, Walmart, Target, Walgreens, and other companies may soon request similar permission. Is the future of our neighborhoods supposed to be skies filled with delivery drones throughout the day and evening?*

*Nebraska residents should be able to enjoy the outdoors and our open skies without constantly seeing and hearing commercial drones overhead. I am also concerned about **[F]** noise, **[G]** visual intrusion, **[Same Topic as C above]** wildlife disruption, **[Same Topic as B above]** camera use, data collection, **[H]** mechanical failures, falling packages, and the safety of operating drones over populated areas.*

This proposal appears to offer limited public benefit while placing the burden on the people who live beneath the proposed flight paths. Faster delivery of small consumer products is not a sufficient reason to permanently change the character of our neighborhoods and skies.

[Same topic as A above] *Please deny or pause the proposed operations and select the No Action Alternative. At a minimum, the FAA should require additional **[I]** public hearings, **[Same Topic as B above]** stronger privacy protections, strict limits on operating hours and flight volume, **[Same Topic as H above]** and clear public reporting of accidents, complaints, and safety incidents.*

I do not want this future for Papillion. Our community does not need it, and our children should not be forced to inherit it.

Sincerely,

*Nathan Vanderwyst
[Address Redacted]
Papillion, NE*

FAA Response – 16_Vanderwyst

Thank you for your comments.

[A] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 9: Scope of FAA Authority*.

[B] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 5: Privacy*.

[C] The FAA has conducted a comprehensive assessment of potential impacts to biological resources, including consultation with the USFWS, and determined that the Proposed Action is unlikely to significantly affect wildlife in the Omaha area. For more information on the determination process, please refer to *Topic Specific Response 1: Biological Resources*.

[D] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 7: Quality of Life*.

[E] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 10: Reasonably Foreseeable Effects*.

[F] As detailed in **Section 3.6** and the Technical Noise Report found in **Appendix E** of the EA, the Proposed Action is not expected to generate noise levels that exceed the threshold of significance (DNL 65 dB) at the nearest noise sensitive location or result in a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase at a noise sensitive area already exposed to aviation noise levels of DNL 65 dB or newly expose a noise sensitive area to DNL 65 dB. For more information on the noise exposure analysis please refer to *Topic Specific Response 2: Noise Exposure*.

[G] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 8: Visual Effects*.

[H] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 6: Safety*. The FAA's primary mission is the safety and efficiency of the National Airspace System, and the safety and reliability of the proposed drone operations have been carefully assessed. The FAA has determined that Prime Air's drones and operation does not create a hazard to users of the NAS or the public and can be conducted safely. Prime Air proactively coordinates with law enforcement and emergency management agencies as needed. Likewise, Prime Air submits a Flight Operations Performance Report to the FAA on a monthly basis and proactively reports any safety incidents to the FAA. Prime Air works with the FAA to resolve safety related concerns or violations.

In parallel with the public comment and review period for the draft EA and after conclusion of the NEPA process, it is important for Prime Air and local governments to continue to engage the local community for concerns related to drone operations. Drone package delivery operations require local approvals in

addition to the FAA's airspace authorization. The siting of Prime Air's PADDs and associated drone delivery infrastructure are subject to applicable state and local land use and zoning requirements. As such, the FAA does not select the locations for Prime Air to conduct operations, and Prime Air is responsible for complying with any such applicable laws relevant to commencing and continuing their operations and includes any state or local requirements for conducting public outreach or meeting specific reporting requirements. As such, the FAA encourages state and local governments, and the public, to engage with Prime Air directly for any concerns or requests related to Prime Air's drone operations. Requests or concerns may be relayed to Prime Air via email at amazondronefeedback@amazon.com or by calling 888-283-0587.

[I] Please refer to *Topic Specific Response 11: Public Engagement*.